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| Terms of Reference | **United Nations Development Programme** | bundp170mm |

### Title: Evaluators(Outcome evaluation) – International and National

Programme: Country Programme Document (2011-2015)

Reporting to: Deputy Resident Representative

**Duty Station: Belgrade, Serbia**

**Duration: 19 October 2014– 31 January 2015 (app. 40 working days within this period)**

**Contract Type: Individual Contract (IC) – for free lance consultant or Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) - if the consultant is working with institution or government or university - (output based consultancy)**

**Background**

|  |
| --- |
| a. **Purpose**  To assess UNDP contributions towards the progress made on **Good Governance** outcome achievements  b. **Objective**  To enhance development effectiveness, to assist decision making, to assist policy making, to re-direct future UNDP assistance, to systematize innovative approaches to sustainable human development  c. **Background Information**  The current Country Programme Document (CPD) for the Republic of Serbia (2011-2015), addresses priorities identified in the main developmental strategies of the Republic of Serbia at the time (e.g. National Plan for Integration, the National Sustainable Development Strategy) and is fully aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011-2015.  The CPD covers three core areas: sustainable and inclusive development; accountability and governance; and, energy and environment. All three areas promote capacity development among governmental and non-governmental counterparts, and mainstream human rights and gender.  UNDP in Serbia is looking for evaluators who will assess UNDP’s contributions towards the progress made on **Good Governance Strengthened** outcome achievements, in order to:   * Provide evidence to support accountability of programmes and for UNDP to use in its accountability requirements to its partners * Provide evidence of the UNDP contribution to outcome * Guide performance improvements * Collect lessons learned for the next programming cycle |

