TERMS of REFERENCE / International Consultant for the Final Evaluation of the Programme

Period of assignment/services: max 6 weeks as a total, broken down in phases.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>MDTF Atlas Project No: MDGF 1897</th>
<th>Country and Thematic Window</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title: Youth Migration: Reaping the benefits and mitigating the risks</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Duration: 3 years</td>
<td>Youth, Employment, and Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Starting Date: 6 November 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official End Date: 06 July 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating UN Organizations:</th>
<th>Implementing partners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td><strong>LEAD: Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (MoSAEO)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture, Tourism, Youth, and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>INSTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education and regional Directorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers’ and private sector intermediary organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Employment Service and its local branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Coordination Mechanisms in Kukes and Shkodra (Regional Employment Boards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Joint Programme Budget:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO:</td>
<td>1,309,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM:</td>
<td>628,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP:</td>
<td>789,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF:</td>
<td>583,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td><strong>3,310,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. BACKGROUND

In December 2006, UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major agreement to programme €528 million through the UN development system towards key MDG and related development goals. The UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) seeks to accelerate progress towards attainment of the MDGs in participating countries by supporting policies that promise high impact, scaling-up of successful models, and innovations in development practice.

The Fund operates through UN Country Teams and actively strives to strengthen inter-agency coherence and effectiveness. Substantively the MDG-F will focus on the following eight key development challenges which are widely acknowledged as central to the achievement of MDGs and internationally agreed development goals: Democratic governance; gender equality; basic social needs including youth and employment; economic and private sector development; environment and climate change; conflict prevention and peace building; cultural diversity and development, private sector children and nutrition and gender and women’s empowerment. A robust results monitoring and evaluation framework 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 learn from and improve joint programmes to attain development results.

2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes towards progress in the MDGs, human development and the generation of public policies focusing on its design, process and results.

3. To obtain and compile knowledge and lessons learned obtained from these development interventions and use them as a major input in the process of designing and implementing interventions that aim to have an impact on the MDGs, Paris Declaration principles and One UN.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system for each joint programme, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and a final evaluation with a summative focus. In addition, for joint programmes lasting more than 2 years, the MDG-F Secretariat has commissioned mid-term evaluations with a formative focus.

Final evaluations are summative in nature and seek to:

1. Measure 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, on one or more of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).
As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

2. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The project “Youth Migration: Reaping the Benefits and Mitigating the Risks” (YEM Programme), financed by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Achievement Fund (MDGF) and implemented by the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (MoLSAEO), in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture, Tourism, Youth, and Sport and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, receives the technical assistance of four international organizations: ILO, IOM, UNDP, and UNICEF.

The YEM programme started its activities in November 2008. The implementing partners have managed the Programme through an international Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) (in the period January 2009-June 2012), together with staff assigned by the four participating international organizations.

The YEM programme was designed to offer some responses to the specific employment challenges of Albania, where strong and sustained economic growth (among the highest of all transition economies since the fall of the communist regime in 1990) did not always result in employment creation. Throughout the last decade, though marked by an expansion of the private sector and increases in domestic demand and foreign direct investment, employment growth remained sluggish— with strong negative peaks in 2001 and 2009. The unemployment rate topped at 18.4 per cent in 1999 and remained in the two digits throughout the period 2000-2009. In 2009, it accounted for 13.8 per cent of the labour force, a further increase from 13 per cent in 2008. Jobless growth has exacerbated vulnerability of many segments of the Albanian population, especially of young people.

Although the country seems to be managing the initial impacts of the global economic crisis, the international economic recession and the uncertainties around the road to recovery could negatively impact the progress made to reduce poverty and improve living conditions. According to the UNDP’s 2011 Human Development Report, the number of people living below the absolute poverty line fell from 25.4 per cent in 2002 to 18.5 per cent in 2005, to 12.4 per cent in 2008. The reduction in rural poverty has also been noticeable, so that the headcount measure of rural poverty declined to 14.6 per cent in 2008. Some authors argue that the decline is due to a combination of remittance flows to the countryside and a shift of employment from agriculture to higher productivity jobs in other sectors. However, both of these sources of growth have limited potential without job creation. While the share of agriculture in GDP has halved in a little over a decade (18.5 per cent in 2008), the proportion of population working in agriculture was still around 44.1 per cent in 2009. At the same time, remittances inflows declined by 3 percentage points of GDP in 2009, compared to 2007, a further reduction from previous years. In terms of welfare distribution,
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2 Percentage of the population whose real per capita monthly consumption is below 4,891 ALL in 2002 prices.
the data also point to growing inequality, with the GINI index reaching 34.51 per cent in 2008 from 28.2 in 2002.

