**TERM OF REFERENCE**

**Mid-Term EVALUATION of**

**THE POVERTY REDUCTION PROGRAMME OUTCOME OF THE Government Of Swaizland/UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP)**

1. **BACKGROUND and CONTEXT**

The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) is a five year framework defining mutual cooperation between the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) covering the period 20011-2015. It is prepared based on the development opportunities and challenges identified in the United Nations Common Country Assessment (CCA) and outlined in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011-2015, which takes into account, various United Nations Conferences, Conventions and in particular Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It also draws lessons and progress made during the implementation of the previous Country Programme – the 3rd Country Cooperation Framework for the period 2006 – 2010, and national development priorities as outlined in the National Development Strategy (NDS) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (PRSAP). The CPAP, prepared in close consultation with key stakeholders, defines the broad outlines of the Government and UNDP common development interventions, within agreed financial and programme parameters.

The goal of the Country Programme is to contribute to the realization of Swaziland’s Vision 2022 as articulated in the NDS and PRSAP and attainment of the MDGs by improving quality of life of the population. The UNDP Country Programme for Swaziland supports implementation of the four outcomes of the 2011-2015 UNDAF, targeting areas where the organization has comparative advantages and demonstrated capacity. In this respect, UNDP focuses on: poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods, HIV and AIDS, environmental sustainability and climate change and governance and gender equality.

As implementation of the CPAP comes to a mid-point in 2013, an evaluation of its processes and outcomes is imperative.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

Thie evaluation is being conducted as per Evaluation Plan approved by the Executive Board. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the processes and achievements made during the first two years of implementing the Poverty Reduction Programme with a focus on achievements and constraints of the Programme targets for indicators and outputs as contained in the CPAP. This will further allow for drawing lessons that will inform the improvement of the Poverty Reduction Programme and its indicators and targets as well as the implementation arrangements

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE and Objectives**

This process evaluation will be conducted for the poverty reduction programme outcome - Pillar 1 of the CPAP 2011 - 2015. The aim of the poverty reduction programme is to support accelerated implementation of evidence-based poverty reduction measures to assist the government achieve its Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme (PRSAP) and Millennium Development Goal (MDG) objectives of significantly reducing poverty by 2015.

A consultant working under the guidance of the UNDP, CPAP Monitoring and Evaluation Committee and the Government Coordinating Authority is required to undertake the evaluation.

.More specifically, the evaluation objectives are to assess the following:

1. Appropriateness, relevance and validity of the Poverty Reduction Programme concept and design
2. Delivery process of the selected strategies including whether the activities prioritized were strategically targeted performance of the programme components
3. Programme delivery mechanisms including institutional arrangements
4. Cost –effectiveness of delivery the programme

. It is expected that this process will culminate in findings, lessons learned and recommendations in the following areas:

* Whether the programme addressed the identified needs/challenges as in the CPAP 2011-2015;
* H1ow efficiently programme planning and implementation were carried out. This will include assessing the extent of organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanism used by UNDP in supporting the programme;
* Ascertain results achieved, constraints and identify areas where progress made as well as areas to be accelerated towards their achievement;
* Ascertain whether UNDP’s outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcomes;
* An analysis of the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influence the outcome (including the opportunities and threats affecting the achievement of the outcome);
* Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective and
* The timeframe covered will be from 2011 to end 2012

 (this you mention here). . Information from this evaluation will assist in assessing the progress made on the implementation of activities, review of the delivery of allocated resources and understudy whether the programme is on-track. The results of the evaluation will also be used by management to make mid-course refinements to the programme.

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The evaluation should to the highest extent possible provide responses to the following research questions:

* Are we on track towards achieving the stated outputs?
* What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes? (coherence of CPAP, its evaluability, realistic RRF, adequate human and financial resources allocated, capacity of the team, implementation challenges, etc)
* To what extent have UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
* Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

And these questions will be addressed using the following evaluation criteria:

**Relevance**: Assess *design* and *focus* of the Poverty Reduction Programme. To what extent is the current Poverty Reduction Programme designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?