**Duties and Responsibilities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Scope** **of** **work**   UNDP Serbia invites applications from qualified consultants in order to perform the evaluation of **Good Governance** **Strengthened** outcome with corresponding outputs related to **parliamentary development, anti-corruption, human rights, EU integration, public finance, disaster risk reduction and security system reform**, as defined in the CPD 2011-2015.  The evaluation should assess the extent to which programmes, project, soft assistance, partners’ initiatives and synergies among partners contributed to its achievement.  To help focus evaluation objectives, the following evaluation criteria will apply: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of development efforts.  The evaluation should assess what works and why, highlight intended and unintended results, and provide strategic lessons to guide decision-makers and inform stakeholders.  Two evaluators (one international and one national) will jointly perform the evaluation.  International evaluator will be responsible for the overall quality of the report and will assess efficiency, sustainability and impact that UNDP interventions had on Good Governance outcome.  International Evaluator will:   * Prepare inception report with evaluation matrix\* * Focus on the general evaluation criteria and * Prepare the Final Report\*\* with the Executive Summary   National evaluator will be responsible for assessing the relevance and effectiveness and to provide respective written inputs for the report.  National Evaluator will:   * Contribute to the preparation of the inception report * Support organization of interviews with key stakeholders * Focus on the analysis of Serbia’s development context during last five years in the governance area * Incorporate received beneficiary satisfaction feedback into the Final Report   The Evaluators will review, analyze and provide conclusions and recommendations on the following:   * Was the outcome achieved or not * What progress toward the outcome has been made * Estimate the degree of UNDP’s contribution to that progress * What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the outcome * The degree to which the projectswithin governance portfolio have been successfully implemented during last five years and desired outputs achieved * What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness * Assessment of external factors affecting the UNDP’s work in governance area, and the extent to which the UNDP has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors * Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? * The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from UNDP activities * The level of beneficiaries’ and partners satisfaction with respective UNDP’s work and results * The potential for continuation or up scaling of UNDP’s work in respective area within the new Country Programme cycle  1. **Methodology**   The evaluation approach has to respond to standard international practices in outcome evaluations. The proposed steps in conducting the evaluation are:   * Review of projects’ documentation, monitoring records and progress and other relevant output and outcome reports * Initial meeting with UNDP Programme Team to agree the specific design and methods for the evaluation, what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. Agree on the evaluation questions that will need to be answered, given limitations (e.g. data) * Organization of interviews with key staff involved in the project implementation * Prepare inception report with evaluation matrix\* * Discussions with members of the Programme Team and beneficiaries of UNDP interventions to assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of development efforts, take note of beneficiaries’ perceptions of accomplishments and potentials for further development and provide suggestions for management response to evaluation findings. Objectively verifiable data should be collected whenever available, to supplement evidences obtained through interviews and focus group discussions * Prepare Draft Report and present it to the Programme Team, Government counterpart(s) and beneficiaries * Incorporate received feedback into the Final Report * Prepare the Final Report\*\* with the Executive Summary   A following set of information sources about the project will be made available to Evaluators:   * Project documents:  |  | | --- | | * 1. Enhancing anti-corruption efforts in Serbia   2. Youth Sleuth: Engaging Serbia’s Youth to Fight Corruption through Investigative Journalism and Social Media | | * 1. Strengthening Accountability of Public Finance (PUBFIN)   2. Advancing Accountability of Public Finance (PUBFIN2)   3. Finance Sector Policy Coordination Framework | | * 1. Strengthening Accountability of Serbian Parliament   2. Strengthening Oversight Function and Transparency of Parliament   3. Promoting Human Rights and Access to Justice for Social Inclusion and Legal Improvement   4. Communicating EU in Serbia   5. Disaster Risk Reduction Capacity Development   6. Kraljevo earthquake response   7. Strengthening of Regional Cooperation on Gender Mainstreaming in Security Sector Reform in the Western Balkans (WinMil)   8. Women Police Officers Network in South East Europe (WPON) |  * Annual reports * Progress reports * Media reports * Project evaluations * Key documents (strategies, policy papers, monitoring reports, surveys etc.) produced by the UNDP in Serbia   \* Inception report and evaluation matrix formats will be provided at the mission's outset (Annexes III and IV of this ToR)  \*\* The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports (Annex I constitutes integral part of this ToR) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Deliverables** **and** **Timeline**   It is expected that the evaluation will be completed within 40 working days, with the following deliverables due:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Deliverables** | **Duration** | **Deadline** | | Inception report including work plan and evaluation matrix prepared and accepted | 10 days | 10 days upon signing the contract | | Draft Evaluation Report on approximately 30 pages prepared and accepted | 20 days | Early January | | Draft Evaluation Report presented to the Programme Team, Government counterpart(s) and beneficiaries | 1 day | Mid January | | Final Evaluation report (30 pages) with Executive Summary (2 pages) prepared and accepted | 9 days | 3 days upon receiving comments from UNDP on the draft report |   Evaluators are expected to visits two municipalities nearby Belgrade  Travel costs (transport, accommodation and living costs) will be reimbursed to the consultant on a lump-sum basis.  Payments for the deliverables will be made in up to three installments (inception report, draft report, final report), upon billing by the consultant and subject to quality review, clearance and acceptance by UNDP Deputy Resident Representative.  The criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:   * The report has to be written in clear language (English) * The Executive Summary should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. * The information in the report has to be complete, well structured and well presented * The information in the report has to be reliable i.e. well documented and supported findings * The information in the report has to addresses priority or strategic information needs * Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable * Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account   The evaluation has to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](http://www.uneval.org/). Code of conduct is enclosed as Annex II and constitutes integral part of this ToR. |

**Skills and Competencies**

|  |
| --- |
| * Excellent analytical skills * Displays ability to synthesize research and reach empirically based conclusions on related subject * Strong writing skills * Proven capacity to produce reports * Displays capacity to provide experienced advice on best practices * Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues * Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback * Good application of Results-Based Management * Good communication, coordination and facilitation skills * Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of work * Treats all people fairly without favourism * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability * Demonstrates integrity by modeling ethical standards |