Against this backdrop, the main thrust of the YEM programme strategy revolved around two major components that combined i) the strengthening of the capacity of institutions (both and national and regional level) to design and implement youth-centred employment policies and programmes, with ii) demonstration programmes directed at the creation of more and better jobs for young people and minimization of the risks of migration of disadvantaged youth from rural areas. The institutional development component was geared at increasing the effectiveness of labour market institutions, including the social partners, in addressing the youth employment challenge through better governance of the labour market and improved capacities to design, monitor, and evaluate policies, strategies, and action-oriented programmes on youth employment. The direct support component provided assistance for the development of targeted employment programmes and information campaigns for disadvantaged youth in rural areas, especially those facing discrimination, informality, risks of irregular migration, and social exclusion in two regions of Albania, Kukes and Shkodra.

Such work also contributed to the achievement of the Outcomes of the One UN Programme (i.e. more transparent and accountable governance, and regional development), and in particular to Result 4.1.4 of the One UN Programme (2007-11), which aimed at expanding local economic development opportunities in target regions.

At the time of formulation, the expected results by the end of the Programme included:

1. Improved capacity of the Albanian government to monitor youth labour market indicators;
2. An inter-institutional mechanism able to design, monitor and evaluate youth employment and migration policies;
3. A permanent partnership mechanism between the public and the private sectors;
4. An improved knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle the informal economy and their impact on migration;
5. Coordination system for social pacts for youth employment at local levels; and
6. A system for mobilizing resources from Albanian communities abroad.

2.1 Improved capacity of the Albanian government to monitor youth labour market indicators

The YEM Programme carried out two staff development programmes, each conducted in subsequent phases and extending over several months with the view of responding to the compounded challenges and emerging needs in terms of provision of labour market data for evidence-based policy making. One staff development programme targeted key experts of relevant line ministries, the National Employment Service, social partners, and other labour market institutions. With a focus on explaining the functioning of labour market information systems and the use of labour market statistics throughout the policy cycle, the programme culminated in Albania’s first ever “National Policy Dialogue on Labour Market Statistics for evidence-based policy making”, held in July 2011 under the aegis of the Ministry of Labour and the National Employment Service. The second programme was tailor-made for INSTAT, in view of enabling INSTAT staff to carry out the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and include the relevant questions on school-to-work transition and employment in the informal economy. Series of training workshops were organized throughout the entire programme implementation, starting from the design of the new LFS questionnaire and up to the use and interpretation of labour market statistics for policy and programme design. These training events...

---

3 YEM Project Document, p. 17.
have also been organized around specific policy objectives, such as the re-orientation of the Government’s PARD (Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development) to target informal employment in agriculture, the use of LM statistics in the design of the IPA IV project, the improvement of the analysis of the skills’ needs survey, the development of the Municipal Plan for Youth Employment in Tirana, the use of statistics for territorial planning in the Kukes Region. Specific training materials and publications were developed in collaboration with the ILO HQs and made available in printed and soft copies to the participating institutions in view of facilitating induction processes of future staff members.

2.2 An inter-institutional mechanism able to design, monitor and evaluate youth employment and migration policies

From early 2009 and until the end of the project, the YEM programme assisted an inter-institutional working group of experts from concerned line-ministers, labour market institutions, and social partners in the development and implementation of the National Action Plan for Youth Employment (YE-NAP). The capacity building programme comprised four main components: i) a long series of thematic seminars on the situation of the youth labour market in Albania; ii) a 1-week training workshop held at the International Training Centre of the ILO on youth employment policy development and implementation; iii) a number of follow-up workshops on monitoring and evaluation approaches; and iv) the involvement in the formulation and implementation of programmes at the local level, such as the Territorial Employment Pact for Youth, the Regional Employment and Training Fund, the Municipal Action Plan for Youth Employment.

The National Action Plan for Youth Employment (YE-NAP) revolves around four key objectives: 1) strengthening the governance of the youth labour market at both central and local level; 2) promoting labour market prospect of young people by enhancing their employability; 3) fostering the role of private sector in creating decent jobs for youth; and 4) promoting labour market inclusion of young people’s through targeted measures.

The National Action Plan was finalized in 2010 and officially launched in July 2011. YEM invested resources directly in support of the implementation of Outcome 1.1 (The Employment Policy Department of MoLSAEo manages the (youth) employment policy cycle more effectively) and Outcome 3.5 (Young people are aware of their rights at work).

