

TOR¹ FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS
(One international consultant and one national consultant)

Final Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme on Gender Equality in Viet Nam

1. Background

Vietnam is a pilot country for UN Reform since 2006 and currently implementing the One Plan² II (OPII) (2006-2010 and 2011 as an extension year). 2011 is the final year of the One Plan II and One Plan 2012-2016 is currently being developed by the One UN in Viet Nam in close consultation with the Government of Viet Nam and other key national and international partners.

In the One Plan II, there are five Joint Programmes including three funded by the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F)³. One of them is the Joint Programme on Gender Equality, which contributes to the One Plan Outcome 4 “The principles of accountability, transparency, participation and rule of law are integrated into Viet Nam’s representative, administrative, judicial and legal systems” through Output 4.11 - Improved capacity of relevant national and provincial authorities, institutions and other duty bearers to effectively implement the law on Gender Equality and the Law on Domestic Violence.

The three-year UN-Government Joint Programme on Gender Equality in Viet Nam started in March 2009 with the overall goal of building the capacity of central and provincial duty bearers to effectively implement, monitor, evaluate and report on the Law on Gender Equality and the Law on Domestic Violence Prevention and Control with the total budget of USD4,683,516⁴. The Programme contributes to the achievement of the MDG 3: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Viet Nam across sectors.

The Joint Programme on Gender Equality has the following joint outcomes:

1. Improved skills, knowledge and practices for the implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of the Law on Gender Equality and the Law on Domestic Violence Prevention and Control.
2. Enhanced partnerships and coordination around gender equality within and outside of the government.
3. Strengthened evidence-based data and data systems for promoting gender equality.

¹ Adapted from the generic Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Final Evaluation of Joint Programmes by MDG-F Secretariat

² One Plan is the equivalent of UNDAF in UN Reform pilot country

³ For more background on the MDG-F, please see Annex 1.

⁴ USD4,500,000 from MDG-F, USD88,810 from AECID, and VND1,610,000,000 (equivalent of USD94,706 as of January 2009) from the Government of Viet Nam

The above-mentioned three joint outcomes are supported by 10 outputs and 48 activities implemented by 12 UN agencies⁵ in close collaboration with the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, and the General Statistics Office, and more than 16 other co-implementing partners⁶. The State Management Agent (SMA) responsible for the Joint Programme on Gender Equality is the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs. UNFPA is the Managing Agent (MA) from the UN side.

The main JPGE beneficiaries are duty bearers at central as well as local levels. Therefore, most of JPGE activities took place at the central or provincial levels. The JPGE also targets the general public in increasing awareness on gender equality and domestic violence. As part of the Programme, a few community-based activities have been implemented. In addition, JPGE works with mass organizations, academic institutions, NGOs, and other stakeholders working on gender issues in Viet Nam to strengthen partnerships and coordination.

The Joint Programme on Gender Equality is in the final year of implementation in 2011 and the Programme is expected to be completed and handed over to the relevant stakeholders in March 2012. In order to assess the overall implementation progress and key achievements and to document good practices and lessons learned from the Programme, an independent final evaluation is planned in November 2011.

In this context, the Programme is seeking highly qualified individual consultants to conduct the final evaluation of the Joint Programme on Gender Equality. The evaluation is planned to be conducted by a team of one international consultant as a team leader and one national consultant as a team member.

2. OVERALL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

1. Assess to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results.
2. Generate substantive evidence based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

⁵ FAO, ILO, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIDO, UN Women, UNODC, WHO, and IOM (IOM is an international organization accredited to the UN with observer status)

⁶ Ministry of Education and Training, Ministry of Information and Communication, Central Communist Party Committee for Education and Popularisation, Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs and Parliamentary Committee for Culture, Education, Youth and Children, National Committee for Advancement of Women (NCFAW), Viet Nam Women's Union, Centre for Women and Development (CWD), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Justice (MOJ), Ministry of Public Security (MPS), National Assembly: Parliamentary Women Group, Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI): Viet Nam Women Entrepreneurs Council, Some key media agencies, Some other related agencies, organizations when required, selected national universities, research institutions, and NGO networks such as GENCOMNET, DOVIPNET, and NEW.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Assess to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Assess joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Assess to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. Assess 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 Ha Noi Core Statement, Accra Principles, and UN reform).
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration and Ha Noi Core Statement, Accra Principles, and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

Detailed guidance note on the final evaluation and Ethical principles and premises of the evaluation are attached as Annexes 3 and 6 respectively.

4. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT AND DUTY STATION

The assignment is expected to take place during late October/early November 2011 to February/early March 2012. The expected number of working days per consultant is 20 days for the International Consultant and 15 days for the National Consultant minimum including 10 consecutive working days in Viet Nam (mostly in Hanoi). The travel outside of Hanoi may be included during the field work. The cost of the travel outside of Hanoi will be covered by the commissioner of this evaluation.

5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The International Consultant will be the Team Leader. The Team Leader, in close collaboration with the National Consultant, will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables. Specifically, the team of consultants is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the UNFPA Hanoi Office (hereinafter referred to as commissioner) and the Joint Programme Coordinator (hereinafter referred to as the manager of the evaluation):

- ✧ **Draft detailed workplan reflecting the work of the international and national consultants:** to be submitted within 5 days of the signing of the contracts.
- ✧ **Inception Report (in English and Vietnamese):** to be submitted within 15 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team.
- ✧ **Draft Final Report (in English and Vietnamese):** to be submitted within 20 days after the completion of the field visit. See Annex 4 for more details.
- ✧ **Final Evaluation Report (in English and Vietnamese):** to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments. See Annex 4 for more details.

6. SPECIFIC TASKS

The selected **International consultant** will work with a National Consultant to carry out the evaluation. The specific tasks are as follows:

- Desk review of all relevant documents
- Mapping of stakeholders
- Preparation of the detailed workplan for the final evaluation
- Preparation of an inception report
- Conduct of meetings and interviews with key project informants
- Site visits to areas as needed
- Preparation of draft evaluation report
- Presentation of the draft evaluation report to the stakeholders of the Joint Programme on Gender Equality to get comments, feedback and recommendations
- Finalise the evaluation report integrating agreed comments and recommendations from the stakeholders' meeting
- Submission of the final evaluation report
- Provide lead and guidance to the national consultant on necessary support/assistance.

The selected **National Consultant** will work to provide support to the International Consultant to undertake the evaluation. Specific tasks are as follows:

- Desk review of all relevant documents
- In close consultation with the International Consultant, support International Consultant throughout the evaluation process including developing the mapping of stakeholders, preparing the detailed workplan for the final evaluation, drafting the inception report, arranging for meetings/interviews, carrying out meetings with the JPGE stakeholders, conducting analysis of data collected, preparing the draft evaluation report and the presentation for the stakeholder meeting, and finalizing the evaluation report
- Provide interpretation and translation support to the International Consultant.

7. QUALIFICATIONS

The consultants should have the following qualifications:

International Consultant as a Team Leader

- Education: Master's degree in Social Sciences, economics, or other relevant fields. Whatever the degree the candidate holds, she or he must have a strong understanding and experiences in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating programmes on gender equality promotion.
- Experiences: At least ten years of experience in conducting evaluation of development programmes in different modalities and working on wide range of gender issues including gender-based violence. Excellent knowledge and understanding of monitoring and evaluation framework. Experience in the UN system especially in One UN pilot countries as an advantage.

- Language: Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English. Working knowledge of Vietnamese language is an advantage
- Competency: Good skills in grasping the very complex project situation in a short time frame. Excellent analysis skills in writing evaluation reports with constructive and practical recommendations. Good audience-oriented communication, teamwork and presentation skills. Ability to understand and appropriately respond to MDG-F requirements.

National Consultant as a Team Member

- Education: Master's degree in Social Sciences, economics, or other relevant fields. Whatever the degree the candidate holds, she or he must have a strong understanding and experiences in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating programmes on gender equality promotion.
- Experiences: At least five years of experience in conducting evaluation and working on wide range of gender issues including gender-based violence in Viet Nam. Knowledge and experience in the UN system especially in One UN pilot countries, relations or past contacts with government department and NGOs would be an advantage.
- Language: Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English and Vietnamese.
- Competency: Good observation and analytical skills in grasping the very complex project situation in a short time frame. Excellent skills in writing reports. Good audience-oriented communication, teamwork and presentation skills. Ability to understand and appropriately respond to MDG-F requirements.

8. APPLICATION

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

7.1 Statement of Interests and Technical Proposal

- Explaining why he/she is the most suitable for the work as per requirements of the TOR (2 pages maximum)
- Giving brief information on similar tasks implemented (2 pages maximum)
- Describing on how he/she will approach and conduct the work (3 pages maximum). Please include the suggested number of days required for this assignment as well as the rate of the consultation fee.

7.2 Curriculum Vitae and P-11 form

- Curriculum Vitae
- Applicants are encouraged to fill and sign a UN Personal History form (P11 Form).
- Please click here <http://vietnam.unfpa.org/public/pid/5551> to download the P11 Form.

