



**TORS FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF MDG-F
JOINT PROGRAMME
Water & Sanitation**

September 2012

1. GENERAL CONTEXT: MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND (MDG-F)

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples' life in 50 countries by accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 130 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OEDC/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results.
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDGS, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one.
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Colombia, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

The Joint Programme: Governance of Water and Sanitation in Angola's Poor Neighbourhoods

The Joint Programme on Water and Sanitation in Angola, which began in June 2008 and will come to a close in March 2013, is an intervention funded by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goals Fund (MDG-F). The project aims to support national priorities on the Water and Sanitation sector bringing together different key actors on the sector, such as the Ministry of Energy and Water, Ministry of Environment, local administrations; building on comparative strengths and expertise from respective UNCT agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, IOM and ILO) and CSOs.

Access to clean water and proper sanitation facilities (WatSan) is still precarious in Angola. In peri-urban Luanda, people pay high prices for poor quality water from private vendors, as a great proportion of water standpoints, especially those managed by state-owned public utilities, break down frequently or do not function; many sub-urban neighborhoods simply do not have water points. In the Moxico province, most people, among whom there is a high number of returnees, take water from rivers, exposing families to water-borne diseases and infections linked to unpurified water.

This programme aims to ensure sustainable, equal and non-discriminatory access to sufficient, safe, physically accessible and affordable drinking water and adequate sanitation for peri-urban and rural communities in the Luanda and Moxico provinces of Angola, through rights-based approach. Therefore, the programme addresses the issue of sustainability of access to water and sanitation by introducing ownership rights and community management of WatSan schemes.

The JP Watsan focuses on the UNDAF Outcome: promoting of equitable economic development and democratic governance in accordance with international norms, by strengthening national capacities at all levels and empowering communities, so increasing their participation in decision-making processes. As well as rebuilding the social sectors to strengthen the national capacity for the delivery of basic services and to sustain processes of social empowerment.

This joint-programme, which sees the participation of ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UNDP, will pursue the key objective of bringing safe drinking water and adequate sanitation to up to 120,000 people directly, and another 400,000 from multiplier effects, so that the MDG gap for water and sanitation is closed by 3.4% (to 12%) and 3.3% (to 12%) respectively.

The model of governance proposed in this project entails promoting a network of autonomous units of small and medium scale WatSan utilities owned and managed by communities – namely the Grupos de Águas e Saneamento (GAS) – in the target peri-urban and rural areas of the programme, with the local government at the 'center' (of the network) confining its role to monitoring the network, regulating the rural water and sanitation market, pushing for the self-sufficiency and autonomy of communities in the management of their water and sanitation schemes, and providing regular monitoring and technical back-stopping when a major problem occurs in any one of the units or when a specific need is expressed (for example, the need for funding to upgrade a water post installation or the enforcement of the applicable pricing system).

To achieve this, the programme will seek to: (i) establish a pro-poor policy and regulatory framework that feature community participation in the provision and management of WatSan facilities; (ii) promote the autonomy of communities in the management of WatSan facilities; (iii) reinforce the capacity of local governments, namely municipalities, to effectively monitor community WatSan management units, mobilize resources and fund community WatSan projects and (iv) put in place an enhanced accountability system for peri-urban and rural water and sanitation sector. Using capacity development and advocacy as main intervention strategies, while focusing on such governance issues as pro-poor policy/regulation, community participation and accountability, the programme will seek to achieve results focusing on addressing the challenge of designing an institutional and regulatory arrangement that embraces a rights-based approach and that is consistent with community-driven approach, to promote sustainable water and sanitation management scheme for the poor.

The programme's total budget of \$ 8,000,000 comes from the Millenium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F), funded by the Government of Spain through a cooperation agreement with the UN system. It is 'passed through' UNDP's Multi-donor Trust Fund Office for transfer and distribution to participating UN agencies at headquarters level, then for use by country offices in a 'parallel funding' fashion.

This programme will initially target 120,000 vulnerable peri-urban and rural people in Luanda (90,000) and Moxico (30,000) provinces, closing the MDG gap for water and sanitation by 3.4% and 3.3% respectively. While the initial target coverage will be limited, the project will produce a multiplier effect with possible far reaching implications through an expanded institution strengthening and capacity building process in additional municípios, then covering a total of 500,000 people.

The JP has the outcome of community-oriented governance of peri-urban and rural water and sanitation sector promoted through autonomy driven institutional, regulatory and accountability system.

The programme's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangement includes the following features: introduction of M&E function in the programme implementation structure, data collection, data analysis, and elaboration of evaluation reports. Data sources include: administrations, small surveys and macro survey reports. Small surveys will be part of programme activities and conducted at three points of programme cycle: inception, mid-cycle and end-cycle. Two types of evaluation reports will be produced, annual reports dealing with the evaluation of agency outputs, and mid-cycle and end-cycle reports dealing with the evaluation of joint-outputs and outcomes.

The commissioner of the evaluation is seeking high-qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation, of this joint programme.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. 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 will commission and finance a final

independent evaluation.