2.3 A permanent partnership mechanism between the public and the private sectors

An active labour market measure that combined work-training and wage subsidies was designed for disadvantaged youth with the aim of enhancing their employability. This active labour market measure was implemented in the context of public private partnerships (PPPs). The PPPs involved the National Employment Service (NES) and its local branches as front-line service providers, capitalizing on NES’ strength in identifying the intended beneficiaries. An innovative aspect of the measure was the involvement of the private sector not only in the identification of existing vacancies, but also in the overall implementation and monitoring of the measure. The measure combined on-the-job training and vocational training. In addition, it provided the target group of disadvantaged youth, with wage subsidies.
2.4 An improved knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle the informal economy and their impact on migration;

Another strand of the work of the YEM programme focused on the provision of policy advisory services to various line ministers on measures to tackle the informal economy. Technical guidance was for instance offered to the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Finance, and Ministry of Agriculture to modify relevant bylaws concerning the administration of agricultural subsidies. This is estimated to have led to a 1.3 % reduction of informal employment in agriculture and 1 ml USD additional revenue for the Government only in 2011. Similar advisory services were offered to the Ministry of Labour and the National Employment Service with regard to the access to employment services in rural areas by youth at risk of labour market exclusion and migration. Moreover, the insertion of relevant questions in the LFS questionnaire on employment in the informal economy and on migration (linked to the inclusion of the “youth module” and measurements of school-to-work transition) will allow to derive interesting data and information for the development of policies and programmes that tackle the nexus between informal employment and migration. The programme also supported social partners, youth organizations and the education system to finalise training and awareness raising materials on the promotion of young people’s rights at work (Facilitator’s guide and toolkit to promote Youths’ Rights@Work). This material was distributed though the network of the employment services, trade unions and employers’ organizations as well as in education institutions. The Guide and accompanying awareness-raising brochure was also used to organize training and information sessions targeting different groups of young people (students, workers, unemployed and inactive youth).

2.5 Coordination system for social pacts for youth employment at local levels

The design of employment programmes targeting disadvantaged youth in the regions followed and sustained the development of the YE-NAP. Hence, the social pacts for youth employment in the pilot regions were an integral part of the implementation of the NAP. With the technical assistance of the programme, both regions of Kukes and Shkodra established Regional Employment Boards, charged with coordinating the development and implementation of Social Pacts for youth employment at local level. To support Albanian labour market institutions in the provision of a series of integrated service lines for the transition to formalization of young workers and enterprises, the YEM programme worked with over 40 partners in the Kukes Region to prepare and launch a Territorial Employment Pact for Youth. In the Kukes Region, the Programme supported the Regional Employment Board in taking responsibility for the management and implementation of a Regional Employment and Training Fund. The key features of the youth employment programmes in these two regions revolve around the groups and geographical areas to be targeted and the type of programmes offered. The target group encompassed young men and women 15 to 29 years old, with priority given to young individuals who: i) had a low level of education; ii) were long-term unemployed, and iii) were “hard-to-place” due to their personal and household characteristics (e.g. at risk of social exclusion). While ongoing exchanges have taken place between the two Regional Employment Boards, for the last leg of the programme, the REBs and other relevant stakeholders were brought together to review progress and discuss and agree upon the guidelines for the design of future pacts. The implementation of capacity building activities was accompanied by the development of context-related tools, guidelines and other training materials.
2.6 A system for mobilizing resources from Albanian communities abroad.

In the frame of the YEM programme, an intervention targeting young Albanian graduates abroad was designed with the aim of enhancing their employability and ultimately filling in the gaps in the skills needed by the Albanian labour market. The scheme has been implemented in a context of close partnerships with the private sector. In this respect, YEM partnered with the Albanian Students Abroad Network (ASAN) and a private sector intermediary. To assist in the identification of programme beneficiaries, an online mapping of the recent Albanian graduates abroad was designed at the website www.punesimirinor.com.

3. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess and evaluate different dimensions of joint programme (design, process and results). It will look at the performance of the YEM Programme in a comprehensive, systematic and objective manner in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact. The evaluation will assess the relevance of the project objectives and approach as well as identify the extent to which: i) the project has achieved its planned objectives, ii) its strategy has proved efficient and effective, and iii) the long-term impact the project is likely to have. The evaluation will look at the project as a whole, identify good practices and lessons learnt to be used as a knowledge base for developing future technical assistance packages.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the Joint Programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation, as reflected in the relevant minutes of the Programme Management Committee (PMC) and National Steering Committee (NSC).

