**TOR Final Programme Evaluation**

### Title: Final Programme Evaluation

Project: PBILD - South Serbia UN Joint programme "Strengthening Capacity for Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia" and "Promotion of Peace Building in South Serbia”

Reporting to: PBILD Programme Manager

Duty Station: Bujanovac

**Duration:** 20 December 2012 – 01 March 2013

**Contract Type:** Contract for professional services

**Background**

**a. Purpose**

The purpose is to undertake a Final Evaluation which provides information on the results of the Peace-Building and Inclusive Local Development (PBILD) programme with a view to ascertaining the desirability of scaling-up the initiative in a second phase.

**b. Objective**

The objective of the Final Evaluation is to assess to what extent and how programme outputs were achieved, including aspects of efficiency and their contribution to tangible results and outcomes. The Final Evaluation will also assess the relevance, impact and sustainability of the PBILD programme and provide specific recommendations to government, donors and UN agencies for future initiatives that build on the programme’s results.

**c. Background Information**

The PBILD programme is composed of two UN joint programmes: `Promoting Peace-building in South Serbia` and `Strengthening Capacities for Inclusive Development in South Serbia. Six UN agencies deliver the programme -- UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, UN-HABITAT, ILO and IOM – and work together from the UN PBILD Office in Bujanovac. The PBILD programme began implementation in October 2009 and is due to finish by the end of March 2013.

Five international donors fund PBILD:

* The Spanish Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) supports ‘Promoting Peace building in South Serbia’ with USD 2.5 million
* The Swedish International Development agency (SIDA), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Kingdom of Norway and UNDP together support ‘Strengthening Capacity for `Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia’ with USD 6.3 million.

### 

### *PBILD’s National Partners*

Until the elections of May 2012, the Ministry of Public Administration & Local Self-Government at national level was PBILD’s lead ministry partner. Following the restructuring of ministries, the lead Ministry now is the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Policy. Other national level partners involved in the programme are: the Ministry for Youth & Sports, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, the Directorate for Human & Minority Rights, the Ombudsman’s Office, the Co-ordination Body for Presevo, Bujanovac and Medvedja and the Commissariat for Refugees.

PBILD works in Jablanica and Pcinja districts of south Serbia which are comprised of the 11 municipalities of Bojnik, Crna Trava, Lebane, Vlasotince, Medvedja, Bosilegrad, Bujanovac, Presevo, Surdulica, Trgoviste and Vladicin Han, and the two cities of Vranje and Leskovac.

**PBILD’s goal** is to contribute to inclusive, peaceful and sustainable development in south Serbia. The four outcomes, or focus areas, of PBILD’s work are:

**Outcome 1** - Community Cohesion and Human Capital: Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk. *(This outcome is achieved through a combination of MDG-F and multi-partner funded activities; other outcomes are funded only by multi-partners, i.e. fall only under the ‘Inclusive Development’ joint programme.)*

**Outcome 2** - Public Services: More equitable and improved access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education)

**Outcome 3** - Economic Development: Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between ethnic groups, and with other parts of the country

**Outcome 4** – Migration Management: Migrants from the region fully participate in the social and economic life of the region and thereby contribute to the development of their wider communities and Serbia’s EU integration aspirations.

**Description of Responsibilities**

**a. Scope of work**

PBILD invites applications from qualified companies to perform a Final Evaluation of the programme.

The purpose is to provide information about the results of the PBILD Programme in order to:

* Measure to what extent PBILD has implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes, with a special focus on measuring development results and assessing transformational change;
* Generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at local or national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

The Final Evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by PBILD, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. The unit of analysis or object of study for this Final Evaluation is PBILD, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the PBILD programme documents and in associated modifications made during the implementation. Under the guidance of the PBILD Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) and in close co-ordination with the members of the PBILD team in south Serbia, the company will be required to review the progress made in the production of the PBILD outputs since its onset and appraise their relevance for the achievement of the PBILD outcomes.

The work of the Evaluators will be guided by the PBILD Programme Documents (in particular the revised result framework and the annual work plans), the Monitoring Framework agreed upon by participating UN Agencies and the analytical framework in Annex 3.

