**ANNEX 1**

 

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

For Joint Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDAF **Outcome 4.2**

***Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016***

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

The Malawi United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2014 has 14 priority development outcomes. As a Delivery As One volunteering country, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) agreed that individual UN agencies would adopt appropriate UNDAF outcomes in their CP documents instead of developing agency specific outcome statements for their respective Country Programme Documents (CPDs).

Outcome 4.2, namely: ***Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016*** is one of the six outcomes of the UNDAF to which UNDP is directly contributing financially and technically.The areas of intervention under the outcome are contributing to MGDS II, Theme 5: Improved Governance - Sub-theme 1: Economic Governance. In addition, the interventions under the outcome are contributing to the MGDS II, Theme 2: Social Development - Sub-theme 2: Health.

At the operational level, Outcome 4.2 is contributing to Public Service Reforms (PSR) and the Public Financial and Economic Management Reform Program (PFEM RP). The former (PSR) is aimed at public institutional strengthening and modernization and improving civil and public service delivery in the country. The latter (PFEM RP) is a key initiative of Government towards fulfilling economic governance objectives of the MGDS II designed to achieve macro fiscal discipline, effective allocation of resources, efficient and effective delivery of government programs, transparency of public finances and strengthened accountability. In recent months the PFEM RP has assumed a more important role as a vehicle for addressing the ills associated with the infamous “cashgate” scandal.

Outcome 4.2 has four outputs as follows:

**Output 4.2.1:** Capacity for public sector management strengthened for effective service delivery;

**Output 4.2.2** Public institutions utilize RBM systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results;

**Output 4.2.3** Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance;

**Output 4.2.4**: National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and the MDGs.

Key interventions under each of the four outputs are listed in the 2012-2016 UNDAF Action Plan. The UNDAF Action Plan also presents results matrices including indicators and Annualised Key Results (AKRs) for each output. Annex 1 presents the relevant section of the 2012-2016 UNDAF Action Plan.

The interventions under this outcome are being implemented assistance from the following UN agencies: UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF. Support from UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP is both technical and financial while UNAIDS is meant to provide in-kind technical assistance. UNDP is the lead UN Agency for the Outcome. It has been strongly recommended that the outcome be jointly evaluated the participating UN agencies i.e. UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF. Annex 3 provides a full list of key stakeholders and partners for the outcome.

1. **PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

**The purpose of the evaluation is to**:

* Assess the contribution made by the UNCT, collectively, and participating UN agencies, individually, to strengthening public institution capacity for development effectiveness and public service delivery as envisaged under outcome 4.2 of the UNDAF including cross human rights and gender equality;
* Inform the UNDAF review planned for 2015;
* Support learning across the UN to improve programme effectiveness.

**The objectives of the evaluation are**:

1. Determine the extent to which the planned outcome and related outputs have been achieved or are being achieved and the likelihood of being achieved by the end of 2016 in general and the extent of participating UN agencies’ contributions.
2. Determine the impact, both positive and negative, from achievement of the outcome and its related outputs;
3. Assess the relevance of the outputs to the effective achievement of the outcome;
4. Assess the adequacy or inadequacy of UNCT and UN agency partnership strategy(ies) for the achievement of the outcome;
5. Examine and analyse factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome by the UNCT collectively and the participating UN agencies, individually, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: weakness in design, management, human resource skills and resources;
6. Explore strategic values and comparative advantage of each of the participating UN agency in contributing to the outcome;
7. Assess how the participating UN agencies worked together jointly in the planning, implementation and reporting of the outcome;
8. Document lessons learnt from the implementation of the interventions.
9. Make recommendations for the UNCT and specifically for each participating UN agency in strategic areas for improving the achievement and sustainability of the outcome; partnership arrangements, mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues and resource mobilization strategies.

