|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME****UNDP Somalia Standard IC TOR format**  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **General Information**
 |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Consultancy:**  | **End of project Evaluation of the Somali Institutional Evaluation Project** |
| **Type of Contract:**  | **IC** |
| **Duration of the assignment:** | **28 days** |
| **Duty station:** | **Nairobi, with travel to Hargeisa, Garowe and Mogadishu** |
| **Expected places of travel:** | **Hargeisa, Garowe and Mogadishu** |
| **Supervisor:**  | **Head of Partnerships and Planning Unit** |
| **Anticipated presence at UNDP premises:** **Date of Issue:****Closing Date:** |  |

 |

**The Somali context**

The Provisional Constitution of the Federal Republic of Somalia was passed on 1 August 2012, beginning a new phase in Somalia’s history. A short while after the legislative and executive branches of a new Federal Government of Somalia were established- the Speaker and Deputy Speakers of the House of the People were elected on 28 August and the President shortly after. The President nominated a Prime Minister, who in turn nominated a Cabinet of Ministers, thus establishing the executive branch of government.

The Constitution provides for a Federal system of government; until this time, the international community had largely been approaching Somalia as comprising three principle zones: South Central Somalia; the semi-autonomous Somali State of Puntland, which severed relations with the Federal Government in August 2013; and Somaliland which unilaterally declared itself an independent republic in 1991. While interlinked ethnically and economically, each of these three zones has evolved differently and faces differentiated levels of stability, development and governance. Areas of Somalia have been in a state of armed conflict of one form or another since 1988.

The new federal administration marks a clear step away from the previous Transitional Federal Government, and unlike the previous government has demonstrated a willingness to identify and tackle key weaknesses facing public institutions which the TFG was not able to muster; nonetheless, it still faces numerous political and economic challenges, including ongoing conflict with Al Shabab in the South.

The administration in Puntland has moderately clear administrative structures, however, government institutions demonstrate relatively limited accountability and transparency.

The administration in Somaliland has developed relatively extensive governance structures including executive offices with line ministries, parliaments and judicial systems. It successfully held Presidential and parliamentary elections in 2010, and has a largely functioning bi-cameral parliament. The Somaliland institutions are currently in the process of agreeing a public sector reform process.

**UNDP Somalia**

In 2011, UNDP Somalia started a new five-year programme that aims to deliver recovery and development assistance to Somalia, based on priorities identified by Somalia authorities. The strategy focuses on making progress towards peace and meeting people’s humanitarian and recovery needs by addressing gender issues, boosting social services, improving livelihoods, reducing poverty, promoting good governance and improving human security. To implement the UNDP Somalia Country Programme 2011 – 2015 UNDP Somalia comprises two main programme clusters: (a) Governance and Rule of Law (GROL) Programme; and (b) Poverty Reduction and Environment Protection Programme (PREP).

The GROL Programme is based on the Strengthening Governance and Rule of Law in Somalia 2012-2015 programme document and responds to the priorities identified by Somalia authorities through a focus on six inter-related and mutually thematic areas which are all essential to the strengthening of governance and the rule of law in Somalia at national, regional and local levels. These are: fostering inclusive political processes, strengthening core institutional functions and systems, improving access to justice and the judicial system, strengthening police and security sector governance, enabling resilient local governance and service delivery, and enhancing community security and resilience. The overall objective is that Somali women and men benefit from more inclusive, responsive governance that enables improved service delivery and enhances peace.

The Somali Institutional Development Project (SIDP) responds to Outcome 2 under the UNDP Country Programme Document 2011-2015 (CPD): Somali women, men, girls and boys benefit from more inclusive, equitable and accountable governance, improved services, human security, access to justice and human rights; and under the Strengthening Governance and Rule of Law in Somalia 2012-2015 programme document SIDP is focussed on the area of strengthening core institutional functions and systems.

**Somali Institutional Development Project (SIDP)**

SIDP commenced in August 2008 with the merging of a number of projects namely (i) the Somali Institutional Capacity Development Project (SICAD); (ii) the Qualified Somali Technical Support Project (QUEST); (iii) the Emergency Technical Assistance Project (ETA) with its component “Aid Management and Coordination” and the (iv) Start Up Package Project (SUP) and the Somalia Institutional Support Project (SISP). The decision to merge these projects into SIDP was based on the need to give a greater cohesion to a number of activities that tended towards a single objective. SIDP responded to the need for Somali government and public institutions to function more effectively and deliver more services to the public, especially to the poor and other disadvantaged group with its overall goal “of developing key central functions more effectively which, in turn, will lead to more effective and efficient service delivery to the Somali people.”