The Evaluators will be specifically required to:

* Appraise the quantitative and qualitative information collected to measure the impact of the activities implemented, including but not limited to cost benefit and cost effectiveness reflections of the programme;
* In collaboration with the members of the PBILD team, interview stakeholders and conduct field visits to gather information on the performance of PBILD;
* Systematize and analyse the data and information stemming from the implementation of the activities under the responsibility of each participating UN agencies;
* Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the activities carried out according to the analytical framework provided;
* Draft a summative evaluation report that:
  + Summarize the overall development results and achievements;
  + synthesizes the overall performance of PBILD;
  + describes innovative practices implemented;
  + identifies challenges encountered and the strategies deployed to address them;
  + provides recommendations and lessons learnt during implementation for further action.
* Finalize the report on the basis of the comments received by the PBILD Evaluation Reference Group.

The Evaluators will also review, analyze and provide conclusions and recommendations on the following:

* The status of the corresponding Country Programme Strategy (UNDAF) outcome and estimate the degree of programme's contribution to it;
* The degree to which the programme activities listed in the Project Document have been successfully implemented and desired outputs and impact achieved;
* What factors contributed to its effectiveness or ineffectiveness;
* The efficiency of the programme approach in delivering outputs and impact;
* Assessment of external factors affecting the programme, and the extent to which the programme has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors;
* The approach to project management, including the role of stakeholders and co-ordination with other development projects in the same area;
* The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from the programme activities;
* The level of beneficiaries’ and partners’ satisfaction with programme implementation and results;
* The contribution of PBILD to the objectives of the MDG-Fund peace-building window as well as the overall MDG-Fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform);
* Assessment on how gender and human rights issues were considered throughout the programme implementation;
* Assessment on how the results-based management strategies were applied for achieving programme objectives;
* The potential for continuation or scaling up of the initiative
* Specific gaps and needs (relevant in the programme context) that remain unattended to, and which require and justify scale-up or replication interventions.

**b.** **Methodology**

The Final Evaluation approach should be in accordance with standard international practices in project evaluation. The proposed steps in conducting the evaluation will be:

* Review of programme documentation, monitoring records and progress and other relevant reports, analysing impact of measures from municipal strategies/action plans facilitated by PBILD;
* Initial meeting with the PBILD Team and Evaluation Reference Group to agree the specific design and methods for the evaluation, what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. Agree on the evaluation questions that will need to be answered, given limitations of time and extant data;
* Organization of interviews with key staff involved in the programme implementation;
* Prepare inception report with evaluation matrix (format will be provided at the mission outset);
* Discussions with members of the PBILD team and partners to assess the programme's relevance and effectiveness of implementation, noting their perceptions of accomplishments and potential for further development and provide suggestions for management’s response to evaluation findings. Objectively verifiable data should be collected whenever available to supplement evidence obtained through interviews and focus group discussions;
* Prepare Draft Report and present it to the PBILD Team;
* Incorporate received feedback from the ERG into the Final Evaluation;
* Prepare the Final Evaluation with an Executive Summary.

The following set of information sources on PBILD will be made available to the Evaluators:

* PBILD Programme documents;
* Progress and technical reports;
* Mid-term evaluation report;
* Key documents (policy analyses, research, surveys, monitoring reports) produced by PBILD;
* Training tools, learning packages and other publications.

The evaluation has to be carried out in line with these ToRs.

**General considerations**

The methodology of the PBILD evaluation will be in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards [UNEG Norms and Standards](http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp;jsessionid=BF5B67B9BD7B90E3998ECF1BBCD3CA5A?doc_cat_source_id=%3c%25=UnevalConst.UNEG_NORMS_STD%25%3e) [www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp;jsessionid=BF5B67B9BD7B90E3998ECF1BBCD3CA5A?doc\_cat\_source\_id=%3C%25=UnevalConst.UNEG\_NORMS\_STD%25%3E](http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp;jsessionid=BF5B67B9BD7B90E3998ECF1BBCD3CA5A?doc_cat_source_id=%3C%25=UnevalConst.UNEG_NORMS_STD%25%3E) . The Evaluation Team will also ensure that the evaluation process is ethical, in line with UNEG Ethical Guidelines. The evaluation will rely, to the extent possible, on already available data

1. **Deliverables** **and** **Timeline**

It is expected that the evaluation will last 30 working days from 20 December 2012 to 01 march 2013. The following deliverables will be due:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Duration** | **Date** |
| Inception Report including desk review, work plan and evaluation matrix prepared and accepted | 5 days | By 4 January 2013 |
| Field mission to south Serbia  Belgrade meetings | 10 days  4 days | 14-25 January 2013  28-31 January2013 |
| Draft Evaluation Report (DER) (see Annex I) submitted, presented to the PBILD Team and comments incorporated | 7 days | 8 February 2013 – submission  12 February – presentation  18 February – revised DER submitted |
| Final Evaluation report with Executive Summary prepared, presented to and accepted by ERG in Belgrade | 4 days | Prepared: 22 February  Presented: 26 February  Accepted: 1March |

