**GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF YEM JOINT PROGRAMMES**

**General Context: The MDGF and the Youth Employment and Migration (YEM) Thematic Window**

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 Achievement Fund (MDGF) supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF 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.

The Youth Employment and Migration thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that promote sustainable productive employment and decent work for young people either at the national or local level, including through a better management of the (negative and positive) effects of migration and by enhancing local capacities to develop, implement and monitor effective policies and programmes in this domain.

The Window includes 14 joint programmes that encompass a wide range of subjects and results. Nevertheless, certain similar underlying characteristics can be identified across most of these joint programmes. The majority of the programmes in the window seek to contribute to increase employment opportunities for young people and/or migrants; and strengthen the national and/or local government’s capacity to act in favor of youth employment, notably through strengthening existing or new government action plans. Most outcomes in this window aim to improve young people’s employment opportunities, both from a “top-down” approach, in which the government enacts policies in favor of youth employment, and from a “bottom-up” approach, in which young people are given the ability and encouraged to find employment or create their own enterprise.

Improving the situation of migrants is also an important outcome in this window, often pursued in conjunction with the employment opportunity outcome.

The beneficiaries of the YEM Joint Programmes are diverse. Virtually all joint programs involve supporting the government, at the national and/or local levels. Related to the importance of increasing employment opportunities for young people, most programs also directly target the youth, either directly (e.g. trainings) or indirectly (e.g. employment services offered to them). In addition, some programs benefit local business communities, through public-private partnerships in favor of youth and migrants employment, while some benefit schools for their ability to transfer skills necessary for employment.

**The following points should be provided by the joint programme team**

* Describe the joint programme, programme name and goals; include when it started, what outputs and outcomes are sought, its contribution to the MDGs at the local and national levels, its duration and current stage of implementation.

**Duration**

36 months, from 01/01/2010 until 01/01/2013

**PURPOSE**

YEM BiHis strengthening capacities of education system, of public employment services and of relevant CSOs while reducing negative impact of irregular migrations.

**TARGET GROUPS AND AREAS**

The Joint Programme (JP) helps unemployed youth in 17 municipalities all over the country.

**Programme goals**

YEM BiH activities focus on policies, institutions and programmes to:

* Increase capacities of the education system and local communities to improve youth employability;
* Enhance capacities of the Public Employment Services and civil society to develop and deliver integrated package of youth employability measures;
* Positive impact of youth migration maximized whilst impact of irregular migrations minimized

**Programme Outcomes:**

1. Capacities of 50 primary and 50 secondary schools to deliver gender sensitive life skills-based education, professional orientation and career development programmes in consultation with private sector increased
2. Capacities of 100 local communities in 17 municipalities to develop early school leavers’ database and mitigation plans enhanced to keep pupils in school and improve their employability, with specific focus on monitoring the involvement and participation of girls and other excluded children.
3. Gender responsive policy and operational guidelines related to facilitating school enrolment and retention, inclusion of disabled youth, Roma and girls from rural areas in education developed.
4. Youth Information Counseling and Training Centers (CISO) established, equipped, staffed and operational
5. 8 500 young people, male and female provided with job counselling assistance, trainings and access to up to date labour market information
6. Work experience provided to youth, male and female, through different work experience schemes
7. Civil society and private sector engaged in development of Youth Work Experience Policy for introduction and formalization of youth work experience schemes.
8. Young unemployed women and women from vulnerable categories in particular received direct, one-on-one job counselling assistance (individual employment plans), training to improve employability, and direct, one-on-one job-search assistance
9. Enhanced awareness and understanding of the value of volunteerism and civic or community engagement among citizens and local government officials in general and in relation to the role and value of volunteering in enhancing employment prospects
10. BiH Statistical Agencies equipped and trained to create migration statistics including youth migration statistics.
11. Overall migration statistics methodology in BiH developed to ensure quality of the migration data and compatibility with EUROSTAT standards
12. The System of Exchange and dissemination of data for migration including youth, established; IT equipment to support Migration data collection, analyses and dissemination purchased
13. Legal basis and national coordination mechanism for monitoring migration flows, including youth migration, established
14. Strengthened institutional capacities and systems to reduce irregular migration and introduce circular migration schemes
15. BiH youth provided with organised and legal opportunities for employment and internships/ apprenticeship in a selected country of destination and support to BiH returning youth on reintegrating into the BiH labour market
16. Increased awareness amongst BiH youth, their families and the general public regarding the dangers of irregular migration and the benefits of regular migration.

