

## Terms of Reference (ToR)

### Mid -Term Evaluations of the programme: Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation (A2J)

#### 1. Introduction

In September 2013, the One UN in Rwanda signed a joint flagship Programme on Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation (A2J). The purpose of the joint programme is to strengthen the capacities of key national institutions to promote access to justice, human rights and peace consolidation.

The programme is aligned to the national priorities and programming cycle of the Government of Rwanda and the One UN through the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy II (EDPRS II (2013-2018)) and the UN Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP (2013-2018)).

The A2J Programme responds to the EDPRS II foundational issues which consider the rule of law, unity and reconciliation, security and stability as key drivers for economic transformation. It also responds to priorities expressed in the Justice, Reconciliation, Law and Order Sector (JRLOS) Strategic Paper 2013-2018. It focuses mainly on strengthening access to justice, rule of law, human rights, safety and peace. It specifically contributes to the achievement of UNDAP Result 2, Outcome 2 which is: "*Human rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*".

The outcomes for the A2J programme are: citizens and especially the most vulnerable groups will have access to equitable justice and enjoy their basic human rights while contributing to building a more peaceful society that is conducive to sustainable peace and development.

The joint programme has the following UN partners: UNDP, UNICEF, UNWOMEN and OHCHR.

The Implementing Partners for the A2J programme are the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST), which implements activities related to access to justice and human rights protection; the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), which implements Human Rights related activities; the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which promotes unity and reconciliation among Rwandans and the Rwanda National Police (RNP), which implements activities related to crime prevention through implementation of community policing concepts.

The joint programme is funded through multiple sources of funds including the One UN Fund, which is a pooled fund mechanism, in addition to UNDP core resources. UNDP is the Managing Agent of the One UN Fund.

By September 2015, the A2J programme will be implemented for a period of two years and in line with the programme documents, are due for mid-term evaluation. The One UN is, therefore, looking for an individual consultant to undertake the evaluation of the joint programme.

#### 2. Purpose of the Mid Term Evaluation

---

The mid-term evaluation will cover 24 months (September 2013 to-September 2015). This mid-term programme evaluation will focus on this implementation period.

The midterm evaluation are forward looking and will capture effectively lessons learned and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the A2J programme. The evaluation will assess the programme' design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. They will collate and analyze lessons learned, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the second phase of implementation (October 2015 - June 2018) of the joint programme.

The emphasis on lessons learned speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future planning. The evaluations will assess the performance of the programme against planned results. They will also assess the preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of sustainable development goals. The findings and recommendations of the evaluations will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the Government of Rwanda- through the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST), the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and the Rwanda National Police (RNP), UNDP and other One UN agencies, especially those partaking in the A2J programme.

### **3. Scope and focus of the Mid-term Evaluation**

---

#### **3.1 Scope**

The A2J mid-term programme evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy. This will include the implementation modalities and co-financing by One UN sister agencies, One UN Fund and the Government of Rwanda. It will also look at issues of coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation will include review of the project design, and assumptions made at the beginning of the programme development process. It will assess whether the programme results are on track; capacities built, and cross cutting issues of gender and human rights have been addressed. It will also assess whether the programme implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The mid-term evaluation will also assess the synergy between the two programs as well as other programs implemented in the area of accountable governance and suggest ways of creating more synergy. The linkage of results to overall UNDAP results framework will be analyzed including the relevance of the indicators set.

#### **3.2 The Evaluation Questions**

The following key questions will guide the mid-term programme evaluation:

##### **i).Relevance – (The design and focus of the programme)**

- To what extent are the stated outcomes and outputs for the A2J Programme on track?
- To what extent have the A2J results so far contributed to the UNDAP and EDPRS 2 results in the area of Accountable Governance and Foundational issues related to Rule of Law?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or hindering achievement of the intended outputs and outcomes?
- Was the strategy adopted and inputs identified, realistic, appropriate and adequate for achievement of the results?
- Has the partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- To what extent has One UN support contributed to the achievement of the results?
- Do the programme continue to be relevant to the GoR priorities in governance?

##### **ii). Effectiveness – (The management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery)**

- Are the programme management strategies for both programme effective in delivering desired/planned results?
- Is there a suitable M&E framework to monitor and support the implementation of the targeted results?
- Are the strategies and tools used in programme implementation effective?
- Are the programme effective in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results can we show?

##### **iii). Efficiency – (Of Programme Implementation)**

- Are the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized?
- What factors are contributing to implementation efficiency?
- Do the programme' activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and /or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- Could a different approach have produced better results?
- How is the program management structure operating?
- How efficient are the management and accountability structures of the programme?
- How did the programme financial management processes and procedures affect programme implementation?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the programme implementation process?

#### **iv). Sustainability**

- To what extent are the benefits of the programme likely to be sustained after the completion of these programme?
- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the programme outcome and benefits after completion of each of the programme?
- How effective are the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the programme including contributing factors and constraints?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of the Programme outcome and the potential for replication of the approach?
- How are capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged.
- What are the recommendations for similar support in future?