**Travel:** The evaluators are expected to travel to south Serbia and interview national partners in Belgrade:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 20 December 2012 | Briefing with PBILD team in Bujanovac |
| 14–25 January 2013 | Mission in connection with interviews (10 working days in Jablanica & Pcinja districts where PBILD operates) |
| 28 – 31January 2013 | Belgrade meetings (with Donors and national partners) |
| 4. 12 February 2013 | Presentation of results and debriefing to PBILD Team in Bujanovac |
| 5. 26 February 2013 | The final report presented to ERG and Donors |

Travel costs (transport and accommodation) will be part of the overall lump-sum reimbursement of the consultancy.

The criteria of utility, credibility, relevance and appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:

* The Final Evaluation has to be written in clear, concise and highly readable English;
* The Executive Summary should highlight the evaluation’s key findings, conclusions and recommendations in no more than 3 pages;
* The information in the report has to be complete, well-structured and well-presented;
* The information in the report has to be reliable, well-documented and supported by findings;
* The information in the report has to address programme priorities strategically;
* Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable;
* Human rights and gender equality perspectives must be taken into account.

**Requirements**

Potential bidders should be a professional services firm/organization/consortium with the following characteristics:

a) a team of three comprised of a team leader, economic expert and social expert;

b) a minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience, preferably in international/multilateral development context in the region of south Serbia;

c) Experience in evaluating and monitoring, technical co-operation and development activities and projects.

The team leader shall meet at least the following requirements:

* The team leader should be an experienced evaluator who has a track record of implementing evaluations on large complex projects in field of Municipal Development
* Experience with public administration reform at the local government level
* Understanding of current policies and legislation on local self-government, gender, minority rights, migration
* Experience with the implementation of municipal and CSO projects
* Experience with local economic development (LED) and the role of local authorities in LED.
* Experience with citizen participation in decision making at the local level
* Knowledge on the approach to Peace-Building and Inclusive Local Development
* **Prior experience of work with UN agencies and on joint programmes would be an asset.**
* Superior English language writing skills

The economic expert shall meet at least the following requirements:

* Excellent understanding of south Serbia's economic situation and migration policies and legislation
* **Knowledge of Pcinja and Jablanica districts capacities and the trends of economic development in the region is an asset.**
* **Good knowledge of economic development issues and past interventions in south Serbia would be a great advantage;**
* **Experience in the field of Strategic Planning, especially in the area of Sustainable Development in Serbia including municipal-level action plans and strategies for sustainable and economic development**
* **Prior experience of work with UN agencies and on joint programmes would be an asset.**

The social expert shall meet at least the following requirements:

* Excellent understanding of south Serbia's minority rights, gender, social inclusion situation, social cohesion and integration challenges, policies and legislation
* **Knowledge of the existing systems of social welfare and education operating in Serbia, and insight into how these systems function and the challenges they face, especially from the migration, gender and minorities perspective.**
* **General high level of awareness and understanding of social, cultural, economic and political situation in Serbia, particularly south Serbia and the particular inter-cultural aspects of societies in the target area, Jablanicki and Pcinjski districts.**
* **Experience in the field of Strategic Planning, especially in the area of Social Protection in Serbia, Gender Equity including municipal-level action plans and strategies for social protection and gender equity.**
* **Prior experience of work with UN agencies and on joint programmes would be an asset.**

The team as a whole should possess the following requirements:

**Skills and competencies**

* Excellent analytical skills
* Ability to synthesize research and reach empirically-based conclusions
* Strong and highly readable English writing skills
* Proven capacity to produce high-quality reports
* Displays capacity to provide experienced advice based on best practices
* Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues
* Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback
* Good application of Results-Based Management
* Good communication, co-ordination and facilitation skills
* Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of work
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Demonstrates integrity by modelling ethical standards

**Qualifications**

* Masters or equivalent in relevant field of Public Administration/Economic development

*Knowledge*

* Excellent understanding of Serbia's socio-economic situation in southern areas;
* Understanding of current policies and legislation on local self-government, gender, minority rights, migration
* Familiarity with the UN evaluation policy, norms and standards;
* Knowledge in the use of computers and office software packages and handling of web based monitoring systems.

