



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNDP Afghanistan TERMS OF REFERENCE

Outcome Evaluation: CPD Outcome 3 (Strengthening Democratic Governance for Service Delivery)

Title: **Evaluation Team Leader** (1 position, Afghan national or international, maximum 40 days)
Evaluation Specialists (2 positions, Afghan national or international, maximum 30 days each)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Timeframe: September – November 2013

Duty Station: Home-based with travel to and within Afghanistan

1. INTRODUCTION

The UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for Afghanistan for 2010-2014 is designed to advance and deepen the progress made in the previous cycle in promoting stabilization, state building and governance, and strengthening democratic institutions in the country. It has been formulated in consultation with the Government and development partners and reflects the national development priorities articulated in the Afghanistan National Development Strategy (ANDS) and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) priorities, and takes into account that UNDP operates under the overall mandate of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA). Under the CPD, UNDP Afghanistan works to contribute towards the achievements of six development outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Capacity in state and non-state institutions increased to contribute to overall stabilization and peace-building.
- Outcome 2: Effectiveness of the justice system is improved and access to justice is increased.
- Outcome 3: The state has improved ability to deliver services to foster human development and elected bodies have greater oversight capacity.
- Outcome 4: The state and non-state institutions are better able to promote democratic participation and be accountable to the public.
- Outcome 5: Capacities of national and local governance bodies are improved for better natural resource and disaster risk management.
- Outcome 6: Increased opportunities for income generation through the promotion of diversified livelihoods, private sector development and public-private partnerships.

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Afghanistan, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess UNDP contributions towards the progress made on outcome achievements. Specifically to this Terms of Reference, UNDP's contributions towards the following outcome are to be evaluated:

“The state has improved ability to deliver services to foster human development and elected bodies have greater oversight capacity.”

This TOR outlines the scope, requirements, and expectations of the evaluation and will serve as a guide and point of reference throughout the evaluation.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Democratic governance is central to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and, in particular, the elimination of poverty. The attainment of the MDGs in Afghanistan are heavily dependent on strong, legitimate and effective public administration structures, at both central and sub-national level, which are responsive to the needs of ordinary citizens, including the poor. After a decade of massive security, development, and humanitarian assistances, some progress has been made in reconstructing the country, its economy, and its governance system. However, state institutions remain fragile and their capacity to deliver basic services and security throughout the country is still weak. Problems of capacity exist at all levels, from individual to organizational capacity as well as a lack of an enabling environment for further development.

State-building efforts in Afghanistan are jeopardised by a widespread insurgency which impacts very negatively on the lives and the welfare of ordinary Afghans and on government access to – and public service delivery in – many districts. While the insurgency has multiple causes¹, in large part it reflects pervasive mistrust in state institutions. The cement which forms the social contract between the government and the society is extremely fragile. The weakness of the social contract stems from several factors:

- People's unmet expectations have led to deep-seated frustrations: on the one hand, the massive engagement of the international community has led Afghan society to form unrealistic expectations; on the other hand, the limited government capacity to respond to this demand has deepened the gap and further weakened state legitimacy, especially in the rural areas.
- The government's inability to respond to grievances from constituents or to facilitate dispute resolution and maintain law and order has further frustrated Afghans who believe that this core government function can be performed even with limited financial resources.
- The weakness of political representation mechanisms and political parties, and the lack of authority of elected bodies, the lack of access to information and the low capacity of civil society organisations (especially outside of main urban centres) have all prevented Afghan society from holding the government accountable.

In order to strengthen the cross-cutting and core capacities of the State, UNDP focuses on strengthening the individual and institutional capacities in priority government entities. This includes support to the Centre of Government, enhancement of the aid management capacities and support to information management. At the sub-national level, support focuses on capacity development of the government in formulating and implementing a sub-national governance policy and legal and regulatory framework; development of institutional and administrative capacities in provincial and district administrations to deliver basic services and

¹ UNDP recognises the variety of causes of the insurgency and the multiplicity of conflicts in Afghanistan. It is also understood that UNDP programmes can only have a limited impact in the peace-building process. This section limits itself to analysing the causes of insurgency that can be addressed through local governance programmes.

strengthening the capacity of Provincial Councils to act as the representative link between the State and local communities.

3. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The 2010-2013 CPD has been extended for another year until 2014 in concurrence with the extension of the UNDAF. The new UNDP Afghanistan Country Programme will start in 2015. The purpose of this evaluation is to take stock and evaluate UNDP contribution towards strengthening the country's governance institutions to improve public service delivery as envisaged under the Outcome 3 in the CPD and CPAP. The evaluation findings will be mainly used to inform the planning, design, and formulation of the new Country Programme Document for UNDP Afghanistan, which will cover the period of 2015-2018. Therefore, this evaluation will need to be forward-looking; the findings and judgments made must be based on concrete evidence that will support UNDP's strategic thinking for its new programme cycle, specifically in determining its strategic priorities in supporting the Government in this outcome area.

Another purpose of this evaluation is to provide inputs to the Assessment of Development Results exercise currently being carried out by the UNDP Evaluation Office.

The outcome evaluation will assist UNDP in gaining a better understanding of the following aspects of its interventions:

- a) the extent to which the planned outcome and the related outputs have been, are being achieved, or likely to be achieved by end 2014
- b) the causal linkage by which outputs contribute to the achievement of the specified outcome
- c) concrete evidence of the UNDP contribution to the outcome including the use of case studies as a tool to explain results
- d) if and which programme processes e.g. strategic partnerships and linkages are critical in producing the intended outcome
- e) factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: weaknesses in design, management, human resource skills, and resources
- f) strategic values and comparative advantage of UNDP in contributing to the outcome
- g) lessons learned from the implementation of the interventions

4. EVALUATION SCOPE

This evaluation is to evaluate the collective results of UNDP's contributions towards strengthening the country's governance institutions to improve public service delivery as implemented through various initiatives under the Outcome 3 of the current CPD/CPAP.

Programmatic scope:

Under this outcome, UNDP implements four key initiatives:

- 1) **National Institution Building Project (NIBP)** – UNDP works mainly with the Independent Administrative Reform for Civil Service Commission (IARCSC) to provide capacity development (CD) support to Afghanistan Government at the national and sub-national levels. The project places international capacity development advisors and national capacity development officers in ministries and departments to provide CD support to civil servants. NIBP, implemented between 2010-2013,

promotes “twinning arrangements” and partnerships between Afghanistan ministries and agencies with corresponding ministries and agencies of other countries to transfer specialized skills and experience. NIBP has three main outputs:

- 1.1 Institutional and organizational capacity of selected government entities strengthened by policy and strategy development and systems improvement through coaching and advisory services to improve service delivery and to support Public Administration Reform (PAR) objectives
- 1.2 Institutional and organizational capacity development of selected government entities improved through coaching and advisory services in alignment with Civil Technical Assistance Plan
- 1.3 PAR management and coordination capacity of IARCSC strengthened and institutional and policy support for implementing required training programmes for civil servants established.

2) National State Governance Project (NSGP) – NSGP, covering the period of 2010-2013, works directly with the Office of the President (OoP) to enable more effective policy and decision making at the center of the government. The project focuses on improving organizational, management, and administrative effectiveness of the OoP; strengthening policy planning, analysis, monitoring, and coordination among relevant state actors; and improving the infrastructure and facilities of the OoP. NSGP works to deliver four outputs:

- 2.1 An enabling organizational environment is in place to support the operations and programs of the President’s Office
- 2.2 Capacity of First Vice-President Office in planning and service delivery improved
- 2.3 Strengthen the human and institutional capacity of the second Vice President to support the President in achieving his mandate
- 2.4 Improved policy analysis and technical capacity of Council of Ministers and Cabinet Committees – Office of Administrative Affairs

3) Afghanistan Sub-National Governance (ASGP) – ASGP supports the Government in developing capacity and systems to ensure effective implementation of the governance strategies outlined in the ANDS under the Good Governance and Rule of Law pillar, and the Afghanistan Compact addressing the challenges identified for sub-national governance. ASGP is now in its second phase covering the period of 2010-2014. ASGP implements three outputs:

- 3.1 National systems, procedures, and legal frameworks to implement, coordinate, and monitor subnational governance policy are in place
- 3.2 Provincial and District Governors’ Offices have the capacity to develop and lead the implementation of strategies for improving security, governance, and development in accordance with the Afghanistan National Development Strategy
- 3.3 Democratically elected Municipal administrations are collecting revenues and delivering basic services under an improved organizational framework by 2014