This final evaluation has the following specific objectives:

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

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 contribute 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.)

  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 provided an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?

  e) How did the project align with and support Albania’s cross-cutting and sectoral strategies?

  f) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?

  g) What was the baseline condition at the beginning of project? How was it established? Was a gender analysis carried out?

  h) Were the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific needs or conditions?

  i) How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project’s progress? Were the targeted indicator values realistic and could they be tracked? Were indicators gender-sensitive? Were the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

  j) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?

  k) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed?

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?

  b) To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been a single agency’s intervention?
c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to the 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, and 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? 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, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?

   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?

   c) To what extent did the joint programme involve the social partners in the implementation of the activities?

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, 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, UNDAF, etc)

g) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

h) To what extent did the joint programme contributed to further promoting gender equality?

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:

i. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?

ii. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?

iii. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?

iv. 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 One UN Programme?

d) To what extent the partnerships and alliances established by the YEM programme partners throughout implementation will contribute to the sustainability of the results of the joint programme?
The evaluation will analyze strategies and implementation modalities so as to provide recommendations to be integrated in the planning process of the Ministry of Labour and other technical and donor agencies that will provide support to the youth employment and migration objectives set out by the Government of Albania. Particular emphasis will be placed on the review of sustainability and impact, as well as on possible innovative technical cooperation features in employment and training. The evaluation will also assess the achievements and effectiveness of pilot programmes at regional level (direct assistance), their replicability and their instrumentality to the institution building and policy development processes.

The final clients of the evaluation report are:

1. Policy makers (particularly the Lead Ministry), managers and practitioners of labour market and other institutions that partnered with the YEM Programme at central and local levels, as well as the social partners, the MDGF Secretariat, and the donor;
2. Project management and the relevant offices of the ILO, IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, including the Resident Coordinator Office.

4. MAIN OUTPUTS

The main outputs of the exercise will be:

- An inception Report (to be submitted within 7 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team)

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.

- A final report in English with findings and recommendations addressing the above-mentioned key evaluation criteria (to be submitted no later than 15 days after the field mission).

The report shall not exceed 60 pages excluding annexes and it will be structured alongside the format appended as Annex.


5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk analysis, survey data, as well as interviews with governmental counterparts and project partners, direct beneficiaries, including young people who have participated in training and/or received services from the project pilots, partner agencies, project management and staff. To this purpose, the evaluation team will undertake a field mission to the Republic of Albania.
The sources of information, information gathering methods and timing are specified below. A complete set of information sources on the project will be made available at the Project Office in Tirana.

A) To be dispatched electronically prior to the field mission:
   - Project documents;
   - Bi-Annual progress reports;
   - Policy and other key documents produced by the Project;
   - Mid-Term Evaluation Document and Relevant Management Response Plan;
   - YEM Sustainability Strategy;
   - PMC Reports and Minutes;

B) To be made available in the Field Project Office during the mission:
   - Training tools, learning packages and other publications;
   - Technical reports;
   - Annual workplan, financial information (MDTF), mission reports from the Secretariat.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical and logistical support of the technical agencies providing support to YEM implementation. The evaluation team will relate to the CTA and the project team for technical matters.

6. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS, WORKPLAN, AND TIMEFRAME

The CTA is the evaluation manager and works in close collaboration with the staff assigned to YEM by the participating technical agencies and the staff of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (Employment Policy Department).

The Resident Coordinator Office is the commissioner of the Evaluation and works in close collaboration with the Evaluation Units at the respective YEM participating agencies. This group liaises also with the MDGF Secretariat, which functions as quality assurance member of this group.

The Programme Management Committee is the Evaluation Reference Group. It is responsible for:

- Reviewing the draft evaluation report and ensure the final draft meets the required quality standards.
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input and participating in the finalization of the evaluation Terms of Reference
- Facilitating the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
- Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation
The tentative timetable of the evaluation is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Review of key project documents. (Evaluator)</th>
<th>4 working days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Field visits</td>
<td>The evaluation team visits project sites, interviews stakeholders and beneficiaries and gathers additional information. (Evaluator and Project team)</td>
<td>8 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Report drafting</td>
<td>The evaluation team drafts the evaluation report and submits it to the Evaluation Manager. (Evaluation Team)</td>
<td>7 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholders comments and feedback</td>
<td>The draft report is circulated to stakeholders for comments and feedback. These are consolidated and sent to the evaluation team. (Evaluation manager and Project team)</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>The evaluation team finalizes the report embedding the comments. (Evaluation Team Leader and evaluation manager)</td>
<td>3 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. EVALUATION TEAM**

The evaluation team will be composed of a senior evaluation expert and a national employment and migration expert. The national staff will also facilitate dialogue and interaction during the field visit and also assist with relevant translations and information gathering during the report writing. Both members of the Evaluation Team will be competitively selected and appointed.