*Personal qualifications*

* Ability to deliver when working under pressure and within changing circumstances
* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
* Excellent interpersonal skills

*Languages:*

* Excellent spoken and clear, concise and succinct written English
* Serbian

If applicable, please provide consortium agreement. This agreement should state the leading company/institution which will be responsible for signing and implementing the contract with PBILD. Also, the agreement should have a clause indicating that the members of the consortium will hold PBILD harmless in case of internal disputes.

**ANNEX I**

**(Integral part of the ToR)**

**Table of Contents for Inception Report**

**1. INTRODUCTION\***

1.1. Objective of the Evaluation

1.2. Background and Context

1.3. Scope of the Evaluation

**2. METHODOLOGY**

2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions\*

2.2. Conceptual framework

2.3. Data collection methods\*

2.4. Analytical approaches

2.5. Risks and potential shortcomings\*

**3. PROGRAMME OF WORK\***

3.1. Phases of work

3.2. Team composition and responsibilities

3.3. Management and logistic support

3.4. Calendar of work

**ANNEXES**

1. Tentative outline of the main report\*

2. Main responsibilities of evaluation team members

3. Associated reference documents

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Evaluation matrix\*

2. Document map

3. Stakeholder map\*

4. Project list

5. Compact document list

6. Project mapping

7. Interview checklists /protocols\*

8. Detailed work plan

\* The structure of inception reports may be adjusted depending on the scope of the evaluation. As a minimum, it is suggested that those elements marked with an asterisk be included in all inception reports.

**ANNEX II**

**(Integral part of the ToR)**

**Evaluation Report**

**Purpose/Description of the Evaluation Report:**

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programmes, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

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

**ANNEX 3**

**ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK**

**(Integral part of ToR)**

**1. Relevance and strategic fit**

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

**2. Validity of design**

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

**3. Progress and effectiveness**

* Were the SMART outputs achieved? Were they achieved in the quantity and quality specified in the PBILD design?
* Are PBILD partners using the outputs? Are the outputs being transformed by PBILD partners into outcomes?
  + - How effective was PBILD in establishing national ownership? Was project management and implementation participatory and did it contribute towards the achievement of PBILD objectives? Was PBILD appropriately responsive to the needs of the national partners and changing priorities?
    - Was PBILD appropriately responsive to economic and institutional changes in the project environment?
    - Did the PBILD approach produce demonstrated successes and impact?
    - In which areas is PBILD having the greatest achievements? How is PBILD building on and expanding these achievements?
    - In which areas is PBILD having the least achievements? What are the constraining factors and why? How could they be overcome?
    - What, if any, alternative strategies would be more effective in achieving the PBILD objectives?

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

* Were resources used efficiently? Were the activities implemented cost-effective? In general, did the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results have been attained with fewer resources?
* Were PBILD funds and activities delivered in a timely manner by participating agencies?
* To what extent the governance at programme (PMC) and national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of PBILD? To what extent were these governance structures useful for development purposes, ownership and for working together? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
* What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did PBILD face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
* To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on PBILD? Was it useful? Did PBILD implement the improvement plan?
* Have the national partners a good grasp of the project strategy? How are they contributing to the success of PBILD?
* How effective is communication between PBILD and their partners?

**5. Impact orientation and sustainability**

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

1. To what extent and in what ways did PBILD contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at national level?
2. To what extent and in what ways did PBILD contribute to the goals set in the peace-building thematic window?
3. To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did PBILD 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 PBILD contribute to the goals of working together at country level?

* What types of effects are resulting from PBILD in accordance with the sex, ethnic belonging, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population?
* To what extent has PBILD contributed to fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF)
* To what extent have the PBILD decision-making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of PBILD?
* At local and national level:
  + 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support PBILD?
    2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with PBILD or to scale it up?
    3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
    4. Sustainability – to what extent have migration solutions provided or facilitated by PBILD been institutionalized or taken over by the local structures? What are the lessons learned?
    5. Impact – to what extent are migration related measures integrated in municipal strategies and action plans? And are the measures being implemented?
    6. Impact – What is the impact of local government measures and programme activities to the end beneficiary (prone to migration)? Migration trends before PBILD and after (programme attribution to changes)?
    7. Effectiveness – To what extent are outcomes producing positive changes? Document these by using cost effectiveness and cost benefit reflections.
* Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
* Are the PBILD results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable and sustainable? Are results anchored in national institutions?
* Can the PBILD approach and results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? Is this likely to happen? What would support their replication and scaling up?
* Were there any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects as a consequence of the PBILD interventions? If so, how was the PBILD strategy adjusted?