Final evaluations are **summative** in nature and seek to:

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

As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

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

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Measure the joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. Measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. **(MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).**
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation

process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level:

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.**
 - a) To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant (assess including link to MDGs, UNDAF and national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process)?
 - b) How much and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
 - c) To what extent was this programme designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (see MDG-F joint programme guidelines.)
 - d) To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - e) To what extent the implementing partners participating in the joint programme had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - f) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
 - g) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?
 - h) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed? Did the JP follow the mid-term evaluation recommendations on the programme design?

Process level

- **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.**
 - a) To what extent did the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
 - b) To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
 - c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
 - d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in

delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?

- e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
 - f) What was the progress of the JP in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by agency? Where there are large discrepancies between agencies, these should be analyzed.
 - g) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
 - h) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the joint programme? Was it useful? Did the joint programme implement the improvement plan?
- **Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions**
- a) To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?
 - b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?

Results level

- **Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.**
- a) To what extent did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document? (detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs, 2) achievement of results).
 - b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute:
 1. To the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
 2. To the goals set in the thematic window?
 3. To the Paris Declaration, in particular the principle of national ownership? (consider JP's policy, budgets, design, and implementation)
 4. To the goals of delivering as one at country level?
 - c) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
 - d) To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted citizens?
 - e) Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
 - f) What type 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?

- g) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
- h) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?
- i) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation recommendations contribute to the JP's achievement of development results?

- Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

- a) To what extent the joint programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?
- b) At local and national level:
 - 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
 - 2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
 - 3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
 - 4. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
- c) To what extent will the joint programme be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?
- d) To what extent did the joint programme align itself with the National Development Strategies and/or the UNDAF?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

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

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

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

- **Inception Report** (to be submitted within 5 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team).

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. **The report will follow the outline stated in Annex 1.**

- **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visit, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

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 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft final report will be shared with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within 5 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. **This report will contain the sections establish in Annex 2.**

- **Reporting Line**

The Reports is subject to approval of the commissioner in order to realize the payments to the consultant.

- **Reporting Language**

The reporting language should be in English.

- **Title Rights**

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP and MDG-F.

7. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluations:

1. The **Resident Coordinator Office** as **commissioner** of the final evaluation will have the following functions:
 - Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
 - Convene the evaluation reference group;
 - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
 - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team;
 - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat);
 - Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
 - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee;
 - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.
2. The **programme coordinator** as **evaluation manager** will have the following functions:
 - Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR;
 - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group;
 - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data;
 - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
 - Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
 - Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation.
3. The **Programme Management Committee** will function as the **evaluation reference group**. This group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint

programme and will:

- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards;
 - Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
 - Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation;
 - Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference;
 - Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
 - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products;
 - Disseminating the results of the evaluation.
4. **The MDG-F Secretariat** will function as a **quality assurance member** of the evaluation, in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation, and will have the following functions:
- Review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.
5. **The evaluation team** will conduct the evaluation study by:
- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed

8. EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE

The work will be non-consecutively undertaken throughout the time-frame below;

Start Date: 20 of January, 2012 / **Completion Date:** 15 of March, 2012.

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	When (calendar days)
Design	Establish the evaluation reference group	CE*	(By 20 Nov 2012)
Design	General final evaluation TOR adapted	ERG**	(By 30 Nov 2012)
Implementation	Procurement and hiring the evaluation team	EM***	(30 Nov – 25 Jan 2012)
Implementation	Provide the evaluation team with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme	EM, ERG	10 days (26 Jan-4 Feb 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group	ET****	5 days (5- 9 Feb 2012)
Implementation	Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team. Agenda drafted and agreed with evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	5 days (10- 14 Feb) 2012)
Implementation	In country mission	ET, EM, CE, ERG	16 days (15 Feb- 2 Marco 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of the draft report	ET	10 days (3-12 Marco 2012)
Implementation	Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team. Fact-checking revision by MDG-FS, to be done at the same time as the ERG (5 business days)	EM, CE, ERG MDG-FS*****	3 days (13-15 March 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of the final report	EM, CE, ERG, MDG-FS, ^NSC	5 days (16-20 March 2012)
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation	EM, CE, ERG, NSC	5 days (21 – 25 March 2012)

* (CE) Commissioner of the evaluation ** (ERG) Evaluation Reference group *** (EM) Evaluation manager

**** (ET) Evaluation team ***** (MDG-FS) MDG-F Secretariat ^ (NSC) National Steering Committee

9. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure the extent to which development results have been attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and products should go far beyond what was said by programme stakeholders during the field visit or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc.) it's the ideal opportunity to set an agenda for the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also excellent platforms to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scaled-up at the country and international level.

