**Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**End-of-the Programme Evaluation**

**UNDP Support to Inclusive Participation in Governance**

**May 2013**

1. **Introduction**

In April 2007, the United Kingdom, Department for International Development (DFID) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), jointly initiated the Programme for Strengthening Good Governance (PSGG). The main purpose was to “Enhance effectiveness and capacities of key national institutions mandated to promote state accountability and responsiveness**”.** In 2011, UNDP and the Government of Rwanda, through the support of Belgium, initiated a follow up programme, “**Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme” (IPG**), as a bridging programme between the end of the PSGG and the start of the next programming cycle for the UN and the Government of Rwanda. The next programming period for the EDPRS and the UNDAP will start June 2013 and will run until June 2018.The IPG programme built on the good practices of the PSGG takes into consideration new governance priorities as well as addressed shortcomings documented.

The programme aimed to achieve concrete outputs in three thematic areas and one cross cutting output area.

1. Undertake governance assessments and dialogues providing recommendations undertaken;
2. Accountability structures for the National Parliament, the National Forum of Political; Organizations and the National Electoral Commission established or improved;
3. Mechanism for media development and media freedom established;
4. Trainings undertaken in the areas of results based planning, monitoring and reporting for implementing partner’s staff.
5. **Objective of the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme ( IPG)**

The overall objective for the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme is to establish a programme structure that can contribute to consolidating high quality data and channels for inclusive participation leading up to the larger Governance Programme that will be aligned with the UNDAP/EDPRS period June 2013 to June 2017.

Mechanisms and opportunities to deepen inclusive participation include focusing on: electoral processes and institutions, mobilization channels such as political parties and CSOs; and communication channels in relation to access to information and independent media[[1]](#footnote-1). Following this rational, the project is built around three key components that will ensure critical interventions are undertaken in this bridging period and to seize the momentum of on-going governance projects. The three thematic areas are:

* Governance Assessment and Dialogue
* Political Participation
* Media Strengthening
1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

The Programme has been implemented for 18 months (January 2012-June 2013).This end of programme evaluation will focus at the entire implementation period.

The evaluation is forward looking and will capture effectively lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the IPG programme. The evaluation will assess the project design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the project objectives. It will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation which will inform the programming strategy in the next programming phase 2013-2018 in response to the EDPRS 11 priorities.

The emphasis on learning lessons speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future planning. It will assess the performance of the project against planned results. The evaluation will assess the preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of sustainable development goals. The results of the evaluation will draw lessons that will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation are the Government of Rwanda- through the Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), the Parliament, The Media High Council (MHC), the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) and the National Forum for Political Organization (NFPO), UNDP and the Embassy of Belgium. The evaluation will generate knowledge from the implementation of the IPG programme by the various implementing partners in collaboration with UNDP and the Embassy of Belgium and reflect on challenges; lessons leant and propose recommendations for future programming.

**3. Scope and focus of the Evaluation**

**3.1 Scope**

The IPG End of Programme evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy This will include the implementation modalities, co- financing UNDP/GoR roles and responsibilities, coordination , partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication, sustainability of the programme. The evaluation will include review of the project design, and assumptions made at the beginning of the programme development process. It will assess the extent to which the programme results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues of gender and human rights have been addressed. It will also assess whether the programme implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The evaluation will cover the period January 2012 to June 2013In order to achieve these objectives; will focus on the areas in 3.2 below.

**3.2 The Evaluation Questions**

The following key questions will guide the end of programme evaluation:

1. **Relevance – (** The design and focus of the programme)
* To what extent have the stated outcomes and outputs for the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme been achieved?
* To what extent have the IPG outcomes and outputs contributed to the UNDAF and EDPRS1 results in governance?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or hindered achievement of the intended outputs and outcomes?
* Was the strategy adopted and inputs identified, realistic, appropriate and adequate for achievement of the results?
* Has the partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* To what extent has UNDP support contributed to the achievement of the results?
* Was the programme relevant to the GoR priorities in governance?

**ii).Effectiveness- (**The management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery)

* Was the programme effective in delivering desired/planned results?
* To what extent did the Programme’s M&E mechanism contribute in meeting programme results?
* How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the programme?
* How effective has the programme been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
* What are the future intervention strategies and issues?

**iii). Efficiency** – (Of Programme Implementation)

* Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized?
* What factors contributed to implementation efficiency?
* Did programme activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and /or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
* Could a different approach have produced better results?
* How was the programme’s collaboration with the UNDP, the Government of Rwanda, national institutions, development partners, and the Steering Committee
* How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the programme?
* How did the programme financial management processes and procedures affect programme implementation?
* What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the programme implementation process?

**iv). Sustainability-**

* To what extent are the benefits of the programme likely to be sustained after the completion of this programme?
* What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of programme outcomes and benefits after completion of the programme?
* How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the programme including contributing factors and constraints
* What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of Programme outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
* How were capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints).
* Describe the main lessons that have emerged
* What are the recommendations for similar support in future?
1. **Institutional arrangements**

The evaluation will be managed by UNDP in collaboration with a review panel made of representatives of implementing agencies. The UNDP M&E manager shall be the focal person for the evaluation and the interlocutor with the Governance Programme.