**Qualifications and Experience**

|  |
| --- |
| *Education:*  Masters or equivalent in relevant field of Law, Political and Social Sciences, Economy or similar  *Work experience:*   * Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience, preferably in international/multilateral development context * Experience in evaluating and monitoring technical cooperation and development activities and projects   *Knowledge*   * Excellent understanding of Serbia's socio-economic situation and developmental challenges * Understanding of main policies, legislation and institutions * Familiarity with the EU accession process * Familiarity with the UN(DP) evaluation policy, norms and standards * Knowledge in the use of computers and office software packages and handling of web based monitoring systems   *Personal qualifications*   * Ability to organize and motivate team, deliver when working under pressure and within changing circumstances * Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude * Excellent interpersonal skills   *Language:*  Excellent knowledge of written and spoken of English and Serbian (for national evaluator only) |

**Application Procedure:**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:

(i) Cover Letter – Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work;

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on the approach to the work and how it will be conducted (max. 300 words);

2. Financial proposal;

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar evaluations and at least 3 references.

**The above information should be included in the following documents:**

* Offeror’s Letter to UNDP confirming Interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment. Document can be downloaded from the following: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx> (only PDF will be accepted).
* Updated and signed P11, in PDF format, containing e-mail contacts of three referees (section 26 & 29). P11 can be downloaded from the following: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/P11.doc>.

**Additional Information:**

* Individual Contract (IC) will be applicable for individual consultants applying in their own capacity.  If the applicant is employed by any legal entity, IC would be issued upon submission of Consent letter from the employer acknowledging the engagement with UNDP.Template of General Conditions on IC could be found on: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx>
* Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) will be applicable for applicants employed by any legal entity. Template of RLA with General Terms and Conditions could be found on: [http://www.undp.org.rs/download/RLA%20with%20General%20Terms%20and%20Conditions.doc.](http://www.undp.org.rs/download/RLA%20with%20General%20Terms%20and%20Conditions.doc) In the case of engagement of Civil servants under IC contract modality a no-objection letter should be provided by the Government entity. The ‘no-objection’ letter must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status (if applicable), and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. If the previous is not applicable ‘leave-without-pay’ confirmation should be submitted.

**Engagement of Government Officials and Employees**

* Government Officials or Employees are civil servants of UN Member States.  As such, if they will be engaged by UNDP under an IC which they will be signing in their individual capacity (i.e., engagement is not done through RLA signed by their Government employer), the following conditions must be met prior to the award of contract:

(i)       A “No-objection” letter in respect of the individual is received from the Government employing him/her, and;

(ii)     The individual must provide an official documentation from his/her employer formally certifying his or her status as being on “official leave without pay” for the duration of the IC.

* The above requirements are also applicable to Government-owned and controlled enterprises and well as other semi/partially or fully owned Government entities, whether or not the Government ownership is of majority or minority status.

UNDP recognizes the possibility that there are situations when the Government entity employing the individual that UNDP wishes to engage is one that allows its employees to receive external short-term consultancy assignments (including but not limited to research institutions, state-owned colleges/universities, etc.), whereby a status of “on-leave-without-pay” is not required.  Under such circumstance, the individual entering into an IC with UNDP must still provide a “No-objection” letter from the Government employing him/her.  The “no objection” letter required under (i) above must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status, and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any.  The said document may be obtained by, and put on record of, UNDP, in lieu of the document (ii) listed above.

**ANNEX I**

**(Integral part of ToR)**

**Evaluation Report**

**Purpose/Description of the Evaluation Report:**

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programmes, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

**Format:**

**The Evaluation Report should contain the following:**

* Title Page
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of contents, including list of annexes
* Executive Summary
* Introduction: background and context of the programme
* Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
* Approach and methodology
* Findings
* Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons, generalizations, alternatives
* Annexes

**Quality Criteria:**

A good evaluation report must be guided by the criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness as defined below.