4) Making Budgets and Aid Work (MBAW) - MBAW, now in its third phase, supports the Budget Department of Afghanistan’s Ministry of Finance, aiming at developing capacity, process, and systems to ensure effective implementation of the Government’s strategies in addressing challenges identified for improved public finance management, as outlined in the ANDS and Joint Coordination and Monitoring Board. MBAW also aims to contribute to the overall improvement of the country’s aid effectiveness. MBAW deliver three outputs:

- 4.1 Improved budget planning and management (the budget is comprehensive, policy-based, prepared in an orderly manner, and supportive of the national development strategy)
- 4.2 National policy and strategy development and coordination of external assistance aligned with Paris Declaration and ANDS implementation improved

4.3 Improved Budget Execution and delivery management and sustainable Institutional capacity developed at MoF and Government Institutions

Time frame:

The overall results of the four key projects contributing to the outcome should be evaluated since the start of each project's current phase that falls within the present Country Programme Document's period (2010-2014). Below is the timeframe of the projects contributing to this outcome.

- NIBP (2010-2013)
- NSGP (2010-2013)
- ASGP (2010-2014)
- MBAW (2007-2013)

Geographical coverage:

NIBP works with the 25 key ministries and government agencies, centrally located in Kabul. It also reaches out and works with all civil training institutes and centers in all 34 provinces in Afghanistan.

NSGP mainly works with the Office of the President, located in Kabul.

ASGP's key project partners are the Independent Directorate of Local Governance and the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Servant Commission, situated in Kabul. Through its provincial approach in the second phase, it has also established partnerships with each of the 34 provincial governors and also with provincial and municipalities on a demand-based basis.

MBAW works mainly with the Budget Department of the Ministry of Finance, located in Kabul.

This evaluation covers the entire geographical reach of all projects.

Target groups and stakeholders:

Target groups and stakeholders of UNDP's interventions under these four projects vary depending on the planned results of each output but they are mainly the key government counterparts for each project.

5. METHODOLOGY

Overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP [*Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*](#). The evaluation team will determine the specific design and methods for the evaluation during the initial inception period in close consultation with UNDP. Specifically on the outcome evaluation, while it should focus on the outcome, it does not mean that other aspects of UNDP initiatives are neglected. In order to understand whether everything has been done to contribute to the achievement of the outcome, the evaluation also needs to look at how well the initiative was planned, what activities were carried out, what outputs were delivered, how processes were managed, what monitoring systems were put in place, how UNDP interacted with its partners, etc. As a result, an outcome-level evaluation does not, therefore, imply an exclusive preoccupation with outcomes; but it does mean that all UNDP initiatives should be evaluated in terms of their overriding intention to bring about change in human development conditions at the outcome level².

Outcome evaluations include four standard categories of analysis:

² Excerpt from "A Companion Guide to the UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation (draft, May 2011)

- An assessment of progress towards the outcome;
- An assessment of factors affecting the outcome,
- An assessment of key UNDP contributions to outcomes
- An assessment of the partnership strategy used

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluation team is expected to apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data. The development of evaluation methodology will be done in close collaboration with UNDP, to be coordinated by UNDP Afghanistan's Strategic Management Support Unit.

The data collection methods should include, but not limited to,

- Desk reviews of relevant documents (Afghanistan National Development Strategy, Afghanistan's National Priority Programs, and other documents related to national development policies, United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Afghanistan (UNDAF), UNDP Afghanistan's Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), project documents, progress reports, relevant evaluation reports and studies, etc.)
- Key informant interviews at the national and subnational level
- Focused group discussions at the national and subnational level
- Direct observations during field visits to selected sites
- Administration of surveys/questionnaires

As indicated in the original Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), the achievement of this outcome will be measured through the following indicators:

a) Number of clients satisfied with improved service delivery of public sector

Baseline: TBD

Target: TBD

b) Public perception of government performance combating corruption

Baseline: 66% negative opinion (2008 survey)

Target: 56% (decrease by 10% from the baseline)

c) Patterns of resource allocation and utilization by sectors addressing citizens' needs

Baseline: 2009 national budget allocation by sectors

Target: Increase in budget allocation (ration) in social sectors

d) Ministries engaged in implementation of ANDS have adequate capacities for analysis and development of policies to support programme and projects