The original project document for SIDP was developed in 2008-2009. The original Results and Resources Framework in that project document defined outputs in the areas of (i) Capacity Building Strategy; (ii) Policy and legislative processes and systems development; (iii) Human resource development; (iv) Macro-Economic and public financial management systems and (v) Developing physical infrastructure and operational support. The project was to be delivered through a new Business Delivery Model by seconding/ attaching staff to UNDP and by using other regional institutions and partners to train and work with Somali counterparts.

In March 2010 the European Union commenced funding of SIDP under a three year agreement for EURO 13 million, informed by the original project document, but with some amendments. Since 2010, SIDP has been funded by the EU, USAID, Norway, SIDA, the Word Bank, Italy, DFID and Denmark. The EU contribution amounts to more than 50% of the funded part of the SIDP budget. The current SIDP agreement with the EU expired in September 2013, having been the subject of a no-cost extension from the original end date of March 2013.

**Evaluations of SIDP**

There has been three evaluations involving SIDP conducted since the commencement of the EU funding in March 2010.

**Results-oriented Monitoring Mission**

The EU Results-oriented Monitoring Mission in May 2011 covered the EU Support to the Governance Sector (overall), but focussed primarily on the SIDP. The report noted that there is a noticeable impact already from SIDP, particularly in Somaliland. It also:

* highlighted weaknesses of the logframe and the disconnect between the logframe and ongoing initiatives/ activities;
* noted the need for one logframe and unified reporting system for all donors;
* demanded a strong, effective and independent monitoring system be put in place and routine reporting practices to senior management and to donors in the governance sector be improved;
* pointed out major challenges in project implementation due to security challenges, government changes, poor staff capacity at beneficiary level especially in South-central Somalia;
* recommended stronger support to the offices of the Accountants General and the Auditors General (in Somaliland and Puntland);
* raised concern over sustainability;
* noted challenges with the existing delivery mechanisms (Letters of Agreement); and
* demanded a review of the QUESTS-MIDA activities and long-term consultant support.

**EU Evaluation of SIDP**

The EU conducted an evaluation of SIDP during the period September to October 2011, with the report published in February 2012, containing the following key recommendations:

* Need for a coherent log frame with clearly defined objectives;
* Need for objectives to be mutually agreed by donor agencies, government and implementing agencies; and
* Ensure that technical assistance addresses the identified needs of the government and it contributes to the increased autonomy of the target institution.

In 2012, as an outcome of these two review processes, a series of strategic planning sessions were held with partners in Somaliland and Puntland to clarify key areas to deliver on until the end of the project in 2013, within the fields of 1) Public Sector and Civil Service Reform; 2) Public Finance Management, Accountability and Transparency and 3) Development Planning and Aid Effectiveness. Based on key results identified, the project then set out to review modalities for more effective and gender and conflict sensitive implementation, in accordance with an Action Plan agreed with the EC.

**Norway Evaluation**

During the period May to June 2013, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation commissioned a ‘Review of Norwegian Support to Somalia through UNDP’ to review their support provided to UNDP since 2010. In relation to SIDP the overall conclusion was that SIDP ‘had been rather unevenly implemented throughout the country, evidently with more access in the relatively well functioning public system in Somaliland and least so far on the federal level.’

**2. Evaluation purpose**

The UNDP Somalia intends to commission an end of project evaluation to measure qualitatively and quantitatively the project progress and will attempt to measure impact in terms of whether and how the project’s support to different institutions, organizations and individuals resulted in the expected and needed impact at the enabling environment level, organizational level and individual level. The evaluation also aims at understanding the relevance of the project and its design, the sustainability of project interventions, the effectiveness of the institutional arrangements and the partnership strategies. The result of the term evaluation will be used to inform the future interventions of UNDP in the capacity building and national institutions building area. The report should be able to enhance the understanding of key strength areas within UNDP’s work strengthening public sector institutions in Somalia, providing recommendations on improvement management arrangements, structures and objectives of future initiatives.

**3. Evaluation scope and objectives**

The review will look at the programme in all regions of Somalia and make separate recommendations based on regional context and common recommendations based on project’s progress towards its intended objectives in the subject-matter area of **public sector and civil service reform, public financial management, and development planning and aid coordination**.

* To examine to what extent the project has achieved the intended outputs, and in what specific areas the project excelled or failed in progress toward intended outputs.
* To indicate whether or not intended project impacts and outcomes are being met and/or, for specific outcomes, whether satisfactory progress was made.
* To analyse underlying factors that are influencing project impacts and outputs.
* To identify and analyse barriers and constraints that have delayed implementation, including challenges emanating from internal and external sources.
* To identify a list of ’lessons learned’ and make recommendations for corrections, including in relation to i) the specific CD services provided by the project (are they appropriate for the client and do they respond to the demands and felt needs of the client?); and ii) the sourcing of capacity (what is the general experience and are steps be taken to source capacity from institutions and networks beyond those considered under the project?).
* Extract the lessons learned and best practices that can be considered in the planning and design of future support activities for government and recommendations for future direction and areas of focus for the next phase of project.
* To state whether or not targets are being achieved and whether current and planned outputs can be sustained, including determination of measures needed to ensure continued sustainability of results in the future.
* Review the project progress, recommendations and action plan in light of the prevailing security situation in South and Central Somalia, Somaliland and Puntland.

