Terms of Reference

for

final evaluation of the Programme

**Public Finance for Development: Strengthening Public Finance Capacities in the Western Balkans and the Commonwealth of Independent States.**

Eligibility criteria: A legal entity, e.g. a company/ research institution/ civil society organization/professional association, will conduct the evaluation.

Duration: August 2013 – November 2013

Terms of Payment: Schedule of instalments:

* First installment in the amount of 20 per cent payable upon approval of an Inception Report including a detailed work plan of the evaluation (respective reports are defined below);
* Final instalment in the amount of 80 per cent payable upon satisfactory completion and acceptance by UNDP BRC of all deliverables, including the final version of an Evaluation Report.

1. Background and context
2. Programme overview

In September 2009, the Bratislava Regional Centre of UNDP Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (UNDP BRC) and the Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic (MF SR) launched the regional Programme: *Public Finance for Development: Strengthening Public Finance Capacities in the Western Balkans and the Commonwealth of Independent States* (“Programme”) (http://publicfinance.undp.sk).

The **Programme document[[1]](#footnote-1)** was signed between the MF SR and UNDP BRC in June 2009 for the Programme duration of 3 years (till June 2012). The initial Programme budget was 1.05 mil. USD funded by the Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic. In December 2011, the amendment to the Programme document (http://publicfinance.undp.sk/en/show/44C01A31-F203-1EE9-BCFA2A4414ABF76F) was signed to extend duration of the Programme to June 2014 and increase the total programme budget to 1.85 mil. USD. The Programme reflects a partnership between the MF SR and UNDP BRC, and is based on their joint commitment and shared objective to advance public finance capacity in the Western Balkans and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The Programme has been managed by UNDP BRC as an Implementing Agency of the Programme and implemented in close coordination with MF SR and UNDP Country Offices (COs) in Programme beneficiary countries. The Slovak Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic and the Slovak Agency for International Development Assistance are involved in the Programme implementation through the Programme Board (PB) membership to ensure alignment with the foreign policy and official development assistance (ODA) priorities. The partner country representative is member of the PB, too.

**The goal of the Programme is to enhance sound and effective public financial management (PFM) by raising awareness, developing analytical capacities and sharing good practice with regard to reforms implemented in Slovakia and elsewhere.** Activities include but are not limited to policy advice to government partners, capacity assessment, institutional development, training, small grants, workshops, study visits, and professional exchange schemes, etc. Geographically, the **Programme targets selected countries in the regions** **that belong to priority countries of the official development assistance (ODA) of Slovakia.** The **selections of areas of cooperation**, and the **design of activities**, are demand driven. These decisions are conducted in a participatory manner with Programme beneficiaries.

Programme strategic objectives include:

1. Develop analytical capacity and build skills in the area of public finance reform for poverty reduction, jobs creation and social inclusion;
2. Increase awareness and understanding of public finance concepts for poverty reduction, human development and social inclusion; and
3. Share knowledge, disseminate information, and improve outreach.

The Programme is comprised of the following Components:

**Component 0** – Identifying national public finance priorities and mapping technical assistance demand in a participatory manner.

**Component 1** – Development of analytical capacity and building skills in public finance reform for poverty reduction, jobs creation and social inclusion.

**Component 2** – Increasing awareness and understanding of public finance concepts for poverty reduction, human development and social inclusion.

**Component 3** – Knowledge sharing, dissemination of information, and improved outreach through dissemination of studies, good practices and securing broader outreach through cooperation with other European and developing countries.

**Component 4** – Programme management, monitoring and evaluation.

Under Component 1, the Programmes targets government institutions primarily finance ministries in beneficiary countries. Component 2 focuses on stakeholders, such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), research institutes, universities and think tanks. Component 3 was designed to support knowledge sharing activities in the region, mainly focused on lessons learned and good practices in public finance management that can be derived from PFM reforms implemented in Slovakia. Component 3 also includes Programme promotion and visibility and was later on extended by quality assurance function for assisted PFM areas of assistance with the aim to support the production of high quality project deliverables through their independent review.

1. Programme implementation

Based on the needs assessment conducted by UNDP BRC and by matching countries demands for assistance with capacity of Slovakia in public financial management Moldova, Montenegro and Serbia were selected by the Programme Board in February 2010 to become beneficiary countries. In January 2011 Ukraine was added as the fourth beneficiary country by the Programme Board. Further negotiations with the finance ministries and other potential beneficiary institutions resulted in proposing priority areas of interventions and indicative activities to be supported by the Programme.