**Implementing Partners**

International Organizations: UNICEF, UNDP, UNV, UNFPA, IOM  
National Partner: Ministry of Civil Affairs

**Contribution to MDGs**

YEM BiH contributes to MDGs: Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education and Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women. Some of initiatives at local level to help reaching the above mentioned MDGs are: helping unemployed young people find the first job, reducing the dropout rate in schools, modernizing schools programs to be more in line with labor market needs, enabling public employment services to assist unemployed youth etc…

**Current State of Implementation**

Planned project activities started successfully but after an unplanned 6 months inception phase which was necessary in order to check the project relevance and feasibility given the long time between the project document writing and a project beginning.

Relationships with the most relevant governmental bodies and the academic community are established. Private agencies related to employment have also been successfully involved.

**In the field of education system related activities:**

In order to ensure easier intervention in education system implementation of the activities organized through Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education (Agency) that is body of the BiH Council of Ministers. The Agency, in close collaboration with its network of consultants, has defined a set of 10 key competencies for lifelong learning and conducted an extensive research of “presence” of key competences in curricula, text-books and teaching practices in primary and secondary education. Research findings were used as a basis for formulating clear instructions and recommendations for establishing competence –based approaches in the BiH educational system.

Besides top-down interventions, bottom-up approaches to integrating gender sensitive life skills- and competence –based education have been undertaken in cooperation with a number of local NGOs, which are active in the field of youth empowerment and training. Specific trainings on life skills and key competences were delivered in rural areas to young returnees. Furthermore, two comprehensive researches were conducted to the aim of defining problems and recommendations related to high dropout and non-enrollment rates and collecting the “Voices of Youth” with regard to numerous issues such as education, employment perspectives, etc.

**In the field of support of public employment services activities:**

Planned project activities are being successfully implemented with support of and cooperation with relevant stakeholders (representatives of PESs, public and private sector institutions and organizations).

16 centers for information, counseling and training (CISO) opened and the impact on reducing youth unemployment is very strong in 2011 and the infrastructure efficiently used. Public calls for co-financing of the employment of young people have been published and first contracts signed in September 2011, which will allow more than 400 unemployed youth to get the first work experience. Strengthening of CISO employees capacities through different trainings is ongoing and without delay as well as strengthening of capacities of CISO beneficiaries.

Tenders for IT and language trainings have been completed, service providers selected and trainings started in November 2011. Number of various contracts has been signed for the implementation of activities in cooperation with CSOs and governmental institutions such as Posao.ba-Virtual Career days, British Council – Enterprise Award Competition, Republic Agency for Development of Small and Medium Enterprises of Republika Srpska- Global Entrepreneurship Week 2011, Employment fair Zenica 2011 with Cantonal PES Zenica-Doboj, Uspon.ba-WEB portal for employment of people with disabilities, Nesto vise-Youth employment of people in rural areas, OIA-How to become attractive at the labour market Manual, PES Una –Sana Canton- Training of welders.

CISO-volunteer outreach activities, conducted by CISO Youth Counsellor-Advisors, have reached over 5,000 community members promoting the services of the CISO centres, and role and value of volunteering in enhancing employment horizons. Volunteer-volunteerism promotion in the context of CISO services have resulted in 850+ CISO clients (youth) expressing an interest in volunteering.

