**Terms of Reference for Terminal Evaluation**

**“Promoting Social Equality in the Gobi-Areas of South Mongolia**

**by Fostering Human Security with Integrated and Prevention Approaches”**

 **UN Joint Programme (JP)**

**Duty Station**: Ulaanbaatar and Project Target soums

**Duration**: 28 working days in total within 6 weeks starting from the 26th August 2013

1. **INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the UN policies and procedures and UNTFHS project implementation guidelines, a terminal evaluation of the UN Joint Programme “Promoting Social Equality in the Gobi-Areas of South Mongolia by Fostering Human Security with Integrated and Prevention Approaches”, short title “UN Joint Programme on Water and Sanitation (JP) in Mongolia “ is to be undertaken in 2013. The JP started in August 2010 and is in its final year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this terminal evaluation of JP.

The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

**Project Title**: UN Joint Programme

**Project ID**: UDP-AS-09-079

**Country**: Mongolia

**Region**: Central Asia

**Focal Area**: Human Security through Education, Health, Livelihood,

Water Supply and Sanitation

**Executing Agencies**: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),

United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF),

World Health Organization (WHO) and,

United Nations Population’s Fund (UNFPA)

**Counterpart Organizations:** Ministry of Environment and Green Development (MEGD),

Ministry of Construction and Urban Development (MCUD),

Ministry of Education and Science (MES),

Ministry of Health (MoH) and,

Ministry of Industry and Agriculture (MIA)

**Approval Date** : 31 May 2010

**Project End Date**: 30 November 2013

**Management Arrangement:** National Execution

**Donor:** United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS)

**Budget:**

 **Grand Total: USD 2,703,679.21**

 UNDP: USD 835,102.90

 UNICEF: USD 716,186.31

 WHO: USD 338,227.00

 UNFPA: USD 341,758.00

 UNDP (ALP): USD 472,405.00

**Project Sites**: Tsogt-Ovoo and Bulgan soums of Umnugovi aimag;

Bayangovi and Shinejinst soums of Bayankhongor aimag, and;

Bayan-Uul and Tugrug soums of Govi-Altai aimag

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES**

Mongolia has been affected by climate change, accelerating the environmental challenges including water scarcity in general, specifically in the southern part of the country in addition to the serious situation of poverty and other social and economic problems. It is widely recognized that poverty in Mongolia is more than income-based. It is a compound result stemming from a combination of a lack of income opportunities, education, poor or intermittent access to water and health services, food insecurity, and social vulnerability. A limited access to and lack of adequate water supply and sanitation facilities, heating system, inappropriate solid waste and waste water management, result in a poor living and hygienic conditions in rural settlements – soum centres, their boarding schools and health facilities in many parts of the country, particularly in the remote provinces including South Mongolia. At present, the diarrheal diseases caused by a poor quality of drinking water, sanitation and hygiene practices still remain the main concern of the public health sector in Mongolia. The burden of disease and growth retardation associate with unsafe water and poor hygiene in the rural areas is significant. The latest research suggests that the areas affected by desertification are already 87.9% of the country’s territory, causing low productivity of pastureland (decreased pastureland biomass), upon which the livelihood of significant portion of the rural population directly depends and potentially leading to lifestyle change in a longer term perspective, if not timely taken actions to halter the trend. Impacted by these challenges, the current state of MDG1 and MDG7 are far behind the targets. While people recognize that such changes in natural and ecological zones, permafrost, grassland yields, vegetation species, soil fertilization caused by climate change are worsened in future, there is no systematic adaptation strategy to deal with climate change related problems and to meet the country’s sustainable development goals.

Taking into account the future impact of climate change on socio-economic situation, a holistic and multi-sectoral intervention, including both upgrading social services and providing adaptation approach to climate change effects, is recognized as the best way to enhance the people’s overall security not only in the short and medium, but also longer terms. In order to respond to the needs of men and women on the ground, the joint programme aims at addressing the causes of deteriorating social services for the most neglected populations who also face the acute impact of climate change in Mongolia, emphasizing the importance on the access to safe drinking water sources, child-friendly education, adequate and prevention-oriented healthcare facilities, and economic opportunities.

The UNTFHS was established in March 1999. Through its support to over 205 projects in 85 countries, including regional projects, the UNTFHS has played an important role in translating the human security approach into practical actions that have helped strengthen the human security of the most vulnerable communities and people around the world.

One of the UNTFHS funded projects in Mongolia is called UN Joint Programme (JP) on Water and Sanitation. The implementation of the JP has started in August 2010 and will end in November 2013.The **human security goal** of the JP is to alleviate social inequality of most neglected and vulnerable populations affected by both serious poverty and climate change in South Mongolia (the Gobi-areas), in order to enhance their human security with integrated, multisectoral and prevention measures.