**4. Evaluation questions**

Key review questions include:

* Whether the objectives and outputs have been achieved, the quality of the results and, if not achieved, whether there has been progress made towards the achievement of both qualitative and quantitative targets of selected projects.
* What has been the level, degree and appropriateness of participation by the beneficiaries, stakeholders, government and donor partners in the project;
* What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs?
* 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?
* Were programme approaches, management and implementation mechanisms revised to address key concerns, for example, was the M&E framework revised to ensure effective programme management?
* What were the key challenges in implementing in implementing in the project work plans?
* To what extent is the political climate impacting project progress and how can the project best respond in the current political situation?
* To what extent is the security climate impacting project progress and how can the project best respond in the current security situation?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project; and how best can the bottle necks be countered?
* What internal or external factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended results?
* Is the project design and intended outputs still consistent with the national priorities and in synergy with other similar interventions by other donors?
* What should be the UNDP approach in similar interventions in the future?
* Ascertain whether UNDP partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed for? How did partnerships arise? Did it identify a niche for itself? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? How did they function and sustain?
* Discuss that what has been the comparative advantage of UNDP vs other development partners in terms of effective project delivery and results achieved.
* Analyze whether the management arrangements for project delivery were enabling and responsive to implement the substantive activities with a focus on management capacity and timeliness of generating outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out;
* Assess how the projects and projects have utilized the funding and human resources to achieve results (including cost efficiency) and whether it has been done according to the rules and regulations of UNDP as per the DIM modality.
* What has been the quality of monitoring (timeliness, is there a regular system for monitoring) and how it has contributed to the project achievements?
* Have the cross-cutting issues gender and environment been given sufficient attention and have they been integrated in the project in an adequate manner?
* To what extent the project has been successful in implementing the recommendations of the previous evaluations; review the validity of those recommendations to date, and indicate progress against key project objectives.
* Assess how the project has responded to the recommendations made in the previous evaluation reports and how well this has contributed to the progress towards attaining the project objectives;

**5. Methodology**

The review will be conducted in a participatory and transparent manner, whereby all stakeholders will have the opportunity to share their views. The review will take gender as a cross-cutting element.

It is expected that the information gained from this review will go into informing a future programming cycle and interventions. Before the start of the review, the consultant will prepare a detailed work plan which will: present the methodology to be utilized in the conduct of the review; identify the review issues to be addressed and a schedule/timeline of planned activities.

The Evaluator will be one international consultant not involved with the formulation, appraisal, approval and/or implementation of daily management of the project. The consultants will be selected by the UNDP/SIDP evaluation support team. An Evaluation Inception Report is required, but a final decision about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultations among the programme unit, the evaluators, and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and extant data.

**6. Evaluation products (deliverables)**

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing the following:

**Evaluation inception report:** An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. 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. See Evaluation Matrix below.

**Draft evaluation report:** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

**Final evaluation report:** The evaluation report for Somaliland, Puntland and Federal Governments should explain the implementation of the project in achieving its proposed objectives. Recommendations on future support to the counterparts and strategic partners and stakeholders for enhancing the institutional capacity development at national and sub-national level to enable institutions to deliver services. For the purposes of providing effective support to the relevant government institutions, the areas of focus in the current phase should be evaluated and areas of future support with modified emphasis on the above-mentioned components should be highlighted. The report should also include: 1. Recommendations for the future implementation and management strategies; 2. Recommendations on the management and operational support to the project in light of the changing political and security climate the country.

A reporting template can be found at:

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/Annex7.html>

Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing

events, if relevant. The report should include recommendations to UNDP including but not limited to: Recommendations for the current implementation and management strategies applied; 2. Management and operational support to the project in light of the changing political and security climate the country

**Table A. Sample Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevant Evaluation Criteria | Key Questions | Specific sub-questions | Data Sources /  | Data Collection methods/tools | Indicators / Success standards | Methods for data analysis |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The review is the conducted by a team of three consultants who should have an understanding of the Somali context and is very versed in issues of governance and public sector reform in post conflict societies. It is expected that the consultant will be familiar with all of the three major areas of SIDP:

* + 1. Civil Service Reform,
		2. Public Finance Management,
		3. Development Planning.

The expert on Public Finance Management will be the Team Leader.