**COMPETENCIES and QUALIFICATIONS of the Evaluation Team**

**A. Senior Evaluation Expert**

- Conceptual and critical thinking as well as analytical skills
- Conversant in monitoring, evaluation and/or social research methodologies (qualitative/quantitative)
- Extensive knowledge and analytical skills based on studies, research, experience, or occupation in one or more MDG-F thematic areas
- Proficiency in English (written and spoken).

Knowledge on:
• MDGs, Development Effectiveness (Paris Declaration, Accra Agenda for Action) United Nations and other Multilateral Development Actors as well as bilateral donor processes and interventions.
• Evaluation experiences within and knowledge of the United Nations system will be considered an asset;
• Evaluation experiences and knowledge on countries where MDG-F operates will be considered an asset providing that the independence of the evaluator is not compromised
• Excellent communication skills
• Computer proficiency;

Qualifications:
I. Academic Qualifications:
• A master degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, engineering or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.
II. Years of experience:
A combination of 7 years of recognized expertise in:
• Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas and
• Having thematic expertise in international development programmes and assessing or evaluating youth employment and migration policies and programmes.

B. Employment and Migration Expert

• Conceptual and critical thinking as well as analytical skills
• Conversant in monitoring, evaluation and/or social research methodologies (qualitative/quantitative)
• Extensive knowledge and analytical skills based on studies, research, experience, or occupation in one or more MDG-F thematic areas
• Experience in interviewing, desk research, drafting and report writing
• Excellent command of English and Albanian

Knowledge on:
• Substantial knowledge in the technical fields of the project (i.e. labour market and development; employment; policies and institutions for youth employment; migration )
• Knowledge of project monitoring and evaluation methodologies
• Evaluation experiences within and knowledge of the United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Qualifications:
I. Academic Qualifications:
• A master degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in employment and labour market monitoring and/or migration would be an asset.
II. Years of experience:
A combination of 7 years of recognized expertise in:
• Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas and
• Having thematic expertise in international development programmes and assessing or evaluating youth employment and migration policies and programmes.

Payments will be disbursed on tranches against products delivered, the first one, upon submission and acceptance by the PMC of the inception report. A second payment upon delivery and approval of a final draft of the evaluation report and acceptance by the MDGF Secretariat.
8. 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.

- **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.
### SUGGESTED FORMAT OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cover page</strong></td>
<td>Summarizing key project data and key evaluation data (type of evaluation, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name/s of the evaluator/s date of submission of evaluation report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Abstract</strong></td>
<td>Maximum of 3-5 pages. It should focus on key findings and recommendations. When preparing the abstract it should be kept in mind that it will appear in the evaluation database.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2. Brief background on the project and its logic** | − Brief description of the project’s objectives and rationale.  
   − Project strategy at approval and during implementation, including agreed revisions.  
   − State of implementation and delivery of the project. |
| **3. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation** | − Type of evaluation.  
   − Brief description of purpose and scope of the evaluation.  
   − Clients and analytical focus of the evaluation. |
| **4. Methodology**               | − Brief description of the methodology used.  
   − Information sources, including remarks on the gaps and limitations.  
   − Remarks on the limitations of the methodology and problems encountered in data gathering and analysis. |
| **5. Review of implementation**  | Brief review of the main stages in the implementation of the project highlighting main milestones and challenges. |
| **6. Presentation of findings**  | Based on key evaluation questions of the analytical framework it should concentrate on key issues (see Section 3 above). |
| **7. Conclusions**               | Concluding assessment derived from the findings and main messages. |
| **8. Recommendations**           | Recommendations should be aimed at improving future projects and general JP strategies and as such they should be presented in a concise and actionable manner, making concrete suggestions for improvements. |
| **9. Lessons learned**           | Observations, insights, and practices extracted from the evaluation that are of general interest beyond the project sphere and contribute to wider organizational learning. This part should also highlight good practices. |
| **10. Annexes**                  | Should include the TORs and list persons contacted as well as any other relevant information. |