Several UN agencies including UNDP, UNICEF, WHO and UNFPA (Participating Agencies) are joining their efforts in supporting the Government of Mongolia (GoM) to achieve MDG Targets to improve access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. JP covers interest areas of poverty, climate change and socio-economic development with **5 objectives (18 outputs, s. Annex I) for the population of vulnerable communities in Gobi** including

1. access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation;
2. quality improvement of education;
3. access to strengthened primary health care service;
4. income generating activities, and;
5. promotion of the Human Security approach.

JP is a pilot initiative with people-centered, gender-responsive, comprehensive, context-specific and area-based emphasis. The project provides concrete and sustainable benefits to specific target communities threatened by scarcity of water, lack of basic social services, and economic opportunities.

A collaboration of diverse agencies through JP will enable a better coverage of problems that are strongly interrelated, thus contributing to the enhancement of human security for the target communities, as well as to the achievement of MDGs.

The terminal evaluation will be conducted by the team of consultants consisted of International (Team Leader) and National experts. The consultants are advised to propose and design their evaluation in close consultation with respective Programme Officers of the Agencies.

1. **OBJECTYIVES OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION**

The main objective of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to assess the progress and achievements against the project’s logical framework.

The evaluation will analyze and rate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project results and overall performance using the following scale:

1 – Excellent 2 – Good 3 – Satisfactory 4 – Unsatisfactory 5 – Not applicable 6 – Insufficient information

The evaluation will identify overall project management main findings and key lessons including examples of best practices for future projects in the country, region and UN agencies and UNTFHS. The results of the evaluation will be reviewed by the UNTFHS.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by the TE will be presented to the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and the GoM at the end of the JP for validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability in contribution of JP to the Mongolian MDGs and major development frameworks, such as the UNDAF and Regional Development Strategy.

The TE has the following specific objectives:

* To assess the extent the JP has contributed to solving the needs and problems identified in the feasibility study and/or baseline survey;
* To ascertain the degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised;
* To measure to what extent the JPWS has attained development results for the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants including individuals, communities and institutions using the logical framework;
* To assess the joint project contribution to the objectives set in the Comprehensive National Development Strategy based on Education, Health, Livelihood, Water Supply and Sanitation MDG at national and local levels, and;
* To identify lessons learned and good practices as a result of the JP implementation within the various programme components with the aim to support the sustainability of the JP or some of its components.
	1. **Scope, Levels of Analysis and Evaluation Criteria**

The TE shall focus on assessing results and impacts generated by the JP, based on the scope and criteria included in the terms of reference. The TE will be guided by a set of questions grouped according to the evaluation criteria. These criteria are grouped according to the three levels of the JP.

1. **Design Level:**

***Relevance:*** The extent to which, the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the population or communities and the need of the country.

1. How much and in what ways did the JP contributed to solving the socio-economic needs and problems identified in the design phase?
2. To what extent the JP was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly?
3. To what extent the JP was the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the Project Document?
4. Did the JP stakeholders and target groups find the project activities useful?
5. To what extent the implementing partners participating in the JP had an added value to solve the development challenges in the Project Document?
6. Is there synergy or complementary between the JP interventions and that of other development partners?
7. To what extent did the JP have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measuring development results?
8. To what extent have the participating UN agencies contributed to raising the quality of the design of the JP?
9. To what extent participating UN agencies have acted within the framework of joint programming?
10. If the JP was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed?
11. How people-centered and gender-responsive approach is ensured in the design of JP?"
12. Compare the socio-economic situation and enabling environment in the design phase with the implementation phase. To what extent did this situation impact the results? What lessons did we learn from this?
13. **Process Level:**

***Efficiency:*** Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc) have been turned into results

1. To what extent was the JP management model (i.e., instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision making in management) efficient in comparison to the outputs delivered?
2. To what extent was the implementation of the JP intervention (group of agencies) more efficient (or less efficient) in comparison to what could have been achieved through a single agency’s intervention?
3. To what extent the governance of the JP at the national and local levels contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the JP? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
4. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
5. What type of obstacles (administrative, financial, technical and managerial) did the JPWS face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?

***Ownership in the process:*** Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s national/local partners in development interventions

1. To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities make the JP their own, taking an active role in it? What models of participation have driven the process?
2. To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of the JP?
3. **Result Level:**

**Effectiveness:** The extent which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

1. To what extent did the JP contribute to the attainment of outputs and outcomes initially expected in the Project Document?
2. To what extent were the JP outputs and outcomes synergetic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
3. To what extent did the JP have an impact on the targeted population?
4. Do the products created live up to the necessary quality?
5. What was intervention coverage? Were the planned geographic area and target group successfully reached?
6. What were constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results?
7. In what way has the JP come up with innovative measures for problem solving?
8. What good practices or successful experiences of transferable examples have been identified? Please describe and document them.
9. To what extent has the JP contributed to the achievement of national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Policies, UNDAF, MGDs, etc)?
10. To what extent did the JP help to increase stakeholder dialogue and/or engagement on development issues and policies?
11. To what extent people-centered and gender-responsive approach was achieved and what difference did it make? Any good practice?