Applications should be sent to Ms. Nguyen Minh Ha, Admin/Finance Associate, UNFPA Viet Nam (minhha@unfpa.org.vn), indicating clearly the position title “**International Consultant** or **National Consultant** - Final Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme on Gender Equality in Viet Nam”

Deadline for submission: **04 November 2011**

Please see Annex 7 for information related to the contract terms.

9. SELECTION PROCESS

Individual consultants will be evaluated using the following criteria and points:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
1. Experience in developing evaluation methodologies and carrying out evaluations, including the drafting and finalization of the evaluation reports especially in the areas of gender	20%	20
2. Experience in evaluating development programmes including complex Joint Programmes	25%	25
3. Experience in/knowledge of gender and gender-based violence	25%	25
4. Familiarity with the UN System and One UN initiatives	15%	15
5. Excellent analytical, drafting and communication/writing skills in English.	15%	15
Total	100%	100

10. EVALUATION DRAFT TIMELINE

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	Timing/Duration	When
Implementation	Selection and recruitment of consultants	CE	7-14 days	Early November 2011
Implementation	Provide the evaluation team with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme (Preliminary list of documents for desk review is attached as Annex 5)	EM, ERG	7 days	Early-Mid November 2011
Implementation	Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group	ET****	15 days	Mid-Late November 2011
Implementation	Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days	Late November 2011
Implementation	Agenda drafted and agreed with evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days	Late November 2011
Implementation	In country mission	ET, EM, CE, ERG	20 days	November – December 2011
Implementation	Delivery of the draft report	ET	20 days	5 January 2012
Implementation	Quality check of the evaluation draft evaluation report	CE, MDGF-S*****	5 days	12 January 2012
Implementation	Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team	EM, CE, ERG/GACA*****	15	3 February 2012
Implementation	Delivery of the final report	EM, CE, ERG, MDGF-S, ^NSC	10	17 February 2012
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation	EM, CE, ERG, NSC	10	Late February and early March 2012

*Commissioner of the evaluation (CE)

**Evaluation Reference group (ERG)

***Evaluation manager (EM)

****Evaluation team (ET)

*****MDG-F Secretariat (MDGF-S)

*****Government Aid Coordinating Agency (GACA)

^National Steering Committee

ANNEX 1: BRIEF BACKGROUND ON THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS ACHIEVEMENT FUND (MDG-F)

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 supports 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.

ANNEX 2: BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON THE JOINT PROGRAMME ON GENDER EQUALITY INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT AND PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS

The Joint Programme on Gender Equality consists of three specific component projects on Gender Equality, Domestic Violence, and Data, and each component is coordinated by one National Implementing Partner (NIP) and one UN Coordinating Agency as follows:

- Gender Equality: the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs and UN Women
- Domestic Violence: the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism and UNFPA
- Data: the General Statistics Office and UNDP

Each NIP has established a Component Project Management Unit (CPMU) consisting of Director, Vice Director, one full-time project coordinator, and one accountant cum secretary. CPMUs are responsible for day-to-day operation and implementation of their Component Project.

Representatives of the CPMUs constitute the Programme Management Unit (PMU) of JPGE. The PMU is responsible for overall management and coordination of the Programme and it meets quarterly to monitor implementation progress, discuss challenges in implementation and to approve workplans. The JPGE Gender Specialist is based in the offices of PMU and CPMU to provide technical support on gender and overall coordination.

The oversight and strategic guidance is provided by a Joint National Steering Committee (NSC) for all three MDG-F joint programmes. The Committee has a representative of the Government Aid Coordinating Agencies (GACA) (Ministry of Planning and Investment) and the UN Resident Coordinator as two co-chairs; a Representative from Spanish Embassy (AECID - Agency for International Cooperation for Development) as core member; and representatives of Lead Coordinating or Managing Agency from Government and UN side as other members. The NSC meets twice a year to review and monitor implementation progress and endorse workplans and annual fund requests.

In addition to the above management structure, the Joint Programme Taskforce, made up of colleagues from the Government and the UN involved in the Programme, meets every month to share operational and implementation updates for improved coordination.

The Joint Programme on Gender Equality reports the implementation progress regularly. In addition, the Independent Mid-term Evaluation of the JPGE was carried out in October 2010 to review the Programme's design, quality and internal coherence, to assess the efficiency of the JPGE's management model, and to identify the programme's effectiveness, its contribution to the objectives of the MDG-F thematic window on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the MDGs, with a view to improving the implementation of the remaining half of the Joint Programme. The recommendations from the Mid-term Evaluation were reviewed and discussed to develop concrete actions to be applied in the remaining JPGE term.

The Joint Programme also took part in the Independent Review of five Joint Programmes conducted in early 2011 to review and assess the implementation modalities of these five Joint Programmes.