The following areas of assistance were initially agreed to be supported within the framework of the Programme:

1. **Montenegro**

* Macro-economic and fiscal analysis and forecasting;
* Adoption of ESA95 methodology in Montenegro;
* Developing a medium-term strategy for a transition to the accrual based accounting;
* Strengthening capacities for public debt management;

1. **Moldova**

* Scaling up the performance based budgeting concept for local governments;

1. **Ukraine**

* Strengthening public finance management at the local level in Ukraine;

1. **Serbia**

* Strengthening capacities for budgeting at the Ministry of Finance of Serbia.

Activities to be implemented under **Component 1** were included in the implementation plans endorsed between the UNDP BRC and the beneficiary institutions. Phase 2 of the projects[[2]](#footnote-2) continues in the area of macro-economic and fiscal forecasting in Montenegro (since March 2012) and in the area of performance based budgeting in Moldova (since April 2012) where the assistance was extended to central level of government. All plans for Montenegro and Moldova for phase 1 and phase 2 were endorsed. Implementation in other areas of assistance in Montenegro did not continue due to limited absorption capacity and lack of commitment of MF Montenegro.

Though the implementation plans were prepared for Ukraine and Serbia, the implementation was not initiated until 2013 due to limited absorption capacity of MF Serbia, delays caused by elections and lack of support and commitment of MF Ukraine for project implementation. On 6 March 2013 the Programme Board decided to re-allocate funds from Serbia and Ukraine to Montenegro and Moldova. Ukraine and Serbia ceased to be Programme beneficiary countries and the Programme implementation continues in Moldova and Montenegro.

**Component 2** has not been initiated due to a need to adhere to the agreed implementation plans and timeframes of projects under Component 1 implementation of which was prioritised.

Under **Component 3**, the Programme supported elaboration of brief case studies/papers on **lessons learned from Slovakia.** These were prepared for all areas of assistance in Programme beneficiary countries to share the experience from public finance reforms implemented in Slovakia and to provide recommendations to the beneficiary countries and other transition countries in the region (<http://publicfinance.undp.sk/en/show/15BE0D39-F203-1EE9-B8791C0083C407F7>).

The Programme monitoring framework (http://publicfinance.undp.sk/en/show/44C01A31-F203-1EE9-BCFA2A4414ABF76F) provides a description of the expected results on Programme Component levels. Specific outputs to be produced are included in the implementation plans and consultants´ Term of Reference (TOR). Description of the Programme progress to date is contained in the quarterly progress reports and the annual review reports.

1. **Evaluation Purpose**

Since 2010 the Programme has been delivering activities in partner countries. There is the agreement between MF SR and UNDP BRC to implement the Programme until June 2014. An **assessment of countries needs and priorities** was conducted at the beginning of the Programme to select beneficiary countries. **Mid-term Review** was conducted in 2011 to comprehensively review Programme implementation set-up, focus, strategy, targets, issues, risks and achieved results. As indicated in the Programme Document of the Public Finance for Development Programme, an **external independent evaluation** will be conducted starting from the last quarter of implementation. The evaluation will review Programme results and identify lessons learned. The evaluation shall assess whether the Programme can be instrumental for the process of institutionalizing Slovak line ministries interventions in development cooperation as regards its design and strategy as well as implementation arrangements.

**The services to be provided will include:**

1. A critical assessment of Programme performance with respect to efficiency (input delivery, cost control and activity management) and effectiveness (actual and potential delivery of results and progress towards achieving the objectives);
2. An assessment of the prospects for sustainability of achieved results;
3. Findings and conclusions in relation to Programme overall goals, approach, relevance, performance, success, failure, strengths, weaknesses;
4. Lessons learned that could be derived from Programme design and implementation (what worked and what did not work and why);
5. Success stories of Programme beneficiaries that could be derived from the Programme implementation;
6. Key recommendations and guidance on future ODA activities in the sector of PFM improvement and reform. Recommendations must be objective, realistic, practical, understandable and forward looking. They will be logically linked to findings and conclusions. Recommendations will be formulated (1) at the projects level and (2) at the level of the Programme as a whole. Evaluators have to classify recommendations into categories and if possible, by the order of importance.