**Sustainability:** Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term

1. Was the JP supported by national and/or local institutions?
2. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the JP and to repeat it?
3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced among national partners?
4. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the JP?
5. To what extent the JP decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decision and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the JP?
6. Are stakeholders ready to continue supporting or carrying out specific JP activities?
7. Did stakeholders replicate the activities in other regions or sectors of the country?
8. Did stakeholders adapt JP results in other contexts?
9. To what extent will the JP be replicated or scaled up at national or local levels?
10. Did the JPWS design take into account strategies to ensure sustainability? Were strategies used in from the beginning of JP implementation? Was there an adequate strategy for capacity building?
11. **METHODOLOGY**

For the TE, methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR will be used as of the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as annual progress reports, project documents, project files, mission reports, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements.

Consultants are also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and qualitative tools as means to collect data for the TE. The evaluation team will make sure that the voices, opinions, and information of targeted citizens and participants of the JP are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the TE should be agreed upon with UNDP and other stakeholders and clearly outlined and described in detail in the terminal evaluation report, and contain at the minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

1. **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The consultant team is expected to deliver the following deliverables to the chair of the JP Coordination for further review and comments by the government and UN partner agencies (UNDP/NPC):

* ***Inception Report***, one week prior to the evaluation mission in order to clarify and get endorsement of the timing and evaluation methodologies.
* ***Draft Final Report*** by 01 September (to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visits). The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report and will be no more than 50 pages in length. It will be written both in English and Mongolian and will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the JP, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations.
* ***Terminal Evaluation Final Report*** by 27 September(to be submitted within 7 days after receipt of the draft final report with comments). The final report will be no more than 50 pages in length. It will be written both in English and Mongolian and contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the JP, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations.
1. **DURATION**

The international consultant is expected to work intermittently between August and October2013, which involves three weeks mission (Ulaanbaatar and field visits) and three weeks desk work. It is expected that the evaluation team will conduct field visits to selected 3 JP target soums of 3 aimags. The Programme Officers and the PIU staff will accompany the field visit to facilitate the consultants.

Duration of the assignment is 6 weeks. Proposed time allocations are below.

* + 1. **Preparation** and inception report including mission plan, evaluation methodologies, outline of the report:

26-30 August 2013 (5 working days)

* + 1. **Evaluation Mission and Debriefing**:

Within 02-18 September 2013 (15 working days)

* + 1. **Draft Evaluation Report and Submission**:

Within 16-23 September 2013 (5 working days, 2 days overlapping with the mission )

* + 1. **Finalization of the Final Report**

30 September - 04 October 2013 (5 working days)

1. **Payment Modality and Schedule**

The UNDP standard method of payment is output-based lump-sum scheme and the payment will be made in two installments upon satisfactory completion of the following deliverables:

***Details of Payment and Schedule***

**The 1st Installment:**

50% of the total contracted amount upon the approval/clearance of the **Draft Final Report, b*y last week of September 2013***

**The 2nd Installment:**

50% of the total contracted amount upon approval/clearance of the **completion of all services, including clearance of the Final Report, b*y second week of October 2013***

1. **Qualifications and Experiences:**
	1. **General**

Evaluators must be independent, not have been engaged in the activities to be evaluated, or responsible in decision making roles for the design, implementation or supervision of the JP.

The evaluation team should comprise of one International Expert (Team Leader) and one National Expert with strong evaluation experience, with requisite expertise in the subject matter of the project, and with expertise in economic and social development issues.

* 1. **Education**

Post graduate degree (preferably Ph.D. or D.Phil.) in economics, natural resource management, water supply and sanitation, health, education, livelihood, human security or related fields;

* 1. **Experience**

At least 10 years of work experience in respective expertise areas; Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; in applying participatory monitoring approaches; and SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;

Experience in evaluation of similar projects/programmes and cold climate countries will be an asset;

* 1. **Skills/knowledge**

Demonstrated experience and ability to reliably contribute to output- and outcome-based evaluations; Strong analytical and writing skills with proven record in M&E, advocacy, policy recommendations and problem identification and solving;

* 1. **Competencies**

Familiarity with project management operations and procedures of various donor agencies and/or multi-lateral institutions and United Nations, M&E procedures and UNTFHS guidelines preferred; Ability to accommodate additional demands on short notice;

* 1. **Language**

Excellent ability to work in English, effective oral and written communication skills

1. **Application Procedure:**

All applications including [P11 form](http://www.undptkm.org/files/vacancy/p11.doc), CV, technical and financial proposals should be directly posted on [www.jobs.undp.org](http://www.jobs.undp.org). This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it till 6:00p.m. of 15 July 2013. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. For further information please contact via bids.mn@undp.org.