1. **Methodology for Evaluation:**

The IPG End of Programme will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and fully compliant with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (206). This is a summative evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the IPG implementation and performance and to make recommendations for the next programming cycle.

**5. Data Collection**

The IPG End of Programme Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the GoR institutions, CSOs as well as development partners, and right holders. Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government officials, as well as with development partners is envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location), where possible.

In order to use existing sources/information and avoid duplication, data will be mainly collected from various information sources through a desk review that will include the comprehensive desk review and analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, triangulation of different, studies etc. Data will also be collected from stakeholder key informants through interviews, discussions, consultative processes, and observations in field missions. This phase will be comprised of:

1. Review and analysis of relevant documents including the GoR programmatic documents & reports, the UNDP/UN Rwanda programmatic documents & reports, recent studies and research reports, developmental and social reports, (see list attached and relevant links)
2. Critical analysis of available data with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UN inputs to the GoR. The IPG End of Programme Evaluation will benefit from and use optimally the data collected through the Country-Led Evaluation of DaO, the UNDAF MTR reports, Independent Evaluation of DaO, UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and independent project evaluations.

**5.2. Basic Documents for Desk Review**

The IPG End of Programme Evaluation will take cognisance of One UN Annual Reports, the Country-led Evaluation, the UNDAF Mid-Term Review Reports, Independent Evaluation of DaO, and other agency evaluations/reports to determine the effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality to support achievement of national priorities.

The IPG Terminal Evaluation should also take into account the lessons learned from the Country-led Evaluation and Independent Evaluation, UNDAF Evaluations in terms of:

1. Response to the national development objectives (programme relevance);
2. Creating a common, coherent and results-oriented strategy for successor programme
3. Facilitating joint programmes to the extent possible (reducing overall transactions costs)

***(Other suggested reference documents are in Annex 3.)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Deliverable** | **Time allocated** |
| Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan | **Inception report**  | **3days** |
| Inception Meeting Initial briefing |
| Documents review and stakeholder consultations | **Draft report**  | **20 days** |
| Field Visits |
| Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft EvaluationReport |
| Validation Workshop |
| Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions andcomments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP and SC. | **Final evaluation report**  | **7 days** |
| Total number of working days |  | **30** |

**6...Expected Deliverables:**

The following deliverables are expected.

1. **Inception report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that evaluator and the stakeholders (Rwanda Governance Board, Media High Council, Parliament, National Forum for Political Organizations, National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, the programme team, UNDP) have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated. (**See Sample in Annex).**The report will include the scope of work, work plan, time frame, analysis 4.-5 days after starting the evaluation process.
2. **Draft IPG End of Programme Evaluation repor**t- The evaluation team will prepare a draft IPG Evaluation Report, cognisant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of evaluation report (see annexes) and distribute it to the members of the Steering Committee and other stakeholders for review and comments. It will be submitted to UNDP and the evaluation review panel. Comments from the Steering Committee and stakeholders will be provided within 10 days after the reception of the Draft Report. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The report will be produced in English in Kigali, Rwanda.
3. **Final IPG End of Programme Evaluation Report.** The final report (30-50 pages) will include comments from the Steering Committee, UNDP, and stakeholders will be submitted 10 days after receiving all comments. This will be submitted to the IPG Project Steering Committee through the UNDP Country Director for validation .It will include recommendations, policy options and conclusions.(**Recommended structure of the report is in the Annexes)**

**7. Duty Station**

The duty station of the work is Kigali, Rwanda. However, the consultant may be required to travel to project sites outside Kigali.

**8. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

The consultancy shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

* 30% after adoption of the inception report
* 30% after presentation of the draft report
* 40% after the approval of the final report

The consultancy fee will be paid as Lump Sum Amount (all inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy). The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**9. Required expertise and qualification**

An international consultant with the following expertise and qualification:

* At least master’s degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant university degree;
* Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance , inclusive participation, support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections;
* At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors;
* Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation;
* Fluent in English. Working knowledge in French is an added advantage; and
* Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Fluency in spoken French will be and added advantage.

**10. Management Arrangements for the Evaluation**

* UNDP will contract the evaluation team (consultant) on behalf of the Government of Rwanda and the UN Agencies. UNDP will focal point for the evaluation will facilitate the logistical requirements for the evaluation team including setting up interviews, field visits, payments for the evaluation teams
* The IPG End of Programme Evaluation process will be led by the Steering Committee which shall provide overall guidance and direction for the review process. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the SC chair and includes members UNDP senior leadership
* A Technical Committee, led by the UNDP Country Director comprised of both implementing partner representatives, and UNDP will supervise the overall work of the consultancy team and guide the process at technical level and provide regular reports to IPG Steering Committee, The M&E Advisor will provide technical oversight, quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria. The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, wide stakeholder consultation and verification of all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final Report and follow-up actions.

**11. Time-Frame for the Evaluation Process**

* The evaluation will be conducted in July 2013 for an estimated 30 working days. The consultants will be provided with information to prepare (with the support of the UNDP Country Office) a table with tasks, timelines and deliverables, for which the consultants will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office (UNDP-CO), indicating for each, who is responsible for its completion.

**Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

**12. Selection Criteria**

## Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:

 The offer will be evaluated by **using the Best value for money approach** (combined scoring method**)**. Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%.

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight***  | ***Max. Point*** |
| ***Technical*** |  |  |
| At least master’s degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant university degree; | *10 %* | *10* |
| Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance , inclusive participation, support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections ;  | *20 %* | *20* |
| Overall Methodology  | *40%* | *40* |
| Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation;  | *20%* | *20* |
| At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors; and h demonstrable experience working for the United Nations System | *5%* | *5* |
| Fluency in English and a working knowledge of one of the other language | *5%* | *5* |
| ***TOTAL*** | ***100%*** | ***100*** |

**13. Annex 1; Recommended List of Documents**

1. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
2. Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008 – 2012), September 2007
3. Republic of Rwanda, Annual Progress Reports on the implementation of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) – 2008
4. Republic of Rwanda, Education Sector Strategic Plan (2006-2010), Ministry of Education, 2006
5. Republic of Rwanda, Health Sector Strategic Plan (July 2009 – June 2012), July 2009
6. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Aid Policy, 2006
7. United Nations Rwanda, One UN ‘Delivering As One’ in Rwanda Concept Paper, April 2007
8. United Nations Rwanda, UNDAF 2008-2012
9. United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, Common Operational Document (2008-2012)
10. United Nations Rwanda, Communication Strategy (2007-2008), 2007
11. Consolidated Annual Work Plan (CAP) 2008
12. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Evaluability Assessment of Delivering as One Pilots, Assessment Report on Rwanda, March 2008
13. United Nations Rwanda, Annual Reports 2008, 2009, 2010
14. United Nations Rwanda, Stocktaking report 2008 & 2009 for Delivering as One in Rwanda
15. Consolidated Annual Work Plan (CAP) 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011

Web links

**13. Studies, Surveys and Evaluations**

1. Demographic and Health Survey Reports (2000, 2002, 2007/8)
2. Integrated Household Living Condition Survey (2000, 2005)
3. United Nations & Republic of Rwanda, Country-led evaluation of the Delivering As One, 2010
4. Sectoral studies and evaluations

**Annex 2; Structure of the IPG End of Programme Evaluation Report**

**Title page**

Name of programme or theme being evaluated

Country of project/programme or theme

Name of the organization to which the report is submitted

Names and affiliations of the evaluators

Date

**List of acronyms**

**Executive summary**

* A self-contained paper of 1-3 pages.
* Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme Evaluation methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order.( Maximum 5 pages)

(**Main Report; Maximum 35 pages)**

**Introduction**

* (Context and national priorities, goals, and methodology, brief description of the results)
* Describe the project/programme/theme being evaluated. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention.
* Summarize the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria.
* Describe the methodology employed to conduct the Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme End of Programme Evaluation and its limitations if any.
* Detail who was involved in conducting the IPG End of Programme Evaluation and what were their roles.
* Describe the structure of the IPG End of Programme Evaluation report.
* A Reflection on the main findings which considers: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with all the stakeholder categories
	+ Results by UNDAF Outcome: national progress, (specific contribution of UN agencies and resources mobilized etc.

**Partnership and collaboration** strategy among UNDP/ GoR/IPs, Donors; and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the IPG programme as a partnership framework

**Major Challenges**

**IPG Financial Management**

**Assessment of M&E process**

**Findings and conclusions**

* State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Assess the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles and human rights based approach. In providing a critical assessment of performance, analyse the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact. To the extent possible measure achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms. Analyse factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative. Discuss the relative contributions of stakeholders to achievement of results. Assess how/if the intervention has contributed to gender equality and fulfilment of human rights.
* Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected. They must relate to the 1PG objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions. They should also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors.

**Recommendations and lessons learnt**

* Based on the findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)’ overall experience in other contexts if possible provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.
* Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, conclusions made and lessons learned. Discuss their anticipated implications. Consult key stakeholders when developing the recommendations.
* List proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order.

**Annexes may include the following (maximum 10-15 pages)**

* Attach ToR (IPG End of Programme Evaluation).
* List persons interviewed, sites visited.
* List documents reviewed (reports, publications).
* Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, Survey, etc.).
	+ Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.
	+ Photos
	+ Stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC])
	+ List of used documents and persons met.

***\*The Inclusive Participation in Governance Programme Evaluation Report should be developed in accordance with the UNEG “Standards for Evaluation in the UN system”, “Norms for Evaluation in UN System and “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.” Analysis should include an appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results. It will consider the evaluation objectives as per relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of results, as well as the key issues of design, focus and comparative advantage.***

**Annex 3: Sample Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection Methods / Tools** | **Indicators/ Success Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. UNDP Guide to Democratic Governance Practice [↑](#footnote-ref-1)