The **findings and recommendations of the Programme evaluation are intended to:**

* 1. Provide the Donor with input into decision making on the future direction of the Programme, with the aim to improve its design to support efficiency, effectiveness, likelihood of Programme success and sustainability of the results in long-term;
  2. Provide UNDP with information on effectiveness of Programme implementation mechanisms and applied results based management approach with the aim to aid enhancement of UNDP programming and implementation approaches;
  3. Provide Programme beneficiaries, partners and other stakeholders with independent assessment of added value and contribution of the Programme to the advancement of public finance reforms in transition countries.

1. **Evaluation objectives and questions**

**C1. The objective of the evaluation is to comprehensively assess**

1. ***Identifiable change in public finance reforms in partner countries (specifically in PFM areas of Programme assistance) since the launch of the Programme to date, and asses Programme contribution to this change, indentifying also unintended consequences/results, if any and analyse underlying factors that led to these results.***
2. ***Sustainability of results and identify factors that determine the sustainability.***
3. ***Programme potential for replication and identify additional/alternative development assistance modalities the Donor can use to effectively support PFM reforms in transition countries.***
4. ***Effectiveness and efficiency of management arrangements.***

C2. The contractor should be guided but not limited to the scope of the evaluation questions listed below. The contractor should raise and address any other relevant issues that may emerge during the evaluation.

1. ***Identifiable change in public finance reforms in partner countries (specifically in PFM areas of Programme assistance) since the launch of the Programme to date, and asses Programme contribution to this change, indentifying also unintended consequences/results, if any and analyse underlying factors that led to these results.***
2. ***Sustainability of results and identification of factors that determine the sustainability.***

The evaluation will not only assess the Programme **achievements** but it will also document the way in which the Programme has **contributed** towards achieving the results. The evaluation will focus on the following:

1. Review and assess the extent to which the Programme has achieved its objectives, outcomes, outputs and impact;
2. Identify key factors that contributed to Programme achievements;
3. Review the results framework and suggest missing or/and alternative indicators that may improve measuring effectiveness of support;
4. Identify the key challenges and obstacles faced during the implementation phase;
5. Identify the additional modalities that can be used in the future support in order to best support PFM reform processes.

**While assessing the achievements and related factors influencing these achievements, the evaluators shall focus on two categories:**

1. **Programme design and strategy**
   1. Programme thematic focus (relevance of the Programme for transition countries in the target regions and their priority needs in the transformation processes)
   2. Programme regional focus (relevance of the selected beneficiary countries in relation to the foreign policy and ODA priorities of the Slovak Republic as well as to the countries’ priority needs in transformation processes)
   3. Programme objectives
   4. Programme structure (components)
   5. Aid modalities (advisory missions, workshops, trainings, document review, document drafting...)
2. **Programme implementation results /progress/**
   1. Overall progress to date - objectives, outcomes, outputs and impact assessed on the level of a whole Programme and by individual PFM projects implemented in beneficiary countries
   2. Adherence to the timeline envisaged
   3. Adherence to the principles of effective assistance (alignment with beneficiaries’ priority agenda, ownership by beneficiaries, focus on tangible results, harmonisation with donors, mutual accountability)
3. **Programme design and strategy related questions**
4. How does the design of the Programme and its implementation strategy contributed to/hampered the following aspects of the assistance provided:
5. relevance (to target group, priority needs): extent to which the objectives and planned results of Programme/projects are consistent with beneficiaries’ policies and requirements within PFM agenda, country-needs, global priorities and donor’s policies;
6. effectiveness: extent to which Programme/projects’ objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance;
7. efficiency: measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results;
8. ownership (by recipients and donor);
9. alignment (with beneficiary partner’s agenda): extent to which the intervention is aligned with and contributes to national strategic documents;
10. managing for results;
11. harmonization with other donors initiatives;
12. Sustainability: extent to which the overall Programme framework contributes to achievement of sustainable results and impact in the respective PFM areas of assistance.
13. What can be done in short-term to improve the Programme implementation and increase its impact?
14. Can the Programme design be utilised by other Slovak line ministries for programming their development cooperation?
15. **Programme implementation results /progress/ related questions**
16. What results have been achieved to date in individual areas of assistance in beneficiary countries?
17. Have results been produced effectively and efficiently? What have been the major factors, which have facilitated or impeded the progress of the Programme/projects in achieving its/their desired results?
18. To what extent the agreed implementation plans and implemented activities to date were/are in line with the Programme strategy, goals and objectives?
19. Have there been any achievements beyond the original scope of the Programme/projects?
20. Have the Programme/projects objectives been achieved? To what extent? What have been the major factors, which have facilitated or impeded the progress of the Programme/projects in achieving its/their goal/objectives?
21. Has the Programme/projects reached the intended beneficiaries/target groups? What effect has the Programme/projects had on target groups?
22. What kinds of capacities (institutional, human, systems and process) have been built and how they have contributed to building sound and effective public financial management system in beneficiary countries?
23. Is there a distinct improvement in competences of target groups compared to those who did not go through the Programme?
24. What is the projects’ prospect for sustainability - continued long-term benefits from the projects - once the Programme phases out its support?
25. To what extent has the Programme/projects supported an enabling or adaptable environment for real change in PFM?
26. To what extent the Programme/projects contributed to the institutional change conducive to systematically addressing PFM concerns?
27. What is the prospective impact (primary and secondary long-term effects) of the projects activities and results on direct and indirect beneficiaries?
28. What is the level of satisfaction of Programme partners and stakeholders with the Programme/projects and their results?
29. What is the level of the local ownership? To what extent have the interventions been informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders and to what extent these stakeholders have been involved in the interventions?
30. Have the project objectives in respective areas of assistance remained part of the officially adopted reform agenda/national/sectoral strategies of the beneficiary? Are they consistently perceived as priorities by the leadership of the beneficiary?
31. What was the level and effectiveness of involvement of partner countries in planning, programming, decision-making and implementation of their own activities?
32. Has the cross cutting issues such as gender, environment been incorporated in the Programme and how has the Programme addressed these issues?
33. Have the resources allocated for the Programme components been used for their intended purposes?
34. Have the assistance delivery modalities been cost effective and effective in delivering the assistance in a timely manner?
35. Has the Programme improved the cohesion & collaboration between government, academia and civil society?
36. Has the Programme promoted civil society organizations’ ability to address PFM issues in partner countries?
37. Have there been any good practices produced under the Programme that could be up-scaled / replicated?
38. Have the projects activities been harmonized / coordinated with activities supported by other donors?
39. **Programme potential for replication and identification of additional/alternative development assistance modalities the Donor can use to effectively support PFM reforms in transition countries.**
40. **Effectiveness and efficiency of management arrangements.**