**In the field of migrations:**

Planned activities related to monitoring migration in BiH for 2011 are being implemented with support and cooperation with all relevant stakeholders in BiH dealing with migration issues. So far,

* final draft of the Methodology of migration statistics in BiH,
* final draft of the Strategy for migration monitoring in BiH as well as
* assessment of the IT needs in regards to creation of system of exchange and dissemination of data for migration in BiH,

were developed. All three documents will be base for 2012 activities in regard to procurement and establishment of hardware and software necessary for creation of system of exchange and dissemination of data for migration in BiH, and submission of Strategy and action plan for migration monitoring in BiH to the Council of Minister of BiH for adoption.

Four circular and temporary labour migration schemes (TCLM) have been initiated, are ongoing or completed.

* Nine nurses are in Germany,
* 10 caregivers and blacksmiths are studying Italian before departure for Italy,
* 2 young people have just returned from the US after working in hotels over the summer season.
* The TCLM scheme with Slovenia (the only one that would be within the framework of a bilateral agreement) has been initiated, but is going slowly as the Slovenians have recently changed their legislation and it is not currently clear which type of contract these young people would be able to enter the country with. The YERP is pushing for apprenticeship contracts given that regular working contracts would make the scheme prohibitively expensive.

To ensure that young people are made aware of the potential dangers of irregular migration, but also the potential benefits of legal migration for work or study, the YERP is continuing training in high schools with a focus on graduating classes.

A guidebook has also been produced on safe and legal ways to find work and study opportunities abroad. In an effort to also focus on the potential for young people to return to the labour market from Diaspora, a survey was published on-line in December 2010. This survey was the first step in identifying possibilities as well as obstacles for young people to reverse the effects of brain drain on their home country’s future. The results of the survey were analysed and are now available on line and in hard copy. The survey results were also used to create a practical written “guide to return” for those young people who want to return to their country of origin.

All handbooks are available in electronic and hard copy through the CISOs and various web sites.

**2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION**

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to a mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are formative in nature and seek **to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned and improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining implementation**. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

**3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS**

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term 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.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme’s **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme’s **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Youth Employment and Migration thematic window,** and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

**4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA**

**The main users of the evaluation represented in the evaluation reference group (Section 8 of the TOR), and specifically the coordination and implementation unit of the joint programme, are responsible for contributing to this section. Evaluation questions and criteria may be added or modified up to a reasonable limit, bearing in mind the viability and the limitations (resources, time, etc.) of a quick interim evaluation exercise.**

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, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**

1. Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme?
2. Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?
3. To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural context?
4. Are the monitoring indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
5. To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?

* **Ownership in the design: national social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**

1. To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans?
2. To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?

**Process level**

**- Efficiency: The extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time etc.) have been turned into results**

1. How well does the joint programme’s management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
2. To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?
3. Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?
4. Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme’s results? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate?
5. Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?
6. Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural context identified?
7. How conducive are current UN agency procedures to joint programming? How can existing bottlenecks be overcome and procedures further harmonized?

**- Ownership in the process: National social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**

a) To what extent have the target population and the participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it?

b) To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s goals and impacts?

**Results level**

**- Efficacy: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been met or are expected to be met, taking into account their relative importance.**

1. Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
   1. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
   2. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?
2. Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
3. Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality?
4. Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
5. Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned?
6. In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
7. Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified?
8. In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of fair youth employment?
9. In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration?
10. 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?

**Sustainability: The probability that the benefits of the intervention will continue in the long term.**

1. Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme?

At local and national level:

* + 1. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
    2. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
    3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners?
    4. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
    5. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will ensure the sustainability of the interventions?
    6. have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing?

1. To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme?
2. In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

**Country level**

1. During the analysis of the evaluation, what lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?
2. To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
3. To what extent and in which ways are the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
4. How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?
5. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country’s public policy framework?

**5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The mid-term evaluation will use an international consultant, appointed by MDG-F, as the Evaluator to conduct the evaluation and a locally hired consultant who will support the Evaluator by providing information about local context such as institutions, protocol, traditions, etc. and assist with translation of key meetings/ interviews during the mission as needed. It is the sole responsibility of the Evaluator to deliver the inception, draft final and final reports.