Baseline: 2 policy unit currently in place and operational in the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry

Target: At least 6 key ministries equipped to undertake policy analysis and development, and all such units operationally and programmatically linked to the Office of the President

Since early 2013, indicators for this CPAP outcome have been revised to:

a) Level public satisfaction with education for children and availability of clean drinking water

Baseline: 2009: Satisfaction with education: 67% and Satisfaction with availability of clean drinking water: 63%

Target: 2013: Satisfaction with education: 80%; Satisfaction with availability of clean drinking water: 75%

b) Percentage of citizens who see corruption as a major problem in various facets of life and at all levels of Government

Baseline: 2009: 76%

Target: 2013: 66%

c) Percentage of state budget allocation for Education, Health and Social Protection

Baseline: 20.2%

Target: 25%

However, it should be noted that these indicators may not be the most appropriate indication to measure the progress or the achievement of the outcome. The evaluation team will need to further design what suitable indicators can appropriately be used to satisfy the evaluation. A new set of indicators may need to be reconstructed on the basis of information available for the period immediately preceding the start of the CPD/CPAP period.

Since the geographical scope of UNDP interventions contributing to this outcome is quite extensive, covering the entire country, the evaluation team is expected to apply a sound sampling methodology to ensure that the evaluation findings and judgments are made based on a good representation of data.

The data collection methods used are expected to be participatory and inclusive of disadvantaged and marginalized populations.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted against the following evaluation criteria as guided by the Development Assistance Committee's Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance.

a) Relevance

- To what extent do the intended outcome and the relevant outputs address national priorities and to what extent is this aligned with UNDP's mandate?
- Have UNDP interventions been relevant to women and other marginalized populations?
- Has UNDP been able to adapt its programming to the changing context to address priority needs in the country?
- What are potential area of engagement for UNDP's next Country Programme in relation to strengthening Afghanistan's governance institutions to improve public service delivery?

b) Effectiveness

- To what extent the planned outcome has been or is being achieved? Are there any additional outcome(s) being achieved beyond the intended outcome?

- How have corresponding results at the output level delivered by UNDP affected the outcome, and in what ways have they not been effective?
- What are the challenges to achieving the outcome?
- Has UNDP best utilized its comparative advantage in deciding to deliver these planned outputs?
- What are the key gaps that UNDP interventions could address within its comparative advantage that would significantly contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
- Has UNDP's partnership strategy been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcome?
- To what extent did the results, both at the outcome and output levels, benefit women and men equally?
- Is the current set of indicators, both outcome and output indicators, effective in informing the progress made towards the outcomes? If not, what indicators should be used?

c) Efficiency

- Has there been any duplication of efforts among UNDP's own interventions and interventions delivered by other organizations or entities in contributing to the outcome?

d) Sustainability

- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
- What is the level of capacity and commitment from the Government and other stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
- What could be done to strengthen sustainability?

All UNDP evaluations need to assess the degree to which UNDP initiatives have supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, United Nations Evaluation Group's guidance on [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation](#) should be consulted.

7. EVALUATION PRODUCTS

The evaluation team is expected to produce the following deliverables:

- **Evaluation Inception Report** detailing the evaluation team's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, an evaluation matrix outlining which data collection methodologies will be used to address each of the evaluation questions, a proposed schedule of tasks. A presentation of the inception report will be made to and discussed with UNDP. Please see Annex A for the minimum requirements of what to be included in the Inception Report.
- **Zero draft Evaluation Report** for initial feedback from UNDP
- **Draft Evaluation Report** to be shared with UNDP and relevant stakeholders for feedback and quality assurance.
- **Evaluation debriefing meeting** with UNDP and key stakeholders where main findings will be presented.
- **Final Evaluation Report**
- **Evaluation Brief** - a concise summary of the evaluation findings in plain language that can be widely circulated. This can be in a form of a PowerPoint presentation or a two-page briefing document.

The final report is expected to cover findings; judgments made following the evaluation criteria and questions based on a good analysis of qualitative and quantitative evidence, as applicable; lessons learned; and forward-looking, realistic, and actionable recommendations. The report will include the following contents³:

- Title and opening pages
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation purpose, objective, and scope
- Evaluation methodology
- Evaluation findings
- Recommendations (forward-looking and actionable)
- Annexes: TOR, data collection report - field visits, people interviewed (names not to be mentioned), documents reviewed, etc.