The current model of programme structure as mentioned above is that the Programme has been implemented in cooperation with two institutions – donor (Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic) and implementing partner (Executive) (UNDP BRC), guided by the Programme Organizational Structure. It is therefore also suggested to assess whether this model could be a good practice for implementation of similar initiatives and draw lessons learned for future replication by the MF SR and/or other ministries. The evaluation will focus on the following:

1. Management arrangements (evaluation shall consider the nature of the joint Programme, assess its institutional set-up /Programme Board, Advisory Board/, management processes, communication, division of labour, the extent to which it has allowed the Donor and UNDP to utilize their comparative advantages and implement the Programme in effective and efficient way).
2. Monitoring system (reporting, on-the-spot visits, MTR...) and knowledge management (identified risks, issues and lessons learned).
3. Visibility and public relations.
4. Assess the timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and outputs and their impact on project operations and relations with project partners.
5. Is the Programme management and implementation model relevant and effective, including flexibility and adaptive capacity in response to changes in external constraints and opportunities?
6. Is the structure of the Programme, the resources, the distribution of responsibilities and coordination mechanisms appropriate for the achievement of Programme/projects objectives?
7. Are Programme human resources assigned for management and implementation in UNDP adequate to the nature, scope and complexity of the Programme?
8. Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?
9. How does Programme management and implementation model contributes to/hamper achievement of the Programme objectives?
10. Are organizational arrangements efficient (value for money) and adequate in meeting the Programme objectives?
11. Is decision-making effective and inclusive?
12. What is the role, functions and services of UNDP/BRC?
13. What is main added value of the UNDP/BRC? What are weaknesses of this cooperation mode?
14. What is the contribution of UNDP/BRC to the achievement of Programme objectives?
15. Is the management of the Programme by UNDP BRC effective and efficient? How the physical placement of UNDP BRC contributed to the project implementation?
16. Assess the clarity and appropriateness of lines of authority and reporting for the Programme Manager and other project staff.
17. What are the key strengths of Programme partners (UNDP BRC) and Donor (MFSR)? Are they fully utilised in the Programme implementation?
18. To what extent did the management arrangements contribute to harmonization and reduction in transaction costs in dealing with partners?
19. What is the contribution of the UNDP Country Offices and the role they have played in promoting and facilitating the implementation of the Programme?
20. Has appropriate visibility been ensured? Has the public in beneficiary countries and in donor countries had access to sufficient information? Has the professional public (PFM experts) been informed?
21. How are strengths and weaknesses managed? Are weaknesses identified and approaches and instruments proposed to address them? Are strengths identified and is their potential utilized?
22. Was the coordination of stakeholders in Slovakia effective? How it contributes to the strengthening of the Slovak ODA capacities?
23. How does the Programme contribute to the strengthening of MF SR expert capacities to engage successfully in the international development assistance projects?
24. Can used management arrangements be effectively applied by other line ministries in development cooperation?
25. Do monitoring tools provide necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
26. Review the overall quality of reporting.
27. Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
28. Assess the processes in place for addressing issues and risks as they arise, and their effectiveness at addressing these satisfactorily.
29. **Scope of the evaluation**