**Evaluation scope:**

The evaluation will cover the period from January 2012 to 31 December, 2014. Geographically, the evaluation is national in nature although there are also district interventions. It will include a review of the UNDAF annual work plans and annual reports, agency level project documents and work plans and related progress reports. Annex 4 provides a list of further documents to be consulted by the evaluators.

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA**:

In order to fulfil the purpose and specific objectives stated above, the evaluation shall address the following five specific questions:

1. Whether the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) including the Outcome and Output indicators were properly designed.
2. Whether the level of financial resources made available by different UN Agencies was sufficient for successful implementation of the outcome vis-a-vis the planned resource envelope.
3. What progress has been made so far towards the outcome and whether the outcome will be met by December, 2016;
4. To what extent has UNDP contributed to the achievement of the outcome?
5. What are the main factors (positive and negative) that are affecting the achievement of the outcomes? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?

**Evaluation Criteria:** The evaluation of performance of the UNCT and the participating UN agencies individually in the outcome and outputs will be made using the standard criteria: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability. Below are detailed questions related to each criterion to be addressed by the evaluators.

*Relevance and design:*

* To what extent is UNCT’s collective and the participating UN agencies’ engaged in promoting the effective management, allocation and utilization of resources for effective development and service delivery, including UNCT’s role in this area and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners?
* To what extent has UNCT, collectively, and the participating UN agencies selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
* Has UNCT been influential in national debates in promoting the effective management, allocation and utilization of resources for effective development and service delivery?
* To what extent did the UNCT mainstream gender and human rights in Outcome 4.2?

*Effectiveness*

* What evidence is there that UNCT collectively and individual UN agency support has contributed towards better management, allocation and utilization of resources for effective development and service delivery?
* To what extent has progress been made towards achieving the outputs and key results under Outcome 4.2?
* Has the support at the national level been effective in helping improve the achievement of effective development and delivery of services at the local level in Malawi? Do these local results aggregate into nationally significant results?
* Has UNCT and individual UN agencies worked effectively with other international and national delivery partners to improve management, allocation and utilization of resources for effective development and service delivery?
* How effective has UNCT collectively and individual participating UN agencies been in partnership with civil society and the private sector to promote effective management, allocation and utilization of resources for effective development and service delivery?
* Has UNCT collectively and participating individual UN agencies utilised innovative techniques and best practices in its programming on effective development and public service delivery?
* Did UN coordination reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of implementation of the programmes relating to the outcome? To what extent did interventions create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimise results and avoid duplication?
* Is UNCT collectively and individual participating UN agencies perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for effective development in Malawi?
* What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNCT’s collectively and individual UN agencies’ performance in this area?

*Efficiency*

* Have participating UN agency strategies and execution of the outcome been efficient and cost effective?
* Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNCT collectively and individual participating UN agencies have in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively?

*Sustainability*

* What is the likelihood that the interventions are sustainable?
* What mechanisms have been put in place by UNCT and participating UN agencies of Malawi to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
* Are UNCT’s management structures and working methods appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?
* What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships and strategies in order to promote long term sustainability?
* What could be done to strengthen sustainability?
* Are there resource mobilization strategies at the UNCT or individual agency level for outcome 4.2?
1. **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation team should provide details in respect of:

1. **Review of project documentation**. Review of key project documents such as approved program documents, recent studies, evaluations and reviews, project monitoring documents, disbursement reports, progress reports and other information available implementing agencies or participating UN agency offices.
2. **Construct a theory, identify detail evaluation questions, methods (mixed methods) and instruments**, stakeholder mapping, etc.
3. **Data collection**: (i) visits to selected stakeholders to carry out in depth interviews, inspection, and analysis of the project activities; (ii) phone interviews and performance data surveys of institutions not visited in person; (iii) interviews with the implementing agencies and participating UN agencies. For each of these interviews, the consultant should first develop and present their ideas for the content and format of the interview forms that will be applied to capture the information required, as well as the method to be used in administering them and tabulating the results.
4. **Analysis:** Data triangulation and analysis triangulation to validate evidence and arrive at findings.