The commissioner of the evaluation, the reference group, the evaluation manager and any other stakeholder relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete plan of dissemination of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, replicability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

10. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

1- Terms and Payment

- **Contracting Authority**
Contracting Authority for this Assignment is UNDP, and the contract amount will be provided through Joint Programme own funds. .
- **Contracting Modality**
IC – Individual Contract of UNDP.
- **Payment schedule**

Payments will be effected upon submission of the deliverables stated in Section 7 of this ToR by the FE and acceptance and approval by the commissioner. If the deliverables are not submitted by the FE as defined in the TOR, the FE will not be entitled to any payment even if she/he invests time in the assignment. The amount paid to the FE shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

The Final Evaluator will be paid in US\$ based on the number of working days invested for each deliverable.

#	Deliverable /Report	Expected Delivery Date Intervals of the Reports*	Estimated Number of Days to be Invested
1	Inception Report	9 February 2012	5
2	In-country mission and Draft Evaluation Report	12 March 2012	31
3	Final Evaluation Report	20 March 2012	5
Estimated Total Number of Days to be Invested			41

**The number of days required is subject to change based on the needs of the programme.*

- **Tax obligation**

The Final Evaluator is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the subscriber.

11. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT/TEAM OF CONSULTANTS

The final evaluation of this Joint Programme will be conducted by 15 of March 2012 as outlined in the MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines. The lead UN Agency (UNDP), as mandated by the Resident Coordinator Office as the evaluation, will seek to recruit highly qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation.

The evaluation team will consist of two members. A highly qualified International Consultant will be assigned to lead the Evaluation Team. A National Consultant or another International Consultant with knowledge on Angola will be assigned to assist the Team Leader during his/her in country mission (field visit). Academic qualification and required experience of the evaluation consultants as follows:

Team Leader:

i. Academic Qualifications: A Master Degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, engineering or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.

ii. Years of experience:

A combination of 10 years of recognized expertise in:

- Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas and
- Having thematic expertise in, one of the MDG-F windows, international development programmes and or assessing or evaluating one or more of the MDG-F thematic areas; (youth and employment; economic and private sector development; environment and climate change; cultural diversity and development, economic governance, children and nutrition, food safety, gender and women's empowerment).

Team Member

i. Academic Qualifications: A master degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, engineering or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.

ii. Years of experience:

A combination of 5 years of recognized expertise in:

- Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas and
- Having thematic expertise in, one of the MDG-F windows, international development programmes and or assessing or evaluating one or more of the MDG-F thematic areas; (youth and employment; economic and private sector development; environment and climate change; cultural diversity and development, economic governance, children and nutrition, food safety, gender and women's empowerment).

13. ANNEXES

ANNEX I: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

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

ANNEX II: DRAFT & FINAL REPORT OUTLINE

- **Cover Page**
Including JP title, thematic window, report date, name of the evaluator/s.

- **Table of contents**
Including page references for all chapters & annexes.
 - **Acronyms page**
 - **Executive Summary**
No more than 2 pages. Summarize substantive elements of the report, including a brief description of the joint programme, purpose and objectives of the evaluation, evaluation methodological approach, key findings and conclusions, main recommendations.
- 1. Introduction**
Explain why the evaluation is being conducted, including the following content:
- **Background**
MDG-F, thematic window, joint programme.
 - **Purpose, Goals and Methodology of Evaluation:**
Purpose and goal of the evaluation, methodologies used (including evaluation criteria, scope), constraints and limitations on the study conducted.
 - **Description of the development intervention**
Provide sufficient detail on the joint programme so that the readers of the report can easily understand the analysis done in the next chapter.
 - **Context**
Social, political, economic, institutional factors that affect the JP.)
 - **JP description**
Title, timeframe, intervention logic, objectives, intended outcomes/outputs, scale of the intervention, total resources, geographic location, etc.)
- 2. Levels of Analysis**
This section should be evidence based, guided by the evaluation criteria and questions.
- **Design | Relevance**
Include a description of the initial concept and subsequent revisions, and all pertinent information for the reader to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Assess the design relevance and address all evaluation questions (including link to MDGs, UNDAF and national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process, M&E framework and communications strategy and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).
 - **Process | Efficiency, Ownership**
Include a description of the JP's governance structure, coordination mechanisms, administrative procedures, implementation modalities, UN coordination, national ownership in the process and all pertinent information to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Address all evaluation questions (including JP's level of financial progress and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).
 - **Results | Effectiveness, Sustainability**
Assess the level of attainment of the development results compared to what was initially expected. Show progression of implementation with an appropriate measure and analysis of the results chain (organized by outcome, and distinguishing findings on completion of activities and outputs from outcomes). If some of this analysis is not included, explain why it is

not. Also, include an analysis of the effect of the mid-term evaluation on the JP's results achievement. For sustainability, please mention availability of financial resources and examples of or evidence for replicability and scale up of JP. Address all evaluation questions.

3. Conclusions

4. Lessons Learned

Define the scope of each lesson (joint programme, national policy, local intervention, etc.)

5. Recommendations

Prioritized, structured and clear. The scope and relevant stakeholder should be clearly defined for each recommendation.

6. Annexes

ANNEX III: DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

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; 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
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)
- Mid-term evaluation report.

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
- Baseline survey report.