**Utility:**  An evaluation report is useful when the report is:

* + - Complete in providing information on the context for the evaluation to allow reader to decide on the value it will derive from the evaluation (i.e evaluability assessment, stakeholder involvement, evaluator or institutional credibility, alignment of evaluators with national institutions, bases for interpretation, budget, timing, national involvement and alignment).
    - The presentation of the evaluation process and findings are complete and well structured to provide ease in accessing information needed for decision-making and for assessing how justified conclusions are based on the linkages among the parts of the report.
    - The recommendations are clear and actionable.
    - Information on expected plans for follow-through with the evaluation by key stakeholders is provided.

**Credibility:** An evaluation report is credible when there is professional rigor for objectivity, validity and reliability of the procedures and instruments used.

* Evaluators are competent professionals and valid in the eyes of the users/stakeholders.
* There is accuracy and validity (programme content and contextual factors, instruments, information coverage/sampling, external validity or linkage with other development findings).
* There is reliability or consistency in the information provided.
* The bases for making judgments are transparent and based on negotiated agreements.

**Relevance, appropriateness and added-value:** A report is relevant, appropriate and adds value when information provided addresses priority or strategic information needs, is not duplicative, and is appropriate given institutional goals. The conduct of evaluation is aligned with national systems.

* The purpose and incentives for use are clear.
* There is alignment with national and government demands, harmonization and coherence within UN and organizational lens: human development and human rights.
* Addresses organizational mandate and the Strategic Plan priorities.
* Advances knowledge or priorities for development (equity, capacity, cooperation and others).

***The following provides for each criterion, performance indicators which would provide the basis for assessing report quality in an objective and reliable manner.***

**1. Utility – Enhancing use and impact of information provided**

* 1. *The title page and opening pages provide key basic contextual information*
* Title of the evaluation that includes a clear reference to the project / programme being evaluated.
* Links to the evaluation plan (with information on strategic value, national involvement and alignment, timing, resources and financing).
* Links to UNDAF outcomes and the Strategic Plan priorities.
* Geographical coverage of the evaluation.
* Name and organization of the evaluators and information in annex for assessment of competence and trustworthiness.
* Name of the commissioning organization (e.g. UNDP country office X).
* Date when the evaluation report is completed.
* Expected actions from the evaluation and dates for action.
* Dates for stakeholder meetings and status of meetings.
* Name of UNDP contact point for the evaluation (e.g. evaluation task manager).

*1.2 For a joint evaluation or for the evaluation of a joint programme, the roles and contributions of the different UN organizations or other partners, are clearly described. The report should describe who is involved, their roles and their contributions to the subject being evaluated, including:*

* Financial and in-kind contributions such as technical assistance, training and logistic support.
* Participation and staff time.
* Leadership, advocacy and lobbying.

*1.3 For a country-led joint evaluation, the framework for the leadership, governance, conduct, use and capacity development are clearly described, and norms and standards for the evaluation are delineated if necessary.*

*1.4 The information in the report is complete, well structured and well presented. The report should provide information on:*

* The purpose of the evaluation.
* Exactly what was evaluated.
* How the evaluation was designed and conducted.
* What evidence was used in the evaluation.
* What conclusions were drawn.
* What recommendations were made.
* What lessons were distilled.

*1.5 The report should be clear and easy to read with complementary graphics to enhance understanding:*

* The report should apply a plain, non-specialist language.
* Graphics, tables and illustrations should be used, when applicable, to enhance the presentation of information.
* The report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
* In the case of an outcome evaluation, the related projects should be listed in the annex, including timelines, implementation arrangements and budgets.

*1.6 The executive summary of the report should be brief (maximum 2-3 pages) and contains key information needed by decision-makers. It should contain:*

* Brief description of the programme.
* Evaluation purpose, questions and scope of evaluation.
* Key findings.
* Conclusions.
* Key recommendations.

The executive summary should not include information that is not mentioned and substantiated in the main report.

*1.7 The recommendations are relevant and realistic, with clear priorities for action.*

* Recommendations should emerge logically from the evaluation’s findings and conclusions.
* Recommendations should be relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and decisions to be made based on the evaluation.
* Recommendation should be formulated in a clear and concise manner and be prioritized to the extent possible.