Please note that ONLY one file can be uploaded in the system, so that all required supporting documents should be in one file.

* Recommended Presentation of Proposal: Introduction about the consultant/achievement based detailed CV; Proposed methodology and workplan (max 1 page); Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other international travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc). Please kindly note that the standard for all travel authorized by UNDP for individual subscribers is economy class.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal**: The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

**ANNEX I**

**SUMMARY OF JOINT PROGRAMME FOR EVALUATION**

**Title:** Promoting Social Equality in the Gobi-Areas of South Mongolia by Fostering Human Security with Integrated and Prevention Approaches

**Funded by:** UNTFHS

**Duration:** 2010-2013 (3 years)

**JP Goal**: The human security goal of this project is ***to alleviate social inequality of most neglected and vulnerable populations affected by both serious poverty and climate change in South Mongolia (the Gobi-areas), in order to enhance their human security with integrated, multisectoral and prevention measures.***

The project has five specific objectives, with each having “top-down” projection and “bottom-up” empowerment component.

Objectives and Outputs

Objective 1: To increase the access to safe drinking water among the vulnerable community members severely affected by climate change, and build qualitative capacity of both local government and service providers in 6 pilot soums of the target Provinces (UNDP)

**Expected Outputs:**

1.1 Up to 80 percent of households in the target area have access to improved water sources and sanitation facilities.

1.2 At least one CBO in each soum established and its operation become sustainable to manage drinking water source, public bathhouse and solid waste collection.

1.3 A policy and regulatory framework developed and piloted with a specific focus on rural Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) as climate change adaptation measures.

**Objective 2**: To improve the quality of formal education through providing rights-based, child- friendly schools that are inclusive, environmental friendly, gender-sensitive, healthy, safe for and protective of the target children, involving their families and communities **(UNICEF)**

Expected Outputs:

2.1 All the six target schools will be developed as model child-friendly schools in their soums that promote child-friendly schools features especially health and safety.

2.2 80 percent of school children in the target areas will have access to improved water and sanitation facilities

2.3 90 percent of school children in the target areas will practice proper behaviors focusing on environment protection and hygiene.

2.4 Water and sanitation data will be integrated in the education M&E system and cost-analysis managed by the MECS and Water Agency.

**Objective 3**: To enhance the access and quality of people-centered primary health care (PHC) with gender-sensitive consideration, by reducing exclusion and integrating health into other multisectoral perspectives including climate change, gender and human rights **(WHO and UNFPA)**

**Expected Outputs:**

3.1 At least 6 workshops organized for PHC needs for the population living in all 6 selected soums to be clearly defined with full participation of the local governments, PHC teams and communities and utilized in planning, implementing and evaluating the people-centered services.

3.2 6 pilot soum health facilities improved with equal access to safe water, sanitation and health care waste disposal facilities in place as models for communities.

3.3 80 percent of all populations in 3 Provinces, including infants, women of childbearing age, adolescents, elderly and minority groups, covered in a newly developed integrated essential package of key health interventions for PHC.

3.4 Stakeholders (at least 120 health workers in 6 PHC teams, 12 women’s groups, 30 soums community leaders, government officials, other donors) participated in the workshops and training programmes on PHC planning & evaluation, gender mainstreaming & human rights issues, and information sharing to strengthen coordination and integrate all efforts.

3.5 6 workshops organized in 6 target soums to increase knowledge, awareness and preparedness on the effects of climate change on health among communities;

**Objective 4:** To provide the target communities with income generation opportunities through community-based organizations, in order to empower their economic security and sustain their livelihood **(UNDP)**

**Expected Outputs:**

* 1. Specific technical and organizational needs of up to 18 selected existing business groups, such as cooperatives, producers’ groups and/or community enterprises and organizations, are identified.
	2. All of 18 selected existing business groups sustain their businesses in active operation with technical and organizational support from the project.
	3. At least 12 new business groups/community enterprises with approx 100 new job opportunities are established through vocational and entrepreneurship training for youth and unemployed community members in the target sites.
	4. At least 50% of the business groups receive microfinance from formal financial institutions with the support/facilitation from the project.

**Objective 5**: To share the lessons-learnt from this pilot initiative using the human security approach to wider audience of both national and regional stakeholders in Mongolia (**Joint UN Initiative: UNDP (lead), UNICEF, WHO and UNFPA)**

**Expected Outputs:**

5.1 The concept of human security is widely understood to both central/local governments and community populations while implementing the pilot initiative

5.2 Discussion over the importance of concept and its successful implementation in the fields is widely recognized through public forum and other events