|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title:** | UNDAF Evaluation |
| **Location:** | Lilongwe, Malawi |
| **Application deadline:** | 25th January, 2015 |
| **Type of contract:** | Individual Consultant |
| **Post level:** | International |
| **Languages required:** | English |
| **Duration of initial contract:** | 2nd March to 15th May (11 weeks, 50 working days) |

# 1. Background

In 2007, Malawi was one of the countries that volunteered to “Deliver as One” (DaO) Ultimately, it was not one of the eight selected “pilots”, but instead was an early “self-starter.” The DaO reform agenda in Malawi has been built on the tenets of the five ones: One Leader, One Programme, One Budgetary Framework, Operating as One and One Voice. Pursuing the UN reform agenda, Malawi is one of the countries globally to develop and utilize the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) planning methodology under the DaO Approach. The UNDAF represents the One Programme component of DaO. It replaces the joint UN programmes and the multiple UN-supported initiatives with a single, coherent plan for all UN funds, programmes and agencies in Malawi, in which each agency is responsible for delivery on a set of key actions that jointly contribute to shared results.

Since 2008, there has been two successive UNDAFs that have been developed since the reform agenda was adopted; with one cycle for 2008-11 and the current cycle for 2012-2016. The UNDAF 2012–2016 is the common plan of 21 resident and non-resident UN agencies, funds and programmes in Malawi[[1]](#footnote-1). It is in response to the needs and priorities of Malawi and based on the objectives of the[Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS)](http://www.malawi.gov.mw/) II. It sets out specific outcomes that the UN and the Government of Malawi together aim to achieve by 2016. This ‘One plan’ for Malawi supports the achievement of the international development goals, the Millennium Declaration and related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), national development priorities which are consistent with the MDGs, and the realisation of international human rights in the country, including the right to humanitarian assistance for refugees.

Guided by the UN comparative advantage, and the goals and targets of the MGDS II, the UNDAF had four inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas:

1. Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
2. Basic Social and Protection Services
3. HIV and AIDS
4. Governance and Human Rights

The UNDAF is fully aligned with the MGDS II. These priority areas are bound together by key overarching issues including a focus on adolescent girls as a means to accelerate development; building resilience among communities and institutions; advancing human rights and gender equality, and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours. A focus on results backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight are key principles for how we implement our programmes.

In the implementation of the UNDAF, the UN in Malawi focuses on four Key Priority Areas:

1. National policies, local and national instituions effectively support equitable and sustainable econmic growt and food security by 2016
2. National instituions effectively deliver equittable and quality basic social and protection services by 2016
3. National response to HIV and AIDS scaled up to achieve Universal Access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2016.
4. National instituons effcetively support transparency, accountability, partipatory demonracy and human rights by 2016.

The UNDAF enhances the UN’s focus on results by bringing together agency specific planning requirements in a consistent manner, ensuring a “necessary and sufficient” programme logic in the results chain and resource requirements. The Plan comprises of a Programme Results Matrix, a framework of Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound Outcomes and Outputs which includes indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification.

The UNDAF is organized in four Clusters with 14 Outcome Groups that allow UN agencies working in development sectors (food security, economic growth, health, governance, etc) to coordinate their implementation under the sector/ cluster. The Outcome Groups have a UN lead agency to facilitate decision-making, coordination and coherence.

To operationalise the UNDAF, an UNDAF Action Plan (AP) was developed which provided Annualised Key Results (AKRs) for each Outcome for each of the five years of the programme. However, more recently, the UNCT, with guidance from the UN Development Group (UNDG), has made the decision to move away from the rigid five year AP and instead focus on more flexible, rolling Annual Work Plans (AWPs). AWPs follow a normal year planning cycle, January to December. The AWPs are developed at the activity level using a common process and template, with the Outcomes and Outputs remaining fixed. This approach provides greater flexibility for revising programme activities based on national priorities and/or developments.

The Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) is an annual high level forum between the Government of Malawi and the United Nations Country Team which seeks to provide an oversight to the implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF. The JSM comprises the Heads of UN Agencies and Senior Government officials from key line Ministries and is chaired by the Chief Secretary, with the UN Resident Coordinator as co-chair.

# 2. Country Context

Malawi, officially known as the “Republic of Malawi,” is one of the seven countries that belong to both the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) trade blocs. It is a landlocked country that neighbours with Tanzania, Zambia and Mozambique. Its surface area is approximately 118,484 square kilometres, of which 20 percent is covered by Lake Malawi. Malawi has a population of 16.4 million, with 85% of the population living in rural areas. Life expectancy at birth is 55.3 years and the country is marked by high levels of vulnerability.

