

External Project Evaluation

Terms of Reference for Individual Contract

A. Project Title

Anti-Corruption and Integrity in the Arab Countries (ACIAC)

B. Background and Context

ACIAC is part of the Regional Programme for the Arab States. It was launched in June 2011 and is expected to conclude its first phase and start the second one in 2015, in line with UNDP's Strategic Plan 2014-2017.

ACIAC is developed to respond to the increasing demand for anti-corruption assistance in the Arab region. It is a regional instrument that is designed to strengthen cooperation and promote collective action against corruption, while adding value to related bilateral and multilateral efforts. It draws on UNDP's extensive governance portfolio and vast network of experts and partners.

During the first phase ACIAC produced region-specific knowledge and supported inclusive policy reforms with the aim of enhancing national capacities to implement the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and related international standards and good practices. Primary beneficiary countries were Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Tunisia and Yemen, in addition to the Arab Anti-Corruption and Integrity Network (ACINET), which is considered to be the leading regional mechanism on capacity development, information sharing and policy dialogue in its field. It includes 45 ministries and agencies from 17 Arab countries, a "non-governmental group" that comprises 20 independent organizations representing civil society, the business community and academia, and finally two governmental agencies with observer status from Brazil and Malaysia.

The Siemens Integrity Initiative (SII) contributed 1,782,000 USD to support the implementation of a major component of the broader ACIAC initiative (hereinafter "project"). The project is outlined in the Full Proposal submitted to SII. It was commenced in July 2011 and concluded in December 2014.

The target output of the project was established as the following:

"Knowledge and skills of representatives from at least 40 non-governmental actors enhanced to participate in the development, implementation and monitoring of national anti-corruption strategies in at least four Arab countries, focusing on the implementation of articles 12 and 13 of the UNCAC, and on mainstreaming integrity standards and practices in specific sectors."

The target outputs for the activities were established as the following:

1. Training materials on the UNCAC developed in the form of two publications to build capacities on the implementation of related international standards in the Arab Region;
2. 40 non-governmental practitioners trained to support UNCAC implementation;
3. Four positions papers formulated by non-governmental actors to enable non-governmental practitioners to assist them in influencing related reforms;
4. Active engagement of non-governmental actors in regional policy dialogue supported and recorded to promote UNCAC implementation and the reduction of corruption risks in key vulnerable sectors; and
5. A service-oriented Portal for ACINET developed and maintained to facilitate communication and cooperation between ACINET members and their peers in the region and beyond.

UNDP-RBAS requires the services of an external evaluation evaluator to evaluate the project's performance for (2011-2014) over achievements, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance to the UNDP Strategic Plan outcome # 2: "Citizen Expectations for voice, effective development, the rule of law and

accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance”.

C. Evaluation Purpose

The external evaluation is requested by the Siemens Integrity Initiative as a standard requirement for the projects it funds. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent consultant. It will assess the project’s progress (and challenges), taking the linkages to the broader ACIAC initiative into consideration, at the outcome level, with measurement of the output level achievements and gaps and in particular, what changes were achieved as a result of the project towards anti-corruption and integrity, and ultimately the promotion of clean business and fair market conditions and meeting citizen expectations for accountability.

The purpose of the external evaluation is foremost to assess how the project impacted the progress towards the achievement of these objectives. Moreover, the contribution of the project in enabling a coherent development engagement, and to identify the factors that have affected its implementation will be assessed.

The evaluation will consist of a desk review based research, one mission to meet with the project team and key stakeholders, and conduct in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. It will document results achieved, the challenges faced, and how those challenges were addressed.

The evaluation is expected to identify success stories, good practices, challenges, constraints, and lessons learned, and to provide recommendations on substantive and process issues to inform the implementation process for the second phase of ACIAC (2015-2017).

D. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The external evaluation will cover the period from July 2011 till December 2014. It will be based on the activities financed by the SII taken into consideration that these would have been implemented in synergy with the rest of activities funded by the other donors under the broader ACIAC initiative.

The specific evaluation objectives are to:

1. Analyze the relevance of the project strategy and approaches;
2. Validate project results in terms of achievements and/or weaknesses toward the targeted results, with a critical examination of how/to what extent the project supported efforts and strengthened the capacities of 40 non-governmental practitioners in the Arab region, as well as other national partners to help fight against corruption and promote integrity;
3. Assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts and commitment to help fight against corruption;
4. Document key lessons learned, good practices, success stories and challenges to inform future work of various stakeholders in addressing the area of anti-corruption; and
5. Document and analyze possible weaknesses in order to improve next steps of project interventions in the area of the fight against corruption.

The ultimate purpose of the external evaluation is to provide UNDP with an opportunity to learn and further enhance related efforts in the future. Upon the request of the Siemens Integrity Initiative, the Evaluation shall be for internal use only and subject to confidentiality.

E. Scope of Work

This assignment will be based on a number of stakeholders’ interviews and desk research, supplemented by meetings with key counterparts.

The *Evaluator* will be responsible of:

1. Conducting **desk review based research**.
2. Conducting **one field visit** to meet with the project team and stakeholders in the field (3 working days)
3. Providing an **analytical report**, which should contain an executive summary (mandatory), be analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative), be structured around issues and related findings/lessons learned; and include conclusions and recommendations.

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

To achieve the above, the *Evaluator* will work with the ACIAC project manager under the supervision of the Regional Programme Coordinator, based on the workplan enclosed as Annex 1.

G. Institutional Arrangement

The Evaluator is required to maintain close communication with the Regional Programme Coordinator.

H. Duration of the Work

The duration of the work is expected to be approximately one month and a half from the start of the contract. Actual number of days to be spent on the assignment is estimated to be around 20 working days. The work is expected to start on 15 March 2015 and end on 30 April 2015.