The key achievements of the Joint Programme to date are as follows:

Joint Outcome 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved knowledge and skills among selected officials in promoting gender equality and addressing domestic violence in their work (e.g. mainstreaming gender in developing legislations, programmes, etc) • Improved national frameworks to support the implementation of the Law on Gender Equality

(e.g. development and approval of the National Strategy on Gender Equality 2011-2020, National Programme on Gender Equality 2011-2015, Plan of Action on Gender Equality 2011-2015 by selected Ministries, Multi-agency collaboration guidelines for the Law on Domestic Violence Prevention and Control, Website on DVL, etc)

Joint Outcome 2

- Enhanced coordination and partnerships on gender equality
 - Increased role and presence of the State Management Agencies (SMAs) in coordination of gender architecture (e.g. MOLISA taking lead in reviewing progress and achievements of Gender Programme Coordination Group)
 - Increased exchange of information on gender issues among various stakeholders for coordination and advocacy (e.g. Gender Action Partnership meetings)
 - Increased participation of various stakeholders including civil society organizations in the process of developing gender related policies
 - Gender Reporters' Network strengthening reporting towards gender equality
 - Self-help groups of DV victims strengthening their life skills

Joint Outcome 3

- Increased and improved data and data systems for promoting gender equality
 - Gender Statistics Indicator System (GSIS) finalized and submitted to the Prime Minister for approval
 - Collection of data in the areas lacking data completed (e.g. domestic workers' working conditions; incidence of trafficking in boys in Viet Nam; gender and remittances; sex work and mobility, etc).

ANNEX 3: DETAILED GUIDANCE NOTE ON THE FINAL EVALUATION

Methodological Approach

This final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, mid-term evaluations and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. Consultants are also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool as a means to collect relevant data for the final evaluation. The evaluation team will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of targeted citizens/participants of the joint programme are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

Evaluation Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions

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) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
 - 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) Have the corrective strategic decisions been made? If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed?
 - h) How much and in what ways did the joint programme contributed to UN Reform in Viet Nam?

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? Was the JPGE model cost effective in relation to the results achieved?
 - 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 (PMU) 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 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? Were the lessons learnt taken into consideration? 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, Professional, Scientific, Political and Mass Organizations (PSPMOs) local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process? What roles did they play?
 - 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?

Results level

- **Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.**
 - a) To what extent 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, One Plan, etc).

- g) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen 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:
 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
 2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
 3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
 4. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the 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 UN One Plan?

ANNEX 4: SUGGESTED OUTLINE OF THE REPORTS

Suggested Outline of the Inception Report

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 desk study 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 below:

0. Introduction
1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
3. Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme
4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information
5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”

Suggested Outline of the Draft and Final Evaluation Reports

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 report 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 draft 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.

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 following sections:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
 - Background, goal and methodological approach
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Methodologies used in the evaluation
 - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of the development interventions carried out
 - Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

ANNEX 5: PRELIMINARY LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR DESK REVIEW

MDG-F Context

- MDG-F Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines (February 2011)

Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission report 2009 by the MDG-F Secretariat
- Mission reports by JPGE colleagues
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual Joint Monitoring Reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan

- Financial information (on MPTF⁷ Gateway at www.mdtf.undp.org)
- Minutes of the NSC, PMU, and JPGE Taskforce meetings
- JPGE Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- JPGE Mid-term Evaluation Report, Comments Matrix, and Improvement Plan
- JPGE research/study reports, training materials, guides, and other JPGE products
- Draft JPGE Sustainability Plan
- List of PUNOs and NIPs with contact details

Other in-country documents or information

- Independent Review of Joint Programmes in Viet Nam
- MDG Reports by Viet Nam (Viet Nam achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2005, 2010)
- UN Viet Nam Annual Report 2009 & 2010
- Gender PCG reports from 2009 and 2010
- Country Gender Assessment Report by the World Bank
- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One
- HPPMG

ANNEX 6: ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES 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.

⁷ MDTF- Multi-Donor Trust Fund has now renamed to MPTF-Multi-Partner Trust Fund

- **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.

ANNEX 7: CONTRACT TERMS

Travel Arrangements and Visa

The International Consultant is responsible for arranging his/her own travel from/to Hanoi. The cost of traveling will be reimbursed as per UNFPA policy. In general, UNFPA does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the International Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

The International Consultant is responsible for arranging his/her own visa. The UNFPA Hanoi Office may issue a letter to support the visa application to Viet Nam upon request.

Travel/medical insurance

The consultants are responsible for arranging for his/her own travel/medical insurance.