The evaluators will be expected to develop and present detailed statement of evaluations methods/approaches in an inception report to show how each objective, evaluation question and criterion will be answered.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**
2. An Evaluation Management Task Force will be established to manage the evaluation process. Each participating UN Agency will appoint an evaluation focal point who will be members of the task force. The full membership of the task force will include government counterparts to UNDAF outcome 4.2 and selected UN officers from the UNDAF outcome 4.2 group. The task force will assist in key aspects of the evaluation process including reviewing evaluation Terms of Reference, selecting evaluators, providing documents, providing detailed comments on the inception and draft evaluation reports and dissemination of evaluation findings, lessons learnt and recommendations.
3. The evaluation coordinating agency, UNDP in consultation with the RCO will provide the necessary guidance on the process and in reviewing reports.
4. The UNDP Assistant Resident Representative (CD) will support the Evaluation Team on daily basis with respect to providing background information and progress reports and other documentation on Outcome 4.2, setting up stakeholder meetings and interviews, arrange field visits and coordinating with Government, other IPs and DPs. The ARR will also lead the Evaluation Management Task Force.
5. The Evaluation team leader will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP.
6. The Evaluation Team will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication, accommodation and transport. Furthermore the evaluators will be expected to familiarise themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.
7. The Evaluation Team will provide the UNDAF Outcome 4.2 Lead (the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative (ARR)) with regular reports and feedback on the progress of the evaluation process.
8. The UNDAF Cluster 4 Lead, i.e. the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (Programme) will provide the overall oversight to the Outcome evaluation and ensure timely delivery and satisfactory final product.
9. **DELIVERABLES**
* **Inception report** – within 5 days of the start of the assignment with UNDP. The report will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, a draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. Annex 5 gives a template of the evaluation matrix. The work plan should also include an outline of the evaluation report as set out in Annex 2 of this TOR.
* **Key emerging issues paper** – a presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders orally and in writing will be made after the data collection exercise with 4 weeks after presentation of the inception report. The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and elaboration of the evaluator’s observations and analysis.
* **Draft evaluation report** – The Evaluator will present a Draft Report within 5 weeks after presentation of the inception report.
* **Final Evaluation Report**. The evaluators will present a Final Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments from UNDP.
1. **COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM**

**Team Leader will work with national consultant employed by UNDP Malawi**

* 1. **Qualifications**

The Evaluation Team Leader must satisfy the following qualifications:

* Minimum of Master’s degree in in economics, business administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to development assistance management and economic governance;
* Proven experience in leading consultancy teams;
* Track record of conducting evaluation of national development projects in any of the following areas: 1) aid and development effectiveness; 2) public sector management capacity development; 3) capacity building for development planning, budgeting, M&E or Results Based Management;
* Experience in conducting evaluations of UN agency project, outcome and Country Programme or UNDAF evaluations in the past five years;
* Excellent communication skills for report writing and presentation of research and evaluation projects backed by extensive technical reports and publications.
* Availability between 15 January and 31 March, 2015.

**Team leader competencies:**

* Institutional Strengthening
* Public sector management
* Strategic thinking
* Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
* Team work skills and experience in leading teams
* Result oriented

1. **TIME AND DURATION:**

The evaluation team will be hired for a combined total of 50 man/days.

Contract Start Date: 19 January, 2015. Contract End Date: 31 March, 2015.

1. **TIME TABLE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Weeks** |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Contract and Entry meeting | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception report, draft revised |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synthesis and development of report of main findings and recommendations (Including inputs from output assessor) |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Summary of main findings and interpretation and conclusions (including inputs from output assessors) |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Drafting and submission of Evaluation Report |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Receipt of comments from stakeholders and reference group members |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Revision and submission of Final Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |

**EVALUATION ETHICS**

Responsibility of the CO to ensure credibility and independence of evaluation; responsibility of TL to provide impartial, evidence-based, report adhering to international evaluation standards, etc.