After independence from British rule in 1964 and more than 30 years of subsequent autocratic rule, Malawi continues to make steady progress in good governance. In May 2014, the current President, His Excellency Prof. Peter Mutharika was elected in Malawi’s first ever Tripartite Elections in which presidential, parliamentary and local government elections were conducted at one time. Mutharika replaced former president Dr. Joyce Banda who ascended to power in April 2012 following the sudden death of the then president, Bingu wa Mutharika, late brother to the current president.

Malawi has a GDP of US$3.705 billion and a per capita income of US$226. With an estimated population of 15.4 million as of July 2012, almost 75% of the population earns less than US$1.25 per day. Agriculture is Malawi’s largest economic activity contributing 28.7% of GDP and more than 80% of export earnings. Malawi achieved encouraging economic results between 2006 and 2010, with an average growth rate of 7.5% but suffered serious setbacks in 2011 and 2012. As a result, it took the decision to devalue its currency in 2012. The 49 percent devaluation of the Kwacha and subsequent depreciation of the currency inevitably contributed to the rise in inflation. Inflation, due to adherence to strict financial polices, has declined and stands at 22.3% for August 2014.

Current development policies and strategies for Malawi reflect the “Vision 2020” strategy which was developed in 1998 and presents the country’s development goals by the year 2020. The MGDS II (2012 to 2016) is the second medium term poverty reduction strategy, which provides a framework for implementing the MDGs. The strategy places emphasises on wealth creation and sustainable economic growth. To ensure that financial resources are directed to the priority areas of the MGDS, government uses Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP). However, significant challenges remain, including weak implementation of a number of government strategies and action plans often attributed to lack of modern public service capacities and incentives. With public dissatisfaction growing, the Government must ensure delivery of minimum quality services including education, health care and social protection. Corruption is a major problem in both the public and private sectors and seen by the electorate as a critical issue.

Poverty in Malawi remains high, widespread and concentrated in rural areas with a Human Development Index of 0.414 (in 2013), placing it below the Sub-Saharan African average of 0.502. According to the 2012 Integrated Household Survey (IHS) report, Malawi’s poverty level is estimated at 50.7% a marginal reduction from an estimated 52.4% in 2005. Incomes remain very low with GNI per capita of USD$ 348 and a Gini Coefficient of 41.5 in 2010 reflecting acute income inequalities with large sections of society marginalized.

The country also ranks as one of the most densely populated countries in Africa with a population density estimated at 139 persons per km2. The 2008 Population and Housing Census (PHC) estimated the population growth rate of 2.8% giving the country one of the fastest growing populations in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. Whilst Malawi is the least urbanized country in Africa, it has one of the highest urbanization rates in the world at 6% per year. This poses a challenge for urban development, green and inclusive growth.

Furthermore, Malawi has been experiencing different natural and economic shocks that have eroded the resilience of most poor and vulnerable households and compromised their ability to sustain their livelihoods. Malawi’s population of over 15 million people is perennially susceptible to several natural and economic shocks which include prolonged dry spells, floods, pest and diseases and high food prices. The majority of these poor households are heavily dependent on subsistence agricultural production, normally cultivating less than 0.5 ha of land. The increasing frequency and scope of these natural and economic shocks despite government’s subsidy to the agricultural sector have mostly resulted in increased vulnerability of the majority of the already impoverished communities.

In 2012, food insecurity was present in 16 districts, while in November 2013, the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee (MVAC) reported a total of 1,855,183 people from 24 districts across the country who would have a food gap and would require emergency food assistance. Food insecurity expanded to districts which had never been reported as food insecure in the past, showing an erosion of people’s ability to withstand shocks. While the projected number of food insecure households in 2014 has reduced significantly (estimated at 690,000 people), significant work is still required to ensure households are resilient to shocks.