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation team will consist of three members: one Evaluation Team Leader and two Evaluations Specialists.

8.1 Evaluation Team Leader (one position, 40 working days)

Roles and responsibilities: responsible for overall coordination of the evaluation team, and for the overall quality and timely submission of the evaluation report to UNDP. Specifically, the Evaluation Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

- Serve as the focal point of the evaluation in liaising with UNDP evaluation manager
- Lead and manage the evaluation mission
- Prepare, finalize, and lead the presentation of the inception report
- Decide the division of tasks and responsibilities within the evaluation team
- Draft and present the evaluation report and evaluation findings
- Finalize the whole evaluation report and submit it to UNDP

Competency requirements

- Advanced university degree in relevant disciplines (e.g., political sciences, public administration, public policy, laws, etc.)
- At least 15 years of international working experience in the field of governance (national and/or sub-national governance), including in post crisis environments
- At least seven years of experience in programme evaluation and proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably including UNDP
- Experience in conducting at least seven evaluations in related fields and with international organizations, at least two of which as the team leader
- Deep knowledge of the political, cultural, and economic contexts of Afghanistan including prior working experience in the country
- Good analytical and strategic thinking skills
- Excellent inter-personal, communication, and teamwork skills

³ For more details, please refer to Annex 7 of UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development Results (2009)

- Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Ability to meet tight deadlines
- Fluency in English language is required. Knowledge of local language i.e. Pashto and Dari is preferable but not required.

8.2 Evaluation Specialists (2 positions, 30 working days each)

Roles and responsibilities:

- Contribute to the development of the Inception Report and the design of the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods of data collection and analysis)
- Perform evaluation-related roles and activities as agreed with the Evaluation Team Leader and as outlined in the Inception Report
- Contribute to the preparation of the draft and finalized evaluation reports including participating in the presentations of findings

Competency requirements:

- Advanced university degree in relevant disciplines (e.g., political sciences, public administration, public policy, laws, etc.)
- At least ten years of international working experience related to capacity development in the areas of governance, including in post-crisis environments
- Experience in conducting at least five evaluations in the field related to this evaluation and with international organizations, preferably including UNDP
- Proven knowledge of evaluation methods
- Excellent analytical and English report writing skills
- Deep knowledge of the political, cultural, and economic contexts of Afghanistan including prior working experience in the country
- Excellent inter-personal, communication, and teamwork skills
- Ability to meet tight deadlines

The evaluators must be independent and objective; therefore, they should not have any prior involvement in the design, implementation, decision-making or financing any of the UNDP interventions contributing to this outcome.

9. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluations in the UN will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in both Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and by the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. These documents will be attached to the contract. Evaluators are required to read the Norms and Standards and the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence to it, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

This evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Afghanistan. To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, a UNDP evaluation manager will be assigned to oversee the overall evaluation process and provide the evaluation team

with any logistics and administrative support as needed. An evaluation reference group will be formed to provide critical and objective inputs throughout the evaluation process to strengthen the quality of the evaluation. It is planned that the members of the reference group will be invited from the Country Office, Evaluation Office, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific, the Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery, and the Asia-Pacific Regional Centre. The members will be asked to provide inputs on the TOR, selection of the consultant, inception report, draft report, and the final report.

11. TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation is to be conducted between August-November, based on the following milestones:

Submission and presentation of the draft Inception Report	10 days after contract signed
Submission of the final Inception Report	3 days after receiving feedback from UNDP
Presentation of the initial findings from data collection	2 days after the data collection mission ends
Submission of the zero draft of the evaluation report	10 days after the data collection mission ends
Submission and presentation of the first draft of the evaluation report	5 days after receiving feedback from UNDP
Submission of the final report and evaluation brief	5 days after receiving feedback from UNDP

Annex A:

The Inception Report should at the minimum, include the following components:

Evaluation purpose and scope—A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

Evaluation criteria and questions—The criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale.

Evaluation methodology—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.

Evaluation matrix—This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered by the methods selected

Sample Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Method for Data Analysis

A schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities.

Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the work plan.