* Is the expected Programme outcome realistic given the CPAP timeframe, the UNDP capacities and resources?
* To what extent, and in what ways are risk and assumptions addressed in Programme design?
* Are the inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results?
* Are the indicators SMART? Is the responsibility for tracking indicators clearly identified?
* Is execution, implementation, monitoring and evaluation responsibilities clearly identified?
* To what extent are human rights principles and standards reflected or promoted in the Programme? To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equalityand other cross-cutting issuesreflected in programming? Are specific goals and targets set? Are th**e**re any efforts to produce sex **d**isaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and what special attention was given to women’s rights and empowerment, and if so, how?
* Does the programme include strategies to strengthen national capacity in the aforementioned thematic areas?
* Are there inter-linkages among the outcome interventions– i.e. between programme areas, with other UN agencies/development partners, etc.

**Effective**

* How are activities implemented?
* Are the planned outputs on track? Are they going to be achieved within the planned time frame?
* Is the process of achieving results effective? Specifically, to what extent is planned outputs attained or will be achieved? What is the quality of the outputs? Is data collected on the indicators of achievement? Do these indicators provide adequate evidence regarding achievement of programme outputs and contribution to outcomes? Is it necessary to collect additional data? What were the results in terms of promoting gender equity and equality (planned/unplanned)? What were the results in terms of capacity development (planned/unplanned)?
* Are the programme implementers discharging their roles in a cost-effective and cost-efficient manner? If not, why not?

**Efficiency of implementation**

* Looking beyond the delivery process, is the program component achieving or is it likely to achieve its outputs?
* Are sound financial and equipment management procedures practiced? Are the financial, human and material resources managed responsibly and efficiently?
* Are monitoring and evaluation systems and processes utilized to allow for adequate assessment of changes in risks and opportunities in the internal and external environments? Did they contribute to effective decision-making in the course of programme implementation?

**Sustainability: To what extent are the benefits of the Programme likely to be sustained after the completion of this cycle?**

* Are the achievements made so far sustainable? Specifically, is it likely that programme achievements will be sustained? Are involved counterparts willing and able to continue programme activities on their own? Have programme activities been integrated into current practices of counterpart institutions and/or the target population? Have resources been allocated by the counterparts to programme activities?
* What particular factors or events are affecting the programme results? Are these factors internal or external to the programme?
* Are there anyunexpected positive and/or negative results of the programme? Can they be either enhanced or mitigated to achieve the desired impact?
* Is there a more effective way of addressing the challenges(s) and satisfying the needs in order to achieve the outputs and contribute to higher level aims? Are programme strategies still valid or should they be reformulated?
* To what extent has the programme developed/strengthened the human and institutional capacities so as to ensure sustainability?
1. **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through the following methods:

Desk study and review of all relevant documents, including country programme action plan (CPAP), project documents, annual work plans, progress reports, annual reports and reports of the steering committee. (Full list attached as Annex 1):

A qualitative approach will be adopted. Structured and semi-structured, Key informant interviews (list attached), In-Depth Interviews, and, Focus Group Discussions with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The consultant working with the Government Coordinating Authority, M&E Committee and UNDP will form the Evaluation team. The consultant will specifically;

1. **Develop an evaluation framework/plan that will be discussed and agreed upon by the Evaluation team**
2. **Inception Report detailing the evaluation methodology to be agreed to by the Evaluation Team comprising of UNDP, CPAP M&E Committee and Government coordinating Authority**
3. **Review available documentation to obtain a general overview of the programme design and progress**
4. **Hold meetings and interview relevant stakeholders including implementing partners of the programme**
5. **Visit identified projects**
6. **Conduct data collection and analysis**
7. **Draft Evaluation reports**
8. **Incorporate comments of** the Technical Committee **and key stakeholders, complete and submit the final Evaluation report**
9. **Consulting with Evaluation team to ensure the progress and the key evaluation questions are covered**
10. **Assuring the draft and final reports are prepared in accordance with these Terms of Reference, especially the checklist for the assessment of evaluation report**
11. **Facilitate Evaluation meetings to present the main findings and recommendations**
12. **Incorporate management responses in the Management Response Template (attached) and annex the same to the final report.**
13. **EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

**The following outputs are expected by the end of the consultancy;**

1. **Inception Report detailing consultancy work-plan and proposed processes (**It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.)
2. **Draft evaluation report (Consistent with the PME Handbook)**
3. **Validation workshop report**
4. **Final endorsed report incorporating comments from stakeholders.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports (see Annex 7 of PME).
5. **Any knowledge products (evaluation brief, etc?)**

Will conform to the UNEG standards and adhere to the PME Handbook of UNDP.

1. **EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATION OF THE CONSULTANT**

The Consultant will possess a minimum of a Master’s Degree in Social Sciences with **strong background in participatory evaluation of development programmes. Specifically the consultant should have proven experience and skills in the following areas;**

* + **10 years experience in conducting programme evaluations;**
	+ **Sound knowledge and practical experience in programme development, planning and implementation in the area of poverty reduction (?);**
	+ **Extensive research and analytical skills;**
	+ **Excellent writing and oral communication;**
	+ **Facilitation and management skills and**
	+ **Possess leadership skills and be a team player.**
	+ **Konwledge of UN system and UNDP**
1. **WORKPLAN**

The consultancy will be conducted and completed within a one month period, commencing on 26th August July and 20th September 2013 (time frame should be consistent with dates provided in table below). The details schedule is presented in the table below:

**CPAP Evaluation Work-plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Major Steps** | **Responsibility** | **Time-frame****April 2013 – October 2013**  |
| A | Debriefing Process |  |  |
|  | UNDP Internal Meeting- Brainstorming exercise -Selecting of Consultant | Country Office | May |
|  | Debriefing MEPD on the Programme Evaluation  | Head of Programmes- Deputy Resident Representative | June  |
| B | Stakeholder Meeting- Debriefing UNDP Implementing Partners on Evaluation  | Country Office – 4th Quarter Review Meeting | May 2012 |
|  | Selection of consultant ( which will comprise of both UNDP MEPD and CPAP Monitoring and Evaluation Committee | Country Office/MEPD/CPAP MEC | June |
| C | Develop TORs for the Evaluation | Programme Manager/Project Staff | April |
|  | Receive comments on the TOR for Evaluation | CPAP MEC, Senior Management, M&E Focal point and Evaluation Advisor RSC,  | May - September |
|  | Advertise for recruitment of f Consultant to undertake the Mid-term Evaluation | Country Office  | September |
|  | Engage consultant to undertake the Evaluation | Country Office |  September |
| D | Commission Evaluation |  | October |
|  | Assemble evaluation documents | CO M&E focal point |  May/June |
|  | Debriefing meeting with Consultant  | CO and Evaluation Team | September |
|  | Arrangement of Evaluation Meeting with Programme Technical Officers, Stakeholders and Implementing Partners | CO Programme Manager for Poverty Reduction Programme  | October |
| E | Produce draft Evaluation Report | Consultancy Team | October |
|  | Internal Review of Draft Evaluation Report | Country Office and M&E Committee | October |
|  | Forward Report to Evaluation Advisor for Comments. | Country Office | October |
| F | Presentation of draft Evaluation to Stakeholders | Consultancy Team | Octoberr |
|  | Submission of Final Report to UNDP  | Consultancy Team | November |
| G | Dissemination of Evaluation finding  | CO M&E focal point | Novemberr  |
| H | Upload Report ERC | CO M&E focal point | November |

1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines. The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key informants in the collection of data. (UNEG Ethical Guidelines attached).

10. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The UNDP Representative, government coordinating institution (Ministry of Economic Planning Development) in close collaboration with the CPAP Monitoring and Evaluation Committee will ensure smooth implementation of the Evaluation. Specific tasks will include:

* Selection of the consultants - review and approval of the terms of reference
* Reviewing and endorsement of the study methodology and assessment tools
* Monitoring and receiving progress reports of the evaluation/assessment
* Approving the final evaluation/assessment reports

The consultant will specifically:

* Take the overall responsibility for technical quality of the evaluation/assessment
* Prepare quality study instruments including: interview schedules and guides, field visit checklists
* Ensure that field work and other survey activities are undertaken in accordance with the work plan
* Coordinate quantitative and qualitative data analysis and report writing
* Prepare inception and final report which will include incorporating comments received from the stakeholders ,
* Disseminate report findings to stakeholders as organized by the UNDP Country Office
1. **COST**

Payment will be made to individual consultants according to the prevailing United Nations rates for consultants. The consultant will be provided with the necessary administrative and logistical support to enable them deliver on the expected outputs.

1. **LIST OF KEY DOCUMENTATION**
2. United nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011 – 2015
3. Country Programme Document
4. Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2011 – 2015
5. UNDP CPAP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
6. Mid-Terms Review of the CPAP
7. Annual Work Plans (2011, 2012)
8. Project progress reports (financial/narrative)
9. Annual Project Progress Reports
10. National Development Strategy Vision 2022
11. Field Monitoring Reports
12. Results Oriented Annual Report
13. Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (2006)