# 3. UNDAF Evaluation Context

Since the formulation of the UNDAF, a number of internal reviews have taken place. These are as follows:

1. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2012
2. UNDAF Annual Review, 2012
3. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2013
4. UNDAF Expanded Annual Review, 2013
5. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2014

For each of these reviews, findings and lessons learnt have been documented, debated and converted into recommendations for improved programming and progression of the system-wide coherence agenda. In addition to these UNDAF specific reviews, the following reviews, assessment and evaluations of the UN in Malawi have also taken place:

1. Capacity Assessment, 2012
2. MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), 2013
3. Post 2015 National Consultations, 2013
4. Delivering as One Audit, 2014
5. UNICEF Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
6. UNFPA Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
7. Universal Periodic Review, 2014

The Government has conducted reviews of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II in 2012/13 and 2013/14 and has produced MDG Reports for the years 2010, 2012 and 2013. In addition to this, a number of sector specific reviews, assessments and evaluation have been conducted as well as a range of national surveys have been conducted by the National Statistics Office (NSO). More information on these surveys can be found on the NSO website[[2]](#footnote-2). Most recently, the MDG Endline Survey was conducted and the initial findings have been released, with the full report due in December 2014.

Referencing these studies, as well as sector-specific reviews and evaluations, the proposed evaluation will focus primarily upon the UNDAF period. It will provide an independent assessment of the specific short- to medium-term results achieved and UN Malawi’s contribution to national development priorities. It will consider what has worked, what has not worked and why, in the context of Delivering as One. It will therefore provide information for strengthening UN programming, UN results and UN coordination going forward.

The primary users of the evaluation at the country level will be the UN Country Team (resident and non-resident, management and technical level staff), key government counterparts, Development Partners, NGOs and civil society, alongside. On the global stage, the evaluation should contribute to knowledge regarding good practice under UN joint Programming and Delivering as One through the UNDOCO and regional offices.

# 4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope

## 4.1. Purpose

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UN country offices to undertake an evaluation of their Programme of Cooperation (UNDAF) in the penultimate year of the programming cycle. To this end, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) in collaboration with UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) has issued guidance on the required Management Structure and Terms of Reference to ensure quality standards are maintained[[3]](#footnote-3). The planned UNDAF evaluation must observe the parameters of the UNEG/DOCO guidance, whilst ensuring an inclusive approach which involves stakeholder representatives in key decision-making processes. This is critical to ensure the Evaluation is nationally owned, encompasses topics of national interest and has application in the wider national sphere.

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

1. **To support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders** – by objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.
2. **To support learning –** the evaluation must provide clear recommendations for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The UN, the Government of Malawi and UNDAF stakeholders should be able to learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with UNDOCO and used for the benefit of other countries.

## 4.2 Objectives

The evaluation has four key objectives:

1. to **assess the contribution made by the UN** through the UNDAF to national development priorities and results, including international and regional commitments on human rights and gender equality, through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence.
2. to **identify the factors that have affected the UN’s contribution**, identifying, understanding and explaining the the enabling factors and bottlenecks that influenced the this contribution (learning).
3. to **reach conclusions concerning the UN’s contribution** across the scope being examined.
4. to **provide actionable recommendations for improving the UN's contribution**, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation, including a review of the UNDAF management structure and processes to identify good practice going forward.

## 4.3 Scope

The UNDAF encompasses both development and humanitarian assistance, with a focus on building the capacity of the Government of Malawi to undertake its responsibilities as the primary duty bearer as well as support to empower rights-holders to claim their rights. In response to national priorities, the UN in Malawi supports the Government in four inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas: Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security, Basic Social and Protection Services, HIV and AIDS, and Governance and Human Rights. The four priority areas include the following 14 programme/outcome areas:

1. Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
   1. Resilience and Food Security
   2. Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change
   3. Employment, Labour and Private Sector Development
2. Basic Social and Protection Services
   1. Health
   2. Nutrition
   3. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
   4. Education
   5. Protection
3. HIV and AIDS
   1. Prevention and Treatment
   2. Enabling Environment
4. Governance and Human Rights
   1. Democratic Governance
   2. Economic Governance
   3. Gender Equality
   4. Population and Development

These priority areas are bound together by key overarching issues including a focus on adolescent girls as a means to accelerate development; building resilience among communities and institutions; advancing human rights and gender equality and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours. A focus on results backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight are key principles of programme implementation. The majority of initiatives are national in coverage and upstream. However, there are components which operate at the sub-national level, usually direct delivery (e.g. refugee assistance in Dzaleka camp) or piloting of projects/activities for extrapolation of lessons learnt and future national roll-out.