The Programme implementation is currently planned to June 2014. This final evaluation will look at all activities implemented over the duration of the Programme **from June 2009 to June 2013.** Preliminary feedback on the ongoing activities can be collected from direct beneficiaries during field visits in Moldova and Montenegro.

The evaluation will focus both on the **Programme as a whole**, to make assessment and recommendations, which would also help to define forward looking strategies.

The evaluation will reach out to all **principle stakeholders**, i.e. Programme beneficiaries (primarily in Moldova and Montenegro), donor (MF SR), implementing agency (UNDP BRC), Slovak government partners (MFEA SR, SAIDC), UNDP Country Offices (Moldova, Montenegro, Ukraine and Serbia) and staff of other relevant donors’ projects (Moldova, Montenegro).

1. **Evaluation methodology**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below, however, the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[3]](#footnote-3)). They must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation should provide gender disaggregated data in cases where it will appear useful for users of the evaluation report and where it is realistically possible to obtain such data.

It is suggested that the methodology to be employed should include the following methods (but is not limited to them):

1. **Desk review of the Programme related documents –** preliminary list of documents to be reviewed is in Annex 1.
2. **In depth consultations**

Direct beneficiaries have to be interviewed.

* Face-to-face / phone structured interviews, with the Programme partners and stakeholders
* Brief questionnaires (if needed)
* Field Visits
* Focus group discussions

Further details regarding the methodology should be specified by the selected Evaluator during the preparatory phase considering time and capacity constraints.

The Evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with key Programme partners and stakeholders. Besides principle stakeholders, interviews are recommended with former PB members and observers, experts engaged in consultancy assignments, including in quality assurance. Preliminary list and contact information of stakeholders will be provided by UNDP BRC. The evaluation team is ultimately responsible for identifying whom to meet in relevant countries and no party can interfere with their decision.

Although the Evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorised to make any commitments or statement on behalf of UNDP or the Donor.

1. **Deliverables**

**Expected deliverables:**

* **Inception report,** including the evaluation work plan and structure, evaluation approach and methodology, issues to be examined at the field missions and planned (already pre-agreed with country partners) schedule of field missions (proposed report outline is in Annex 3) – submitted **no later than 2 weeks after the contract award** and prior to the commencement of the evaluation process to the Programme Manager and Donor representative.
* **Evaluation report**, including the key findings, conclusions, recommendations, good practices, lessons learnt, future direction(s), and shortcoming(s) of the current practices employed in the Programme implementation. **The draft report** will b**e submitted within 4 weeks after conducting the evaluation missions but no later than by 30 September 2013.** The draft report will be circulated for two weeks to the government counterparts and project management unit to verify factual statements. Any discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.
* The **final evaluation report** will be submitted within **2 weeks after completion of review process by stakeholders and no later than** by **30 November 2013.**
* **The contractor will present** a final report, which **should adhere to the UN standard format** (see proposed format in Annex 4). The reports should be submitted in English language and should be of high quality that can be shared with outside agencies, donors or interested third parties. It should provide substantive evaluation findings on progress achieved against objectives as outlined in the project work plans, and should be structured according to UN format in terms of issues and related findings, assessment of performance, description of best practices, lessons learned, conclusions, recommendations and/or optimal scenarios.

The evaluation report should not exceed 60 pages excluding annexes.

* Oral presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations (presented in power point) to the Programme Board (possibly during the Annual Review Meeting), no later than by 30 November 2013.

The final evaluation report will be made available to the Programme stakeholders in and outside UNDP and to the Donor. Full report will be shared with the Reference Group. Selected key parts will be publicly available on the Programme website.

The findings and recommendations will serve as input into the Programme implementation, with a view to taking immediate measures for the improvement of Programme implementation and to planning the Programme’s next phase better.