The qualifications and expertise for the assignment is laid out below:

* Advanced University Degree in political science or related fields, such as conflict studies, peace building, public administration, governance studies;
* A minimum of ten (10) years of relevant professional experience in the areas of governance, international development, political science, public policy, peace building and/or public administration in the context of fragile and post-conflict states,
* Expert technical leadership and knowledge of theories, principles and methods in the combination of selective fields of the following: Public sector reform, institution and capacity building, human resource development, public finance management, development planning;
* Experience in and knowledge of UN (preferably UNDP) systems and approaches;
* The evaluation team should also possess a broad knowledge and understanding of the major economic and social development issues and problems in Somalia.
* Evaluation expertise and experience will be rated highly;
* Experience in the project cycle and knowledge of the activities of multilateral development donors will be an added advantage;
* Background or familiarity with conflict and post conflict situations may also be required, both for the conduct of the exercise itself, and for understanding the particular context of the evaluation.
* Ability to communicate and write effectively in English;

Somali language skills will be an asset.

**8. Evaluation ethics**

Evaluations in UNDP are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.’ Evaluations should be carried out in a participatory and ethical manner and the welfare of the stakeholders should be given due respect and consideration (human rights, dignity and fairness). Evaluations must be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed.

Evaluation procedures should be conducted in a realistic, diplomatic, cost-conscious and cost-effective manner; must be accurate and well-documented and deploy transparent methods that provide valid and reliable information. Evaluation team members should have an opportunity to disassociate themselves from particular judgments and recommendations. Any unresolved differences of opinion within the team should be acknowledged in the report.

Evaluations should be conducted in a complete and balanced manner so that the different perspectives are addressed and analyzed. Key findings must be substantiated through triangulation. Any conflict of interest should be addressed openly and honestly so that is does not undermine the evaluation outcome. Evaluators should discuss, in a contextually appropriate way, those values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the interpretation of the evaluative findings. These statements apply to all aspects of the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.

The rights and well-being of individuals should not be affected negatively in planning and carrying out an evaluation. This needs to be communicated to all persons involved in an evaluation, and its foreseeable consequences for the evaluation discussed.

**9. Implementation arrangements**

The mission is expected to take a total of four weeks including travel to the regions in Somalia which is integral to the evaluation however it is subject to flight availability, security risk management and subsequent travel restrictions.

Logistical support, security clearance, and travel arrangements will be made by the SIDP support team.

**10. Time-frame for the evaluation process**

The contract duration is expected to last 21 days. The expected approach will be as follows:

* **Day 1-3**: Kick-off meeting with UNDP and SIDP Donors. Meetings and video conference (as required) with UNDP and project teams. Review of documentation in Nairobi, meetings with relevant stakeholders, preparation of field work. Presentation of inception report. (3 person/days);
* **Day 4- 14:**  Field visits to Somalia (10 person days);
* **Day 15-18:** Follow-up discussions with UNDP and presentation of preliminary findings to the UNDP and donors donors; Preparation and submission of draft report (3 person/days);
* **Day 19 – 21:** Within 14 days after receipt of consolidated SIDP donors and UNDP feedback; Final editing and submission of final report (3 person/days).
* Location(s) of assignment: Kenya and Somalia

**Public sector management – team lead**

**11. Cost**

**Fees**: The assignment will be contracted on a fee –based price basis. The consultant is expected to provide a financial proposal alongwith a technical proposal. It is expected that the Contractor will make available an appropriate management and backstopping mechanism, quality control system, secretariat and any other support staff (editors, proof readers, etc.) that it considers necessary in order to implement the Framework.

**12. KEY DOCUMENTATION (PRESENTED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)**

* Evaluation of the UNDP Somali Institutional Development Programme, Alain S. Thery/Andrea Amici, February 2012.
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* McLure, Douglas “Monitoring Report: Support to the Governance Sector (Overall)”, Ref. 140303.01, 06.06.2011 (a.k.a. RoMS Report)
* Somaliland Civil Service Reform Strategy (Concept Paper) 2011
* Accord 2010, Policy Brief 21 “What peace is it anyway? Connecting Somali and international peace making”
* Interpeace 2010: Peace Mapping Study (5 volumes)
* Renders, M. and U. Terlinden (2010). "Negotiating Statehood in a Hybrid Political Order: The Case of Somaliland." Development and Change 41(4): 723-746.
* Joint Strategy Paper 2008-2013
* OECD 2007 “Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States & Situations”, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/45/38368714.pdf
* Cabdiraxmaan Jimcaale (2005). Consolidation and Decentralization of Government Institutions.
* Rebuilding Somaliland: Issues and possibilities. W. S. Programme. Lawrenceville, N.J., Red Sea Press: 49-122.
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