The evaluation will review delivery and achievement of results across all 14 programme Outcomes, contributed to by 21 UN Agencies. However, a number of agencies are undertaking programme/Outcome specific evaluations in early 2015. These are as follows:

* UNDP
  + Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change
  + Gender Equality
* UNICEF
  + Health
  + Nutrition
  + Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
  + Education
  + Protection
* WFP
  + Humanitarian Food Security Response

Following on this, the UN Women as Chair of the Gender technical working group and OHCHR as chair of the Human Rights technical working group will undertake a desk review of the integration of the cross cutting issues across the UNDAF 2012-2016

Therefore, rather than re-evaluating these areas, the evaluation will focus on those areas not already evaluated and build on the thematic evaluations, bringing all areas together under a common evaluation framework. In addition to this, the evaluation will build on the national review process which is likely to take place from January to March. As the UNDAF is the primary document for supporting the Government national development plan, the consultant will be expected to work closely with the consultant(s) conducting the national review and as much as possible, collaborate and work jointly to reduce duplication of efforts (for example, share consultation meetings with stakeholders).

The evaluation should also include analysis of the mainstreaming of the five UN programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) and examine DaO as an overall strategy.

# 5. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation should be a programmatic evaluation that assesses performance against the given programme framework. The UN contribution should be against national development outcomes contained in the results framework. As such, and in line with the UN System’s mandate to promote national ownership and capacity development, the evaluation is country-led, with national partners, both within Government and civil society, co-determining what is to be evaluated, jointly assessing the quality of the evaluation and its application to the wider national sphere. The overall approach should be participatory and orientated towards learning how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. The Evaluation should also be gender and human rights responsive and should conform to UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines.

The evaluation will assess delivery of the UNDAF Outcomes and broader contribution to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II as well as advancement of human rights in country. Given realisation of the UNDAF Outcomes involves a number of partners, establishing a causal linkage between the development intervention and the observed result (attribution) may prove problematic. The evaluation will therefore consider the contribution of the UN to the UNDAF Outcomes in light of national strategies and actions to support the planned change

The primary focus of the evaluation will be at the Outcome level. As the assessment will be undertaken during the penultimate year of the UNDAF, it will not be a standard summative evaluation and will require some degree of anticipation in terms of the likelihood of Outcome delivery. It will be for the Consultant to establish in the Inception Report how they plan to manage this challenge, whilst retaining due rigour.

The standard set of evaluation criteria across all UNDAF evaluations is to be used, namely:

1. **Relevance -** The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with country needs, national priorities (including National Strategy for Gender Development) the country’s international and regional commitments, including on human rights (core human rights treaties, including [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Convention on the Rights of Children etc.) and the recommendations of Human Rights mechanisms (including the treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR), sustainable development, environment, and the needs of women and men of all ages, young people, boys and girls and most vulnerable groups in the country. To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality?
2. **Effectiveness -** The extent to which the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the UNDAF and to the degree to which were the results were equitably distributed among the targeted groups. To what extent was a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the UNDAF? Did the intervention contribute to empowerment of rights holders, especially women and young people, to claim and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality standards? The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.
3. **Efficiency -** The extent to which outcomes were achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.). The extent to which resource allocation took into account or prioritised most marginalised groups including women and girls. To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF?
4. **Sustainability -** The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue, after it has been completed. In particular, if the transition from developing *individual* capacity in the short-term to creating *institutional* capacity in the long-term has been made. The range of requirements should be considered, including creation of technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights. To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues?
5. **Impact –** Assess the changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributed to the UNDAF. Identify the changes that have occurred and provide accountability of the UN system. It will also provide feedback to help improve the design of the next UNDAF.

During assessment, using the above criteria, the evaluators should identify the various factors that can explain performance. Where these factors have been identified as UNDAF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered as both results and enabling factors. The evaluators must include reference to:

1. **UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One -** The extent to which UN Coordination and DaO created or encouraged synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication? The extent to which harmonisation measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results? Factors that facilitated or adversely impacted upon implementation and commitment to the DaO approach.
2. **UN Programming Principles -** To what extent were the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results? Were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation? Were adequate resources (both agency specific and One UN Fund) allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results?
3. How well did the UN use its **partnerships** (with civil society/private sector/local government/parliament/national human rights institutions/gender equality advocates/international development partners) to improve performance? To what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (in particular vulnerable groups including women and girls) ensured in the UNDAF process?
4. Did the UN undertake appropriate **risk analysis** and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost?
5. **Responsiveness -** How adequately did the UN during planning and implementation of the UNDAF respond to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections)?
6. To what extent did the UNDAF **Governance and Management Structures** promote or challenge delivery, with reference to the internal Division of Labour and Government of Malawi Dialogue Structure? Could outcome groups be better defined and operationalised in future?

The evaluation will not use a pre/post comparison design and, therefore, does not lend itself to specifically attributing effects to the UNDAF. The UNDAF evaluation should draw on a variety of data collection methods, including but not limited to:

* document review;
* semi-structured key stakeholder interviews;
* surveys;
* focus groups;
* outcome mapping; and,
* observational visits.

These should be identified based upon availability, logistical constraints (travel, costs, time, etc) and ethical considerations. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex, age, geographical region, and to the extent possible, other contextually-relevant markers of equity. It is anticipated that the inception report will include an evaluation matrix linking the data collection methods to the evaluation criteria and questions. Analysis should combine qualitative and quantitative tools, triangulating information sources and findings where possible for validation purposes.

# 6. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation

## 6.1 Evaluation Management Structure

UNDAF evaluations are country-level evaluations. As such, they are jointly commissioned and financed by the UNCT and the national government. The Consultant is expected to work in full independence from the evaluation commissioners under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure.

1. Direct supervision is provided by the UN Programme Management Team which for this purpose, will be expanded **to** include 1-2 representatives from the national counterparts. This group will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and management of the evaluation budget. The key roles of the PMT are:
   * To prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in coordination with the Evaluation Steering Committee (UNCT);
   * To lead the hiring of the team of external consultants, reviewing proposals and approving the selection of the Consultant;
   * To supervise and guide the Consultant in each step of the evaluation process;
   * To review, provide substantive comments and approve the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology;
   * To review and provide substantive feedback to the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes;
   * to ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation and to guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
   * To identify and ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in coordination with the UNCT throughout the evaluation process;
   * to ensure the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and,
   * to contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response
2. The decision-making organ for the UNDAF Evaluation will be the UNCT. Again, for purposes of the evaluation, the UNCT will be expanded to include two national counterparts. Other key stakeholders such as national civil society organizations and donor representatives may also be added.

## 6.2 Consultant PRofile

The consultant should have the following profile:

* Minimum 10 years’ experience of conducting complex evaluations, including at least one UNDAF evaluation and one Gender Equality and Human Rights responsive evaluation.
* Master’s degree in International Development, Public Administration, Evaluation or related field
* Extensive experience of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods
* A strong record in designing and leading evaluations, using a wide range of evaluation approaches
* Process management and facilitation skills, including ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
* Strong understanding of the United Nations system and UNDAF programming processes and procedures
* Ability to assess the application of the five UN Programming Principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development.
* Understanding of DaO principles and processes
* Familiarity of national planning processes.
* Experience of the Malawian context is desirable.
* Strong management, communication, interview and writing skills
* Excellent communication and interview skills
* Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
* Proficiency in English

The consultant is expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of IT/office equipment, stationary, communication, office space, accommodation, transport and other logistics.

Note: the consultant should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the subject of the evaluation. Existence of any potential conflict of interest should be communicated in writing to the evaluation manager prior to signing of a work contract (see [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/documentdownload?doc_id=102&file_id=548) for further clarification about conflict of interest)

# 7. Evaluation Process and timeframe

The Consultant must prepare an inception report that operationalizes the design elements of the ToR. The report should include the results of a desk review, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach, data collection plan, additional data collection tools and analysis methods, key informants, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. The report should also include an evaluability assessment, foreseen limitations and risks, team composition and distribution of tasks, resource requirements and logistic support. To facilitate the development of the inception report a list of documents will be provided in to the evaluators. The PMT will review and provide substantive comments to the report, before final approval can be awarded by the UNCT.

The Consultant must then proceed with data collection and analysis. This process should be made in close consultation with the Resident Coordinator’s Office who will ensure coordination with the PMT and the UNCT. Preliminary findings should be presented to the PMT and UNCT. Based on their feedback, a final report should be produced, in accordance with UNEG Norms and Standards.

Once the evaluation report has been validated by the UNCT, it will be made publicly available through posting on the UNDG and UNCT websites. The UNCT will develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations, including a timeframe and responsibilities for follow up. Lessons learned from the evaluation will be extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels, including for the formulation of the UNDAF successor document.

Deadlines may require revision, dependent on the availability of data and informants.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Deliverables** | **Payment schedule/amounts** |
| **Inception Report**  Includes detailed Evaluation Work Plan, Evaluation Matrix & Tools | **9th March 2015 (5 days)**  20% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |
| **Draft Evaluation Report**  To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist | **1st May 2015 (40 days)**  40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |
| **Final Evaluation Report**  Max. 30,000 words plus essential annexes and 2,500 word Executive Summary (submitted in hard and soft copy).  To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist | **15th May 2015 (5 days)**  40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |

# Annex I: UNDAF Evaluation Schedule

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Activity** | **Responsible** | **Timeframe** | **Output** |
| **Planning** | **Draft ToR**  RCO drafts the TOR in close consultation with the PMT. UNCT validates the final TOR. | RCO | 29th Sep – 12th December | Draft TOR developed |
| **Identify National Counterparts**  Suitable Government representatives identified and agreed to participate in PMT and UNCT for purpose of management of the evaluation. | UNCT | 8th – 16th Dec | National Counterparts identified and agreed |
| **Select Consultant**  PMT opens the bidding process for recruitment of Consultant based on the agreed TOR and according to UN procurement rules. PMT selects the Consultant against agreed selection criteria. Interviews may be conducted with candidates. | PMT | 15th Dec – 6th Feb | Consultant selected |
| **Contract Consultant**  PMT prepares a contract with the Consultant according to the TOR. The contract outlines the responsibilities of the Consultant, duration, fees, travel, etc. | PMT | 6th – 13th Feb | Consultant recruited and contracted |
| **Implementation** | **Brief Consultant**  PMT provides access to all relevant documentation. All relevant stakeholders to facilitate access to all necessary information. | PMT | 2nd Mar | Consultant briefed |
| **Inception Report**  Consultant to prepare and submit to the PMT an Inception Report that further refines the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology. | Consultant | 2nd Mar – 9th Mar | Inception report developed |
| **Data Collection and Analysis**  Consultant collects data deploying various data collection methods agreed upon in the Inception Report. Relevant stakeholders from UNCT and the different UN agencies to facilitate access to information and provide all necessary logistical/organisational support. | Consultant | 9th Mar – 3rd April | Data collection and analysis completed |
| **Preliminary findings**  Consultant delivers a presentation on the evaluation preliminary findings to the PMT, the UNCT and its representatives, as well as additional stakeholders invited by the UNCT for immediate feedback. | Consultant | 6th – 10th Apr | Preliminary findings of evaluation presented |
| **Reporting**  Consultant prepares the report in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards. The report is to be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations. | Consultant | 13th – 24th Apr | Final report drafted |
| **Present Draft Evaluation Report to UNCT and PMT** | Consultant | 27th Apr – 1st May | Draft final report presented |
| **PMT and UNCT provide final feedback to the Consultant** | PMT / UNCT | 4th – 8th May | Feedback on report provided by PMT and UNCT |
| **Consultant produces a final report based on the UNCT and PMT final feedback.** | Consultant | 11th – 15th May | Final report developed |
| **Review and Follow-up** | **Disseminate Evaluation Findings**  PMT disseminates report to internal and external stakeholders, ensuring access to vulnerable or marginalised groups. A workshop is organised to disseminate and discuss the evaluation findings. Report to be published on the UN Malawi and UNDG websites. | PMT | 18th – 22nd May | Findings of evaluations shared with stakeholders |
| **Extract and Share Lessons Learned**  PMT to ensure lessons learned from evaluation are extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels. Lessons should be applied in the design of the following UNDAF cycle and can feed into knowledge management processes internally. | PMT | 25th – 29th My | Lessons learned extracted and shared |
| **Develop Evaluation Management Response**  UNCT issues a management response that outlines agreed upon actions as to how the evaluation findings and recommendations will be addressed by the UNCT. The Evaluation Management Response should be issued within two months after the evaluation findings become available and shared with DOCO and other entities | UNCT | 1st – 5th June | Evaluation Management Response developed |
| **Follow up of Implementation of Management Response Actions**  This step is beyond the completion of the normal evaluation process and is normally done as part of annual planning and review processes by the UNCT and other UNDAF stakeholders. It is also a good practice for Audits to examine the extent to which management response actions were followed up | UNCT / UNCT | 8th June onwards | Management Response Actions followed-up and implemented |

1. **Resident**: FAO, UNAIDS, UNDP, , UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UN Women, WFP, WHO

   **Non-Resident:** IAEA, IFAD, ILO, UNCDF, OHCHR, UN-Habitat, UNEP, UNESCO, IOM, UNIDO, UNODC, OCHA [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.nsomalawi.mw/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.undg.org/docs/12720/UNDAF%20ToR%20Guidance%20OCT%2022%20Draft.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)