I. Duty Station

The Evaluator's duty station will be home-based. Part of the assignment would require travel to either Lebanon or Tunisia to be decided in consultation with UNDP.

J. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor

The evaluator should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.

S/he should have:

- a) A university degree at the post-graduate level in law, social sciences, management or other relevant field of study;
- b) A minimum of 7 years of experience in implementation / evaluation of projects/programmes on democratic governance / anti-corruption; preferably some experience of these in the Arab countries;
- c) Experience in cooperation with multilateral agencies would be an asset;
- d) Strong background experience including familiarity with UNDP systems, requirements, procedures, and rules & regulations;
- e) Technical Skills: Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages (MS Word, excel, Power Point presentations, etc.);
- f) Strong writing skills including technical reports, general reports, and proposals;
- g) Solid understanding of international anti-corruption and integrity standards and experiences in programming on related issues;
- h) Solid understanding of governance and government structures within the Arab regional context;
- i) Excellent analytical and report writing skills;

- j) Knowledge of English is a prerequisite; knowledge of Arabic and/or French is an asset;
- k) Proven work experience in use of participatory evaluation methods for identifying measurable target indicators and in particular for identifying outcome / impact – positive change of behavior, policy or law made;
- l) Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues;
- m) Must be a self-starter and be able to work independently with excellent demonstrated teamwork, coordination and facilitation skills;
- n) Experience in leading multi-disciplinary teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations;
- o) Fluency in computer (bringing his/her own laptop to the mission will be required);
- p) Previous experience in UN agency an asset.

Other competencies:

- Strong leadership and planning skills
- Strong communication skills
- Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines
- Ability to network with partners on various levels

K. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The financial proposal is based on a lump sum amount. Payment will be effected in one installment, upon satisfactory completion of the deliverables required.

L. Recommended Presentation of Offer

For purposes of generating Offers whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative analysis, it is recommended to have in your offer the following contents and format, filling the following documents:

- a) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate
- b) **Proposal:** (i) Explaining why you are the most suitable for the work
(ii) Providing a brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work
- c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

M. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The selection criteria, which shall serve as basis for evaluating offers, will be done in the following manner:

- Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and technical competence will be weighted a max. of 70%, and the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%;

The offer will be evaluated against the qualifications and methodology in the following way:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical Competence</u>	70%	100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A university degree at the post-graduate level in the social sciences, management or other relevant field of study; A minimum of 7 years of experience in implementation / evaluation of projects/programmes on democratic governance, in particular anti-corruption; preferably some experience of these in the Arab countries; Experience in cooperation with multilateral agencies would be an asset; Strong background experience including familiarity with UNDP systems, requirements, procedures, and rules & regulations; Technical Skills: Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages (MS Word, excel, Power Point presentations, etc.); Solid understanding of international anti-corruption and integrity standards and experiences in programming on related issues; Proven work experience in use of participatory evaluation methods for identifying measurable target indicators and in particular for identifying outcome / impact – positive change of behavior, policy or law made; Solid understanding of governance and government structures within the Arab regional context; Strong writing skills including technical reports, general reports, proposals and preparation of budgets; Excellent analytical and report writing skills; Knowledge of English; Arabic or French is an asset. 		60
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the proposed methodology and technical offer 		40
<u>Financial</u> (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	<u>30%</u>	100
<u>Total Score</u>	Technical Score * 0.7 + Financial Score * 0.3	

N. Evaluation Ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”¹ and should describe critical issues evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers.

O. Cost

Cost shall be inclusive of 20 Working Days and related costs, except travel costs (tickets, Daily Subsistence Allowance, and Terminal Expenses), which will be borne by UNDP according to applicable policies, rules and regulations.

P. Annexes

- Annex 1: Proposed Evaluation Work Plan
- Annex 2: Structure of Evaluation Report
- Annex 3: Code of conduct
- Annex 4: Project Proposal to Siemens Integrity Initiative. *Related annexes and reports will be made available upon the recruitment of the consultant.*

Q. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature



Name and Designation Mr. Yakup Beris, Regional Programme Coordinator, UNDP-RBAS

Date of Signing March 2nd, 2015

¹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/102>

Annex 1: Proposed Evaluation Work Plan

Deliverables/Outputs	Activity	Estimated Duration	Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Evaluation inception report (including evaluation workplan and timeframe, and using the Sample evaluation matrix- <i>Table A</i> below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project document and progress reports • Other relevant literature review • Agreement on activities & timeframes • Preparation of schedule of interviews • Development of assessment methodology 	6 days	30 March	Regional Programme Coordinator
Draft evaluation report Draft evaluation findings. Documented records of interviews and observations with stakeholders. Presentation of findings to key stakeholders Draft report delivered to UNDP for consideration and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with selected stakeholders • Field visit to Beirut or Tunisia (to be agreed with the Evaluator) • Incorporate feedback into findings • Draft the report NB: See annex 2 for the report structure	10 days	15 April	Regional Programme Coordinator
Final evaluation report A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables/graphs where appropriate will be submitted after the completion of the mission, incorporating comments made on the draft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address comments provided by UNDP and the SII • Submission of Final Report 	4 days	Within one week of receiving the comments of UNDP and the SII	Regional Programme Coordinator
Time allocated to the assignment	20 working days			

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

Annex 2: Structure of Evaluation Report

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the 'UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

Title and opening pages—should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents—should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—a stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention— provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit**, what kind of change was required and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals**.
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Briefly summarize the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Briefly summarize the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives—the report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- Evaluation scope—the report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- Evaluation objectives—the report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- Evaluation criteria—the report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions—Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods—the evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.

- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—the report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions—the report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Recommendations—the report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned—as appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes—suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluator