

TERMS OF REFERENCE

International and National Consultants to conduct two evaluations:

1. Sustainable local and regional development Outcome Evaluation and
2. Final Evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme

Job title:	Team of 1 International and 1 National Consultants to undertake two evaluations: 1. Sustainable local and regional development Outcome Evaluation and 2. Final Evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme
Contract type:	Individual Contract (IC)
Contract duration:	August - October 2015
Expected Workload:	International Consultant – 36 days of consultancy, incl. 1 mission to Moldova National Consultant – 33 days of consultancy

A. OVERALL CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

Moldova is a low middle-income country in transition with real GDP growth at 4,7 percent during January-September 2014, despite the continued global economic and financial crisis. Moldova's economic growth remains mostly consumption-based, with benefits mainly concentrated to the capital and couple of other cities. This growth is mostly driven by recovering remittances and expanding exports. However, this performance is yet to transform into sizable gains for the whole society. In 2014 however, growth slowed down due to increased economic pressures. The Russian Federation, absorbing almost 30% of Moldovan exports and accounting for over 50% of migrants' remittances, temporarily blocked Moldovan wine and fresh fruit exports, and restricted labour migration contributing to a significant decline of economic growth from 8.9% in 2013 to 4.6% in 2014. The significant depreciation of the Russian ruble contributed to the instability in the volume of remittances in 2014.

This recent growth did little to alleviate the urban-rural divide, as more than 70% of the country's poor reside in rural areas, while the labor market remained stagnant. Rural population is, therefore, the most vulnerable segment of the society in terms of welfare and security. Moldova displays a significant economic polarization coupled with disparities between regions and a widening development gap between rural and urban areas. According to Ministry of Economy data, the South remains the poorest (eight times poorer than Chisinau), followed by Center, North and Gagauzia regions. While economic activity and qualified labour force are concentrated in the capital, socio-economic development of rural areas is weak, focused predominantly in the agriculture sector with a poverty ratio outside the capital around 23-30%. In 2014, the average disposable income of a rural inhabitant was 29% lower than an urban one and 7% below the average national subsistence level (MDL 1,627.1). Poverty levels are further compounded by non-monetary dimensions, such as limited access to water and sanitation. This, coupled with stagnant decentralization reform and low employment rate, contributes to a high level of labor migration.

Moldova moved from 55.9 in 2006 to 64.5 in 2014 on the World Bank's Doing Business Distance to the Frontier indicator, measuring how far a country is from global best practice. Reforms in business registration, business regulation, licenses, authorizations, tax administration, insolvency and other areas have reduced the time spent by management on meeting regulatory requirements from 17% in 2005 to 10.7% in 2013.

The existing macroeconomic framework is considered broadly adequate, even though macroeconomic risks associated with the financial sector, vulnerabilities to external and climatic shocks, institutional weaknesses and related slippages in the implementation of macroeconomic and structural reforms will continue to be substantial over the medium-term. European integration anchors the Government's policy reform agenda, but political tensions and weak governance pose risks to reforms. Given the regional geopolitical climate the prospects for substantial progress in the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict remain dim.

The evolving geopolitical context and political instability affected the re-integration of the breakaway Transnistrian region. The region's de-facto administration avoided any serious engagement with Moldova's EU association process, opting for the Eurasian Union instead. Despite the resumption of dialogues between Chisinau and Transnistrian leadership, little progress was seen in the 5+2 confidence building talks. Positive changes were observed on the non-political side, where civil society actors established joint initiatives and cross-river partnerships. A positive signal was also the adoption by Transnistrian leadership of an action plan following the release of the first UN human rights report on the Transnistrian region.

Employment rates in Moldova are among the lowest in Europe and Central Asia due to a significant decrease in Labor Force Participation (from 53% to 41% compared to 60-70% for countries in Europe and Central Asia). The general unemployment rate was 3.9% in 2014, however unemployment among youth aged 15-24 was 9.8% and a cause of concern. According to government statistics in 2014, 15.5% of men and 7.8% of women of working age were working abroad or looking for work abroad. The Ministry of Labor, Social Protection and Family undertook considerable steps to ensure the protection of migrants' rights to social security outside the country. The UN system supported the signing of two and the negotiation of four agreements focusing on equal treatment and social security rights of all migrants in the destination country.

Local governments in Moldova play a significant role in the provision of public services and bear primary responsibility for water supply, sanitation, local roads construction, and maintenance and heating. Currently, the local governments are left fragmented, underfinanced and providing services that are inadequate and of poor quality and in many cases are inaccessible for women and men representing vulnerable groups of population. Following the basic principles set up in the Moldovan Constitution which guarantee equal human rights throughout the country, access to quality education, health and social services, as well as the access to clean water, environment and basic infrastructure; it is clear that there is no alternative to implementing the local governance reform, financial autonomy and fiscal decentralization; that may clarify roles and functions, and provide sufficient financial resources to meet those development and societal objectives. The continuous delay of these improvements, as well as maintenance of the current level of inequalities have a great impact on human rights in Moldova and will only deepen if no concrete steps are taken to overcome this. The improvement of the much-needed public service in rural areas will depend on the ability of the government to fast track local governance reform.

B. SPECIFIC BACKGROUND

Against this background United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2017 response is aimed at contributing to the establishment of a modernized public administration system properly capacitated to effectively and efficiently develop, budget, implement and monitor evidence-based policies in support of the country's priorities and European integration objectives and is also integrated into the United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) "Towards Unity in Action". Results achieved with the UNDP and relevant UN Agency's assistance will contribute to the achievement of CPD Outcome 2 which refers to Access to more equitable sustainable regional development, economic opportunities - innovation and agriculture in particular - and decent work. The assistance is provided through UNDP programmes and projects, as well as through the joint projects implemented in cooperation with the other UN Agencies – UN Women, UNICEF, WHO with co-funding by Donor partners, such as the EU, Governments of Sweden, Denmark, Swiss and Romania, and in collaboration with the national partners, such as the State Chancellery, line Ministries, Parliament, Bureau of Reintegration, other central Government institutions and the local authorities. To review the progress achieved in the above-mentioned Outcome and within the Joint Integrated Local Development (which contributes to the Outcome achievement), UNDP in partnership with UN Women are commissioning 2 evaluations, according to the Evaluation Plans.

I. Sustainable local and regional development outcome evaluation

I. a. Brief description of the Outcome to be evaluated

Results achieved with the UNDP and relevant UN Agency's assistance will contribute to the achievement of the Country Programme Document Outcome 2 which refers to *Access to more equitable sustainable regional development, economic opportunities - innovation and agriculture in particular - and decent work*. The assistance is provided through UNDP programmes and projects, as well as through joint projects with other UN Agencies – UN Women, UNICEF, WHO. These are co-funded by various development partners, such as the EU, Governments of Sweden, Denmark, Swiss and Romania, being implemented in collaboration with the national partners, such as the State Chancellery, line Ministries, Parliament, Bureau of Reintegration, other central Government institutions and the local authorities.

For the Outcome evaluation, the following Outputs falling under this Outcome, as stated in UNDP CPD 2013 – 2017, are to be part of this evaluation:

CPD Outcome	Outputs	Indicator/Baseline/Target	Programmes/Projects
People have access to more equitable sustainable regional development, economic opportunities - innovation and agriculture in particular - and decent work.	1. LPAs ensure sustainable development and access of vulnerable to public services by empowering communities, promoting PPPs and inter-municipal cooperation	Indicator: Deprivation Index; Baseline: North 472, South 455, Center 462; Target: increase by 10 % per region;	Joint Integrated Local Development Programme
	2. Labour force competitiveness (focused on women and vulnerable) improved, by vocational education and job opportunities	Indicator: Gender wage gap; Baseline: 76.4%; Target: reduce by 2 p.p ; Indicator: Employment Rate, disaggregated by urban/rural, geographical areas, gender and age Baseline: General: 41.9%, women 48.1%; Target: increase by 10 p.p	Innovative business for local development Innovative Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Employment
	3. Partnerships created between communities, businesses, CSOs across Nistru River for better services/business infrastructure.	Indicator: # of projects in Transnistria (incl. gender sensitive); Baseline: 36 Target: 125	Confidence Building Measures II & III Strengthening Human Rights in TN

I. b. Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation will put the major focus on assessing the progress achieved within the Outcome 2 “People have access to more equitable sustainable regional development, economic opportunities - innovation and agriculture in particular - and decent work” and the impact produced so far under the area of intervention, as well as draw conclusions and recommendations for eventual adjustments, and, to extend possible, lessons learnt for further programming and implementation of programme. The evaluator shall also give importance to assessing efficiency and to a possible extent effectiveness of the CPD Outcome 2, whether the size of resources, both financial and human, and partnership strategies continue to be cost-effective and may be applied in continuation and/or revised/changed.

The evaluator shall take into account and rank the following items:

- Status and degree of change in the Outcome, and factors influencing the Outcome
- Level of incurred changes: Enabling environment, Organizational and/or individual levels
- UN/DP’s strategic positioning on achieving the Outcome
- Relevance of the Outcome and outputs
- Partnership strategy
- Sustainability: whether there is ownership and capacity to maintain and manage development in the Outcome

Worksheet on Outcome Evaluation: Categories of Analysis/Scope

Category	Notes
Progress to outcome realization	Review indicators to determine extent/degree of contribution in the outcome realization by assessing progresses made to-date vis-à-vis

	baseline. Focus on the how and why outputs and strategies contributed to achieving outcome. Focus on questions of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.
Factors affecting outcome	These are political, economic and social factors. As such, the evaluation scope shall be as broad as possible so as to take all factors into account
UN's contribution to outcome	Conduct quantitative and qualitative assessments of contributions from UNDP's own and joint interventions vis-a-vis outcome indicator baseline. Assessment should focus on determine the continued validity of the strategies applied to-date by UN/DP and so as to decide whether they should be revised and/or changed for the next programming cycle
Partnership strategy	Determine whether the best possible synergies have been established among partners and the steering role played by UN/DP within this context. Assess whether other stakeholders and/or sponsors should be included and/or excluded from the programme in continuation as well as referring to the next phase of CPD

I. c. Specifically, the Outcome evaluation shall address, but shall not be limited to the following questions:

1. Outcome analysis

- Are the Outcome and associated projects/programmes relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and UN/DP's mandate?
- Where the actions to achieve the outputs and outcome effective and efficient?
- Where there multi-level interventions conducted (environment, organization, individual)? How many?
- Are the outputs and outcome leading to benefits beyond the life of the existing projects?
- Which findings may have relevance for eventual adjustments and/or future programming?
- Are the stated outcome, indicators and targets appropriate for the development situation in Moldova and UN/DP's programme of assistance in this field?
- What is the current status and prospects for achieving the outcome with the indicated inputs and within the indicated timeframe?
- What are the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UN/DP's interventions that affected or are affecting the achievement of the outcome? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards outcome?
- Were UN/DP's proposed contributions to the achievement of the outcome appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable?

2. Output analysis

- What are the key outputs that have been produced by UN/DP to contribute to the Outcome?
- Are the UN/DP outputs relevant to outcome?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the Outcome, or is there a need to improve these indicators?
- Is sufficient progress been made with regard to UN/DP outputs?

3. Resources, partnerships, and management analysis

- Was UN/DP's resource mobilization strategy in the field appropriate and effective in achieving the Outcome?
- Was UN/DP's partnership strategy in the field appropriate and effective in achieving the outcome?
- Are UN/DP's management structures and working methods appropriate and effective in achieving the Outcome/
- Overall, assess the scope, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of UN/DP's resource mobilization, partnership and management arrangements in achieving the Outcome.

4. Recommendations

- Based on the above analysis, recommendations should be provided as to how UN/DP should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures for an efficient and effective implementation of the current UNPF/CPD.

I. d. Key deliverables

Outcome 2.1 Evaluation report - a comprehensive analytical product in English that should, as a minimum, include the following contents:

- Executive summary;

- Introduction;
- Description of the evaluation methodology;
- Analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
- Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for the future programming, incl. concrete recommendations for the second phase of the project;
- Key findings (including best practices and lessons learned);
- Conclusions and recommendations;
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

I. e. Timeframe

It is expected that the evaluation would be conducted during August – October 2015.

Activity Timeframe:

Activity / Deliverable for the International Consultant	Activity / Deliverable for the National Consultant	Place
Evaluation methodology and work plan for the outcome evaluation agreed 1.5 w.d.	Provide inputs to methodology and work plan 2w.d.	online /home based
All relevant input documents reviewed <u>home based</u> <u>2 w.d.</u>	Background materials for the International Consultant collected 2 w.d.	online /home based
<u>Visit to Moldova.</u> Project site visits, interviews with partners and key stakeholders conducted. Summary key findings presented to UNDP CO 4 w.d.	Field visits and meetings with relevant parties for the International Consultant arranged. Participation in the meetings 5 w.d.	In Chisinau
Drafting of the Evaluation report (<u>home based</u>) 5 w.d.	Inputs to the draft Evaluation Report provided. 4 w.d.	online /home based
<u>On line presentation</u> 0.5 w.d.	Presentation of the Outcome evaluation report to UNDP and key stakeholders 0.5 w.d.	Online
Finalization of the evaluation report. Final Outcome Evaluation report submitted and approved 2 w.d.	Inputs to the final evaluation report provided. 1 w.d.	online
Total estimated number of working days – 15, out of which 4 days on mission to Moldova	Total estimated number of working days – 14.5	

Chapters C-I are relevant for both tasks. Please refer to information below.

II. Final Evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme

II a. Brief description of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme to be evaluated

The Government of Moldova explicitly acknowledges that decentralization represents an essential item on the reform agenda of the country. The goal is to provide quality services to women and men equitably - including the rights of persons from vulnerable groups - through building autonomous and democratic local governments, able to manage efficiently their responsibilities. Thus, on April 5, 2012 the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova adopted the National Decentralization Strategy that represents the main policy document in the field of local public administration and establishes the national mechanisms to ensure genuine local autonomy.

The Development Objective of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme, implemented by UNDP and UN Women, is to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy.

The Immediate Objectives of the Programme are: (1) To support the Government in improving the policy and legal framework as mandated by the National Decentralization Strategy to ensure local autonomy, availability of resources, and more effective local management for better and equitable service provision, and (2) To improve the capacity of LPAs to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion.

The project consists of two inter-related outputs as follows:

Output 1: *Policy and legal frameworks to support autonomous, efficient and financially-sustainable LPAs developed and implemented.*

Activities under the output 1 aim to support for the elaboration of sector-specific strategies and the assistance to different central government institutions to actually implement the NDS. From 2014, financial resources for the JILDLP activities under this output were not available, except for some interventions on specific topics that were financed from UNDP's and UN Women's TRAC funds, as well as by other donors and with the active involvement of the JILDLP team. In 2014-2015 JILDLP activities was limited in the assistance to the rayons piloting the new local public finance system and the elaboration of the sectoral decentralization strategies for communal services. Another important activity was providing assistance to Government in developing a public policy document on the territorial administrative reform in the Republic of Moldova.

Output 2: *Capacities of LPAs and communities strengthened to deliver better services to citizens and create models of LPAs - in line with changes brought by the Decentralization Strategy.*

Under Output 2, the interventions at the local level aimed at developing models of operational local governments - 'champions of change' - by providing support to implement changes in the operation and structure of local governments in line with the changes brought by the Decentralization strategy. JILDLP assisted LPAs in improving their capacity and operations and support 30 pilot target communities and their local authorities to provide quality public services to achieve sustainable economic and social development, in the main areas affected by the Decentralization strategy. The quality of life of local communities as well as empowerment of the most vulnerable women and men, increased through further supporting to implementation of the projects (in 20 communes and 10 clusters of communities) using innovative tools such as inter-municipal cooperation, private-public partnerships and e-governance, among others, to serve as best examples of decentralized arrangements for service provision at local level. To ensure an integrated approach to local governance and development, support for the development of an enabling environment for local business development and identification, implementation of innovative income generating activities with a particular focus on vulnerable women and men was provided.

II b. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

This evaluation has a twofold purpose

- 1) **Review the progress made by the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme** in fulfilling its agreed objectives through the planned activities and to assess the efficiency and effectiveness with which resources have been used to generate results and achieve project objectives with special emphasis on impact and sustainability.
- 2) Gather **findings, lessons learned and recommendations for potential follow-up interventions**, for the expansion of JILDLP interventions beyond 2015, which UN Moldova can offer as support to the Government in view of advancing with the implementation of the decentralization reform.

The UNDP Country Office and UN Women Country Office accordingly will make use of the exercise as a learning opportunity for the offices and key partners and stakeholders, as inclusively and practically possible. In particular, the findings and recommendations generated by the evaluation should inform the implementation and targeting of activities planned for the next stage of the project development.

The **overall objectives** of evaluations are to assess the achievement of project results, help identify and critically analyze the relevance of the project activities, as well as, the effectiveness of the implementation. The comprehensive evaluation will examine whether the activities, outputs and objectives outlined in project document have been achieved, and underlying factors affecting either positively or negatively the implementation of the project, draw lessons and make forward-looking recommendations for improvement of the sustainability of benefits obtained from the project.

Specific evaluation objectives include:

- Analyze the relevance of the programme's implementation strategy and approaches to the project's results chain;
- Review the relevance of the logical framework and respective Monitoring and Evaluation Plan of the programme;
- Validate project results in terms of progress toward the achievement of outcomes and outputs;
- Assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts;
- Document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges to inform future work of both UNDP and UN Women and key stakeholders on local development;
- Document and analyze possible weaknesses in order to improve future intervention interventions in the area of women, peace, and security programming.

II c. Evaluation Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. An overall guidance on project evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (Annex A)* and *UN Women Evaluation Handbook (please see annex section)*. The evaluators should come up with a suitable methodology for the evaluation of this intervention based on the guidance given therein.

The evaluation will address the criteria of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

More specifically, the evaluation will address the following key questions:

1. Relevance:

- A) How does the programme design match with the complexity of national structures, systems and decision-making processes?
- B) Is the project design based on quality analysis, including gender and human rights based analysis, risk assessments, socio-cultural and political analysis and conflict assessments?
- C) Were the programmatic strategies appropriate to address the identified needs of key different target groups?
- D) What capacities and skills should UN Women and UNDP prioritize and further develop to bring greater coherence and relevance to future intervention on local development?

2. Effectiveness:

- A) What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved?
- B) What are the key factors affecting the achievement (or lack of) of the project results?
- C) To what extent have capacities of relevant duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened?
- D) Does the project have effective joint monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results?
- E) How adaptably and rapidly did project react to changing country context?
- F) To what extent has the joint programme promoted or led to improved communication, synergies, coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders, e.g. between different line ministries and among government and civil society?
- G) To what extent this joint programme affected increased collaboration, coordination, and information exchange between UNDP and UN Women in relation to local development?
- H) To what extent has this joint programme modality contributed to inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, etc. among the UN agencies involved in the design and implementation of this programme?

3. Efficiency:

- A) Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outcomes? B) Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? Was programme design approach considered a viable and relevant execution instrument to attain development results?

4. Sustainability:

- A) To what extent are relevant national stakeholders been included in programme design and implementation and policy advocacy processes?

- B) What is the likelihood that the benefits from the project will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time after the project phase out?
- C) How effectively has the programme been able to contribute to the generation of national ownership of the results achieved, the establishment of effective partnerships and the development of national capacities?
- D) To what extent has the programme been able to promote replication of successful strategies?
- E) To what extent has the programme promoted or led to improved communication, synergies, coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders, e.g. between different line ministries and among government and civil society stakeholders?

II d. Expected deliverables

1. **Inception report** which contains evaluations objectives and scope, findings from inception meetings with all relevant stakeholders, initial desk review, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approaches (separately for Outcome and JILDLP evaluations), data collection tools, data analysis methods, key informants/agencies, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. It should include a clear evaluation matrix linking all these aspects
2. **JILDLP draft and final evaluation report**- comprehensive analytical product in English that should include as a minimum the following contents:
 - Executive summary;
 - Introduction;
 - Background
 - Description of the evaluation approach and methodology;
 - Key findings
 - Conclusions;
 - Lessons learned
 - Recommendations;
 - * Annexes: including Evaluation ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.
3. Based on the assessment of the implementation of the current JILDLP phase, draft a **Concept note**, where the evaluation recommendations are developed to continue future programme implementation (app. 10 pages).

II e. Stakeholders Participation and Evaluation Management

The evaluation will be a consultative, inclusive and participatory process and will ensure the participation of all relevant groups. Special attention will be given to representativeness of all target groups including central and local public authorities, national and local legislative bodies, CSOs, diverse community groups and representatives, etc. The evaluation will be Human Rights and Gender responsible.

UNDP and UN Women will designate two persons each as the Evaluation task manager that will constitute the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) for this evaluation and who will be responsible for day-to-day management of the evaluation process, the review of the deliverables, of sharing deliverables with ERG and consolidate their comments and provide them to the evaluation team,

Upon completion of the evaluation exercise, a stakeholders' validation workshop will be organized, where the main evaluation findings and recommendations will be discussed, as well as the main ideas for the Programme way forward.

Within six weeks upon completion of the evaluation, UNDP and UN Women have the responsibility to prepare a Management Response (MR) that addresses the recommendations included in the evaluation.

This is a consultative/participatory final project evaluation with a strong learning component. The EMG of the evaluation will ensure that key stakeholders will be appropriately consulted so this process is transparent and properly informed.

II f. Timeframe

It is expected that the evaluation would be conducted during August – October 2015.

Activity Timeframe:

Activity / Deliverable for the International Consultant	Activity / Deliverable for the National Consultant	Place
---	--	-------

Evaluation methodology and work plan for the evaluation and concept note agreed 1.5 w.d.	Provide inputs to methodology and work plan 1w.d.	online /home based
All relevant input documents reviewed <u>home based</u> 2 w.d.	Background materials for the International Consultant collected 2 w.d.	online /home based
<u>Visit to Moldova</u> . Project site visits, interviews with partners and key stakeholders conducted. Summary key findings presented to UNDP CO and UN Women CO. 6 w.d.	Field visits and meetings with relevant parties for the International Consultant arranged. Participation in the meetings 6 w.d.	In Chisinau
Drafting of the final JILDLP Evaluation report (<u>home based</u>) 4 w.d.	Inputs to the draft Evaluation Report provided. 3 w.d.	online /home based
Drafting of the Concept note 4 w.d.	Inputs to the Concept note 3 w.d.	
<u>On line presentation</u> 0.5 w.d.	Presentation of the Report and Concept note. Briefing with UNDP and UN Women, as well as key implementing partners. 0.5 w.d.	Online
Finalization of the evaluation report and concept note. Final documents submitted and approved 3 w.d.	Inputs to the final evaluation report and concept note provided. 3 w.d.	online
Total estimated number of working days – 21, out of which 6 days on mission to Moldova	Total estimated number of working days – 18.5	

Chapters C-I are relevant for both tasks. Please refer to information below.