1. **Evaluation Team - required skills and qualifications**

The evaluation will be carried out by the company (Evaluator) with prior experience in the evaluation of comparable programmes and projects. The Evaluator forms the evaluation team, namely appoints the Lead Evaluator and at least one technical consultant with sufficient knowledge of the subject matter of the projects. Both the Evaluator and individual experts engaged in the assignment must be independent, i.e. they must not have participated in the Programme preparation and implementation and must not be in any conflict of interest with Programme related activities.

Required qualifications for the **Lead Evaluator:**

* At least Master’s degree in development studies, public policy and administration, political science, economics, management, business administration, or related field;
* Evidence of formal training in evaluation is necessary (unless not part of the university studies);
* 10 years of national and international experience in the field of evaluation;
* Proven work experience of at least 7 years in evaluation of development projects and programmes including leading evaluations of multi-stakeholder programmes;
* Recognized experience in the design/management/evaluation of public administration/governance related projects in developing country contexts;
* Knowledge of evaluation methodologies is required;
* Recent knowledge and experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation;
* Solid understanding of aid effectiveness agenda and contemporary development practices;
* Familiarity with the target region, its overall governance features, development needs, and directions;
* Solid understanding of public financial management agenda;
* Solid understanding of public administration reform programmes, notably in the target region.

**Required qualifications of other member(s) of the team – technical consultant(s):**

* At least Master’s degree in finance, economics, public policy and administration, economics, management, business administration, or related field
* Minimum 5 years of experience in public financial management, preferably in the areas of Programme assistance (macro-economic and fiscal forecasting, programme budgeting, debt management, accounting, ESA95);
* Prior experience in facilitating, planning and execution of monitoring and evaluation will be an asset.

**The Lead Evaluator and technical consultant(s) will have the following additional skills:**

* Extensive experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation;
* Strong coordination and planning skills;
* Excellent analytical skills;
* Strong interpersonal, communication and interviewing skills;
* Excellent reporting and writing skills to produce and present concise and analytical reports;
* Ability to work swiftly and commitment to deliver the expected results in a short period of time and to meet deadlines;
* Ability to work in a multi-cultural team environment;
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Ability to network with partners on various levels;
* Experience in working with government officials, civil servants and public administration agencies and authorities;
* Knowledge of UNDP’s results based evaluation policies and procedures are an asset.
* Fluency in written and spoken English;
* Knowledge of Slovak and/or Moldovan and/or Montenegrin and/or Russian language/s is an asset.

**Lead Evaluator will perform the following key tasks:**

* Lead the whole evaluation process;
* Lead the planning of the review activities, discussions and liaise with Programme partners and stakeholders;
* Work closely with the evaluation team members and decide on the division of labour within the evaluation team;
* Ensure timely preparation of the deliverables specified in the TOR;
* Communicate with UNDP BRC on behalf of the Evaluator whenever it is needed;
* Conduct the desk review of the relevant documents;
* Plan and conduct the interviews with Programme partners and stakeholders;
* Conduct field visits (if relevant) to the project sites identified and collect data;
* Report to UNDP BRC when required;
* Discuss amendments and incorporate comments to the report;
* Produce the inception report;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
* Produce the final evaluation report;
* Present key findings, conclusions and recommendations at the evaluation closing meeting.

The **Technical Consultant(s)** will perform the following tasks:

* Provide input to the design of the detailed evaluation work plan, structure and methodology for the assignment (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Conduct the field mission to Moldova and/or Montenegro;
* Provide expert input to the analysis and assessment as per the scope and objectives of the evaluation;
* Communicate with the stakeholders, react to comments and assist the Lead Evaluator in incorporating the comments;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report and provide input to finalization of the evaluation report;
* Support the organization of and actively participate in the presentation of the evaluation report.

While the Evaluation team will work in independent manner, UNDP BRC, as the agency responsible for administering the Programme, will provide support to facilitate the evaluation team communication with stakeholders, including the provision of contact for stakeholders and documentation.

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

**H1. Management structure for evaluation**

Evaluation team will report to the **Evaluation Manager** – Mr. Ben Slay, UNDP BRC Poverty Practice Leader. UNDP BRC Programme Manager will provide necessary support and documentation to the Evaluator. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP BRC having the following responsibilities:

* Manage selection and contracting of the Evaluator;
* Identify, collect and provide documents for desk review;
* Provide a preliminary list and contacts for stakeholders to be interviewed;
* Ensure participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process;
* Closely communicate with the evaluation team during the whole evaluation process;
* Clarify questions raised during the evaluation;
* Manage the contractual arrangements and the evaluation budget;
* Approve payment of fees on acceptance of deliverables;
* Provide general oversight and support to the Evaluator;
* Brief and de-brief the Evaluator;
* Ensure the decisions to be made on time for the evaluation team;
* Facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the Reference Group;
* Monitor evaluation implementation and provide guidance to the evaluation team;
* Review the draft reports and ensure that the final drafts meet quality standards;
* Ensure dissemination of evaluation report to stakeholders;
* Facilitate a management response and monitor the implementation of committed actions in the management response.

The evaluation will be overseen by a **Reference group** consisting of the Programme Board members and observer(s). Their roles and responsibilities will include:

* Participation in the drafting, review and agreement on the draft TOR;
* Provision of relevant data and information;
* Overseeing progress and conduct of the evaluation;
* Reviewing the draft evaluation reports and ensuring the final drafts meet quality standards;
* Preparation and agreement on the management response and provision of update (where needed).

The donor representative (International Relations Section at the Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic) will participate in

* selection of the company as an observer,
* review of the inception report,
* review of the evaluation reports,
* at the meeting organized for the final presentation of the evaluation report by the evaluation team,
* dissemination of the report;

and observe the process of the evaluation.

The evaluation team is responsible for setting up stakeholder interviews, arranging field missions, etc. Prior to the mission (at least 10 days) the mission agenda will be submitted to UNDP BRC Programme Manager.

The final Inception Report shall be submitted in two signed printed copies and electronically by e-mail to UNDP BRC (Ms. Alena Srankova, address: Grosslingova 35, 811 09 Bratislava, Slovakia, tel.: +421-2-59337 223, e-mail: alena.srankova@undp.org).

The final Evaluation Report shall be submitted in two signed printed copies, electronically (in word format) via email and twice electronically on CDs to the UNDP BRC (Ms. Alena Srankova, address: Grosslingova 35, 811 09 Bratislava, Slovakia, tel.: +421-2-59337 223, e-mail: alena.srankova@undp.org).

The **working language** will be **English**. For oral communication with stakeholders, other languages can be used, among them Slovak, Moldovan, Montenegrin, and Russian. Interpretation and/or translation services during missions, if needed, will be arranged by UNDP Country Offices and will be paid by the Programme.

**H2. Timeframe**

The evaluation is planned for estimated 64 man days[[4]](#footnote-4) in the period August - November 2013. It will include:

| **No.** | **Activity** | **Estimated timeframe for Evaluator (man days)** | **Key outputs** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Preparation of Inception report (desk work)**   * conduct desk review of the key Programme documents, * develop and agree on the work plan and the structure of the evaluation; * develop the evaluation methodology. | 10 days | **Draft Inception report**, including the evaluation work plan and timeframe,  evaluation methodology (matrix with key evaluation questions and means of verification – see sample matrix in Annex 2), questionnaires, interview protocols, meeting schedules, focus group methodologies, etc. – submitted to UNDP BRC and the Donor |
|  | **Discussion of the Inception report**   * Meeting with UNDP BRC and the Donor * Incorporating changes, report finalization | 3 days | Final Inception report |
|  | **Mobilization, meetings and discussions with stakeholders** in order to review and to evaluate the Programme, to conduct in-depth interviews, to consult the key stakeholders, to prepare draft report   * Discussions with UNDP BRC officials and Donor representatives * Meeting with the project implementing partners – Slovak government representatives, UNDP Country Offices * Field visit to project sites in Montenegro and Moldova | 30 days | Meetings schedule  Documented records of interviews and observations with stakeholders.  Draft evaluation findings. |
|  | **Drafting the Evaluation report**  *Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders* | 7 days | Draft Evaluation report – submitted to the Evaluation Manager |
|  | **Review of the draft Evaluation report by UNDP** BRC and Reference Group  Incorporation of relevant comments into the report by evaluators | 10 days | Revised Evaluation report – submitted to the Evaluation Manager |
|  | **Finalization and submission of Final Evaluation report** | 2 days | Final Evaluation report – submitted to the Evaluation Manager |
|  | **Debriefing**   * Discussion about the report with UNDP BRC and Donor | 1 day | Presentation of report in .ppt |
|  | **Knowledge sharing and management** | 1 day | Plans for dissemination of final evaluation report |
|  | **Estimated time allocated to the Assignment** | **64 man days** | |

1. **Evaluator ethics**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex 5) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)[[5]](#footnote-5)

1. **Tender process**

Interested offerors are requested to apply per Instructions to Offerors in Annex xx.

**REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FOR SUBMISSION**

Please specify within your **technical proposal** the following:

* Registration of Company/Civil Society Organization/Professional Association, etc. (any legal entity is eligible);
* Profile of Company/Civil Society Organization/Professional Association and a list of implemented projects with a reference list and client contacts for reference check indicating the e-mail addresses or fax numbers for contact persons;
* CVs of the proposed Lead Evaluator and Technical Consultant(s) (also CVs of any other external or internal expert needed for the evaluation, if applicable);
* Clear presentation of the proposed methodology, outlining all steps that will lead towards the completion of the assignment.

**Annexes**

1. Preliminary list of documents for desk review
2. Evaluation matrix (sample table)
3. Proposed table of contents of the Inception report
4. Proposed table of contents of the Evaluation report
5. Evaluation Code of Conduct

**Annex 1**

**PRELIMINARY LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR DESK REVIEW**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document type** | **Description** |
| Programme document | Programme document  Programme document amendment  Cost sharing agreement, CSA amendment  Programme performance monitoring framework |
| Programme reports | Quarterly / semi-annual progress reports  Programme financial reports (CDRs, programme financial overview report)  Annual reports  Programme board meeting minutes  Mid-term review report  Mission reports  Reports from meetings with beneficiaries |
| Technical documents produced by the Programme/projects | Needs assessment guidelines  Survey of countries  Country profiles  Implementation plans for individual PFM areas of assistance  Terms of reference for consultancy assignments  Final consultants’ deliverables in individual PFM areas of assistance:   * Technical reports * Analytical documents, guides * Action plans/recommendations * Presentations * Training materials * Consultants’ missions reports |
| Other documents and sources | Communication strategy  Media reports  Programme website  Medium-term strategy for Slovakia’s ODA for 2009-2013  National Programmes for Slovakia´s ODA for 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013  Special review of the Slovak Republic  (OECD DAC report)  Standards for evaluation in the UN System  Norms for Evaluation in the UN System  UNDP Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results |

**Annex 2**

**SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria (categories)** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub-questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods/tools** | **Indicator/success standard** | **Methods for data analysis** |
| Programme design and strategy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programme implementation results |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 3**

**PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR AN INCEPTION REPORT**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1. Evaluation purpose and scope

1.2. Objectives of evaluation

**2. EVALUATION APPROACH**

2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions

2.2. Evaluability

2.3 Evaluation methodology (including data collection methods and analytical approaches)

2.4 Evaluation matrix

2.5 Risks and potential shortcomings

**3. EVALUATION WORK PLAN AND STRUCTURE**

3.1. Phases of work

3.2. Detailed work plan, including a planned schedule of interviews and field missions

3.4. Evaluation timeframe – schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities

3.2. Team composition and responsibilities

3.3. Management and logistic support

**ANNEXES**

1. Terms of reference of the evaluation

2. Stakeholder map

3. Interview checklists/protocols

4. Reference documents

**Annex 4**

**PROPOSED CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION REPORT**

* Title and opening pages
* Table of contents
* List of acronym and abbreviations
* Executive summary
* Brief description of the Programme
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods
* Summary of principle findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
* Introduction
* Evaluation purpose
* Key issues addressed (explanation of the structure and content of the report)
* Description of the Programme and projects, their development context
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and methods
* Data analysis
* Findings and conclusions (focused on answering the Evaluation questions defined in this Terms of Reference or other evaluation questions raised by Evaluator):
* Programme design and strategy
* Programme/projects implementation results
* Potential for replication and relevant modalities
* Management arrangements
* Recommendations
* Lessons learned
* Report annexes (TOR, work plan, list of people interviewed, list of documents reviewed, field visits reports, evaluation matrix, questionnaires used)

**Annex 5**

# Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Programme Document can be downloaded here: (<http://publicfinance.undp.sk/en/show/44C01A31-F203-1EE9-BCFA2A4414ABF76F>) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. (SlovakAid) Project refers to individual PFM areas of assistance implemented in beneficiary countries; (SlovakAid) Programme refers to the Public Finance for Development Programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See http://www.uneval.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Days allocated for the assignment are estimates only. The Evaluator is expected to review and revise if necessary. The Evaluator must adhere to the schedule of the assignment as described in Section F above. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)