1. Credibility - accuracy, reliability, and objectivity
   1. *The subject or programme being evaluated is clearly and accurately described.*

* The goals and objectives of the programme/project/subject are clearly described and the performance indicators presented.
* The conceptual linkages or logic theory among programme/project strategy, the outputs and the outcomes should be described, explaining their relation to national priorities and goals.
* The context in which the programme/project existed is described so its likely influences in the program can be identified.
* The level of implementation of the programme/project and major divergences between the original implementation plan or approach should be described and explained.
* The recipient /intended beneficiaries, the stake holders, the cost and the financing of the programmes/projects should be described.
  1. *The report provides a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation.*
* The objectives, scope and coverage of the evaluation should be explicit and its limitations should also be acknowledged.
* The original evaluation questions from the TORs should be made explicit as well as those that were added subsequently or during the evaluation and their rationale provided.
* The results of an evaluability assessment are noted for its effects on defining the scope of the evaluation. Evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process[[1]](#footnote-1).*
  1. *The methodology is fully described for its role in ensuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation.*

Any description of the methodology should include the following in addressing the questions of the evaluation:

* The universe of data needed to answer the questions and the sources of this data.
* The sampling procedure applied to ensure representativeness in collecting information from these sources (area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sampling).
* Procedures applied (including triangulation) to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected.
* Bases for making judgements and interpretation of the findings including performance indicators or levels of statistical significance as warranted by available data.
* Description of procedures for quantitative and qualitative analyses.
* Innovations in methodological approach and added value to development evaluation.
* How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
* How a human development and human rights perspective provided a lens for the evaluation and influenced the scope of the evaluation.
  1. *The findings of the evaluation address the following in response to the key questions of the evaluation.*
* Cost efficiency and relevance.
* UNDP partnership strategy and the extent to which it contributed to greater effectiveness.
* External factors influencing progress towards the outcome.
* UNDP contribution to capacity development and institutional strengthening.

*2.5 Conclusions are firmly based on evidence and analysis.*

* Conclusions are the judgement made by the evaluators. They should not repeat the findings but address the key issues that can be abstracted from them.
* Conclusions are made based on an agreed basis for making judgments of value or worth relative to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability.
* Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the subject being evaluated, determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.
  1. *Annexes are complete and relevant.*
* The original Terms of Reference for the evaluation.
* Details on the programme and its context in development.
* Details of data and analyses.
* Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, and surveys).
* Evaluation plan.

**Relevance and Added Value**

*3.1. The purpose and context of the evaluation are described.*

* The reason(s) why the evaluation is being conducted should be explicitly stated.
* The justification for conducting the evaluation at this point in time should be summarised.
* Who requires the evaluative information should be made clear.
* The description of context should provide an understanding of the geographic, socioeconomic, political and cultural settings in which the evaluation took place.
  1. *The report includes an assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender, in particular, and human rights considerations are incorporated in the project or programme.*

The evaluation report should include a description of, *inter alia*:

* How a human development and human rights perspective was adopted in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
* How issues of equity, marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups were addressed in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
* How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
* How the evaluation used the human development and human rights lens in its defining the scope of the evaluation and in the methodology used.
  1. *The report presents information on its relationship with other associated evaluations and indicates its added value to already existing information.*

**Procedures and Accountabilities:**

The primary responsibility for preparing the evaluation report rests with the evaluation consultant or the leader of the evaluation team (if a team is established). Those who commission the evaluation and those who are actually evaluated can also contribute with their inputs. Particularly, key stakeholders should be involved in reviewing the draft report to check if there are any relevant factual errors or omissions, and to highlight any interpretation of the findings that they consider as incorrect. The evaluators should accept changes related to factual errors, but in safeguarding the principle of independence, they should be free to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

To ensure compliance with the criteria noted, a quality assurance and enhancement system at country level will be established and made operational.

**ANNEX II**

**(Integral part of ToR)**

## Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

1. Norms for Evaluation for the United Nations System, para 7.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)