The Evaluator will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, the Evaluator is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. The Evaluator is also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

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

**6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluator is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

**Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the Evaluator)

This report will be 5 to 10 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 inception report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation managers. The Evaluator will also share the inception report with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

**Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

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 MDGF Secretariat will share the draft final report with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

**Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. 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 major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The MDGF Secretariat will send the final report to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page

2. Introduction

* + Background, goal and methodological approach
  + Purpose of the evaluation
  + Methodology used in the evaluation
  + Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

3. Description of interventions carried out

* + - Initial concept
  + - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.

4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions

5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)

6. Recommendations

7. Annexes

**7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term 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 Evaluator and the reference group of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Evaluator must corroborate all assertions, and note any disagreement with them.

• **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 Evaluator 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, the Evaluator must report these immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used by the Evaluator to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.

• **Validation of information.** The Evaluator 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 Evaluator 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.

**8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION**

The main actors in the mid-term evaluation are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the Programme Management Office of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee. The Programme Management Office, PMC Co-Chairs, MofCom and RC Office will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

* Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
* Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
* Providing input on the evaluation planning documents (Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
* Providing input and participating in the drafting of the 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.
* Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
* Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall manage the mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the mid-term evaluation. As manager of the mid-term evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated; promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

**9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

1. **Design phase (15 days total)**
2. The Secretariat shall send the generic TOR for mid-term evaluation of countries reference group. The reference group is then to adapt these to the concrete situation of the joint programme, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF).

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation. This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

1. The MDGF Secretariat will send the finalized, contextualized TOR to the Evaluator it has chosen
2. From this point on, the Portfolio Manager is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the Evaluator, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (Evaluator, reference group in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.
3. **Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)**

**Desk study (15 days total)**

1. The Portfolio Manager will brief the Evaluator **(1 day).** He/she will hand over a checklist of activities and documents to review, and explain the evaluation process. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. The Evaluator will review the documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. The Evaluator will submit the inception report to the MDGF Secretariat; the report will include the findings from the document review and will specify how the evaluation will be conducted. The Evaluator will share the inception report with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (within **seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal points for the evaluation (PMC Co-Chairs) and the Evaluator will prepare an agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (Within **seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

**Field visit (9-12 days)**

1. In-country, the Evaluator will observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document review. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager may need to facilitate the Evaluator’s visit by means of phone calls and emails to the reference group.
2. The Evaluator will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

**Final Report (31 days total)**

1. The Evaluator will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group **(within 10 days of the completion of the field visit).**
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The Evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed **(within 14 days of delivery of the draft final report).**

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the report, but these do not affect the Evaluator’s freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

1. The Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager shall assess the quality of the final version of the evaluation report presented, using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this TOR **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report).**
2. Upon receipt of input from the reference group, the Evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report by the MDGF Secretariat to the evaluation reference group **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments).**
3. **Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within 21 days of delivery of the final report):**
4. The Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the reference group to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
5. The Secretariat’s Portfolio Manager will hold a dialogue with the reference group to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

**10. ANNEXES**

**a) Document Review**

**This section must be completed and specified by the other users of the evaluation but mainly by the management team of the joint programme and by the Programme Management Committee. A minimum of documents that must be reviewed before the field trip shall be established; in general terms the Secretariat estimates that these shall include, as a minimum:**

MDG-F Context

* MDGF Framework Document
* Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
* YEM Thematic Window TORs
* General thematic indicators
* M&E strategy
* Communication and Advocacy Strategy
* MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Documents for Joint Programme

Other in-country documents or information

* 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

**b) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan**

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 1** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| **Key actions** | **Time frame** | **Person responsible** | **Follow-up** | |
| 1.1 |  |  | **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 2** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| Key actions | Time frame | Person responsible | **Follow-up** | |
| 2.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 3** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| Key actions | Time frame | Person responsible | **Follow-up** | |
| 3.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 |  |  |  |  |