C. GENERAL TERMS OF EVALUATION

Both the **Mid-term evaluation of the Outcome 2** of the UNDP Country Programme Document and the **final evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme** will be conducted by one International Consultant and one National Consultant, working together as a team. The International Consultant will take the leadership and assume overall responsibility for the quality and timeliness in the performance of this assignment.

Both evaluations must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. An overall guidance on project evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (Annex A)* and *UN Women Evaluation Handbook (please see annex section)*. The evaluators should come up with a suitable methodology for the evaluation of this intervention based on the guidance given therein.

During the evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following participatory and consultative approaches for data collection and analysis:

- **Desk review** of relevant documents (project documents with amendments made, review reports - midterm/final, donor-specific, etc.);
- **Discussions with the Senior Management** and programme staff of UNDP Country Office and UN Women Country Office (on JILDLP evaluation); Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, UN Women and the Government, as well as with other donors and partners (on JILDLP final review);
- **Interviews with partners and stakeholders** (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used);
- **Field visits** to selected project sites and discussions with project beneficiaries;

- Consultation / stakeholders' meetings.

Interviews will be held with the following key partners, organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- *UNDP Moldova CO (both evaluations)*
- *UN Women Moldova CO (JILDP evaluation)*
- *EU Delegation (both evaluations)*
- *Bureau for Reintegration (Outcome evaluation)*
- *Ministry of Economy (both evaluations)*
- *USAID Local Government Support Project in Moldova (JILDP evaluation)*
- *GiZ Modernization Public Services in Moldova (JILDP evaluation)*
- *State Chancellery (both evaluations)*
- *Ministry of Finance (JILDP evaluation)*
- *Ministry of Environment (JILDP evaluation)*
- *Ministry of Regional Development and Construction (both evaluations)*
- *Ministry of Education (both evaluations)*
- *Ministry of Labor Social Protection and Family (both evaluations)*
- *At least 3 Local Public Authorities (both evaluations)*
- *At least 3 CSOs leaders and community mobilisers (both evaluations)*
- *At least 3 Managers of inter-municipal enterprises (JILDP evaluation)*
- *Congress of Local Authorities from Moldova (both evaluations)*
- *Syslab Career Center representatives (Outcome evaluation)*
- *NGO IDIS Viitorul (both evaluations)*
- *NGO Institute for Urban Development (both evaluations)*
- *NGO Contact Centre (both evaluations)*
- *NGO Tarna Rom (JILDP evaluation)*
- *Academy of Public Administration (JILDP evaluation)*

D. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The International Consultant will be assisted by a National Consultant in fulfilling the assignment. The members of the evaluation team must not have been associated with the project's formulation, implementation or monitoring.

The International Consultant will undertake one field visits to Moldova (10 working days). The National Consultant will provide substantive feedback and support to the International Consultant in the construction of the evaluation report and in conducting field missions to Moldova (including field visits). Otherwise, the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the Outcome evaluation.

E. EVALUATION'S ETHICS

Evaluations (the review) in UN agencies are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (Annex B). The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key information providers in the collection of data.

F. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

International Consultant

- Lead the evaluation and assume overall responsibility for its quality and timeliness;
- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and Evaluation outline;
- Briefing with UNDP and UN Women CO representatives, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the Evaluation report prior to the first mission;
- Interviews with project implementing partners, relevant government bodies, NGO, independent experts, beneficiaries and donor representatives;
- Field visit to the project sites and interviews conducted with local stakeholders;
- Elaboration of a summary key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner;
- Development and submission of the first Evaluation report draft. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final Evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

National Consultant

- Collection of background materials upon request by International Consultant;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodology, work plan and Evaluation report outlines upon request by International Consultant;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in desk review of materials;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in developing the mission agenda and establishing meeting with relevant stakeholders;
- Participation in debriefings with UN Women and UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Arranging field visits and assistance to the International Consultant in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites, provision of interpretation in communication with beneficiaries when required;
- Assist the International Consultant in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Participation in briefing with UNDP, UN Women and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in developing the first draft of the Evaluation report. The draft will be shared with the UNDP, UN Women, and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Assist the International Consultant in finalization of the Final Evaluation Report.

G. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Each candidate will be required to submit an aggregated financial offer (“aggregated financial offer” is the total sum of all financial claims of the candidate for accomplishment of the task), which includes proposed consultancy fee, travel costs, visa costs (if required), per diem (for accommodation, meals and local transport / communication). In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. The consultant will be provided with the necessary administrative and logistical support to enable them deliver on the expected outputs.

Payment will be disbursed in two installments upon submission and approval of deliverables and certification by the UNDP Programme Manager that the services have been satisfactorily performed.

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals:

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

1. Proposal: explaining why they are the most suitable for the work including past experience in similar evaluations (brief information on each of the required qualifications, item by item);
2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, per diems, travel costs, phone calls etc.);
3. Duly completed and signed P11 Form, and at least 3 contacts for references.

H. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCIES

The International and National Consultants must possess the following qualifications:

International Consultant:

- Master’s degree or equivalent in Management, Business Administration, Economy, Public Administration, Public Finance, Local Development and/or other relevant fields;
- At least 8 years of work experience in the areas relevant to the assignment (decentralization, regional and local development, economic, consulting services, participatory and sustainable development);
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting monitoring and/or evaluation of development projects in the local development field;
- Knowledge and experience with programming development, monitoring and evaluation;
- Excellent analytical and writing skills;
- Excellent spoken and writing skills in English. Knowledge of Romanian or Russian is an advantage;
- Familiarity with development approaches in the decentralization in the region is a strong advantage;
- Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations, in particular, respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status.

UNDP Moldova is committed to workforce diversity. Women, persons with disabilities, Roma and other ethnic or religious minorities, persons living with HIV, as well as refugees and other non-citizens legally entitled to work in the Republic of Moldova, are particularly encouraged to apply.

National Consultant:

- University degree in Public Administration, Public Finance, Local Development, or other related areas;
- Minimum 5 years of professional experience/technical knowledge in providing management or consultancy services to the preferably in local development and decentralization fields;
- Good understanding of Moldovan decentralization policies and strategies;
- Previous experience with practical use of monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Experience in managing, monitoring and evaluating projects for UN or other international development agencies in the region will be an asset;
- Fluent in English and Romanian both written and spoken. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage;
- Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations, in particular, respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status.

UNDP Moldova is committed to workforce diversity. Women, persons with disabilities, Roma and other ethnic or religious minorities, persons living with HIV, as well as refugees and other non-citizens legally entitled to work in the Republic of Moldova, are particularly encouraged to apply.

•

I. REFERENCE MATERIALS

The following documents shall be studied by the evaluators:

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (Annex A)
2. UN Women Evaluation Handbook¹
3. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (Annex B)
4. UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR, MPTF) for Moldova (2013, 2014)
5. JILD Project Document (Description of Action) and relevant progress reports
6. National Development Strategy Moldova 2020
7. Government of the Republic of Moldova Activity Programme (2015 – 2018)
8. Development Partners' Briefing Book for the Government of Moldova
9. Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports
10. UNDP Assessment of Development Results, 2012
11. United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) "Towards Unity in Action" (2013 – 2017)
12. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2017
13. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations²
14. UNEG Ethical Guidelines³
15. UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System⁴
16. UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System⁵
17. UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender in the UN System⁶
18. UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and related Scorecard⁷
19. Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

Other official documents and materials related to the domain from the government, donors, etc.

Background documentation is available on www.undp.md; www.gov.md; <http://descentralizare.gov.md/?l=en>

¹ <http://genderevaluation.unwomen.org/en/evaluation-handbook>

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

⁴ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

⁵ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

⁶ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

⁷ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1452>