#### **4. Institutional arrangements**

The evaluation will be managed by the One UN (UNDP) in collaboration with a review panel made of representatives of implementing agencies. The UNDP Head of the Management Support Unit shall be the focal person for the evaluation and the interlocutor with the Governance Programmes. An individual consultant will be hired for the mid-term evaluation of the A2J program.

#### **5. Methodology for Evaluation:**

The midterm evaluation of the A2J Programme will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and fully compliant with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (206). This is a mid-term evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the A2J implementation and its performance and to make recommendations for the remaining implementation period.

#### **5.1. Data Collection**

The mid-term Evaluations of the A2J Programme will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the GoR institutions, CSOs as well as development partners, and right holders. Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with One UN and the Government officials, as well as with development partners are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location), where possible.

In order to use existing sources/information and avoid duplication, data will be mainly collected from various information sources through a comprehensive desk review that will include the analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, triangulation of different studies etc. Data will also be collected from stakeholder key informants through interviews, discussions, consultative processes, and observations in field missions. This phase will be comprised of:

- (i) Review and analysis of relevant documents including the GoR programmatic documents & reports, the One UN Rwanda programmatic documents & reports, recent studies and research reports, developmental and social reports, (see list attached and relevant links)
- (ii) Critical analysis of available data with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UN inputs to the GoR. The midterm evaluation of the A2J programme will benefit from and use optimally the data collected through the Country-Led Evaluation of DaO, the UNDP annual reports, Independent Evaluation of DaO, UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and independent project evaluations.

## **5.2. Basic Documents for Desk Review**

The mid-term Evaluation of the A2J Programme will take cognisance of One UN Annual Reports, the Country-led Evaluation, The governance outcome evaluation report, the UNDAF final evaluation Report, Independent Evaluation of DaO, and other agency evaluations/reports to determine the effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality to support achievement of national priorities. These

The Mid-term Evaluations should also take into account the lessons learned from the Country-led Evaluation and Independent Evaluation, UNDAF Evaluations in terms of:

- (i) Response to the national development objectives (programme relevance);
- (ii) Creating a common, coherent and results-oriented strategy for successor programme
- (iii) Facilitating joint programme to the extent possible (reducing overall transactions costs)

***(Other suggested reference documents are in Annex 3.)***

**Table: Timeline for Deliverables and related Activities**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Time allocated</b>
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	<b>Inception report</b>	<b>3 days</b>
Inception Meeting Initial briefing		
Documents review and stakeholder consultations	<b>Draft report</b>	<b>20 days</b>
Field Visits		
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft Evaluation Report		
Validation Workshop		
Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP/One	<b>Final evaluation report</b>	<b>7 days</b>

UN Rwanda		
Total number of working days(for both programs)		<b>30 days</b>

## **6. Expected Deliverables:**

The following deliverables are expected. Every individual consultant will deliver separately the following:

1. **Inception report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluator's understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders the Ministry of Justice, the National Commission for Human Rights, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and the Rwanda National Police, the programme teams, UNDP, etc.) - have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated.
2. **Draft Mid-term Programme Evaluation reports** - The consultant will prepare draft Evaluation Report for A2J programme, cognisant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of evaluation reports (see annexes). The report will be submitted to the A2J Programme Steering Committees through the UNDP Country Director for validation. Comments from the Steering Committee and stakeholders will be provided within 10 days after receiving the Draft Report. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The report will be produced in English in Kigali, Rwanda.
3. **Final A2J Mid-term Programme Evaluation Reports.** The final report (30-50 pages) for the programme will include comments from the Steering Committees, UNDP, the evaluation review panel and stakeholders will be submitted 10 days after receiving all comments. This will be submitted to the A2J Programme Steering Committee through the UNDP Country Director for validation. It will include recommendations, policy options and conclusions. (**Recommended structure of the report is in the Annexes**)

## **7. Duty Station**

The duty station of the work is Kigali, Rwanda. However, the consultant may be required to travel to project sites outside Kigali.

## **8. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

The individual consultant shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

- 30% after adoption of the inception reports
- 30% after presentation of the draft reports
- 40% after the approval of the final reports

The consultancy fee instalments will be paid as Lump Sum Amounts inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy). The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

## **9. Required expertise and qualification**

An individual consultant with the following expertise and qualification:

- At least master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant university degree;
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance , inclusive

participation, , access to justice, human rights promotion, conflict prevention and peace building and support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections;

- At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors;
- Extensive experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience in evaluating similar programmes
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Fluency in spoken French will be an added advantage.

## **10. Management Arrangements for the Evaluation**

- UNDP will contract individual consultants (one individual consultant per program) on behalf of the Government of Rwanda and the UN Agencies. UNDP as the focal point for the evaluation will facilitate the logistical requirements for consultant including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.
- The A2J mid-term Programme Evaluation process will be led by the Steering Committee of the joint Programme and shall provide overall guidance and direction for the review process.
- A Technical Committee, led by the A2J Programme Manager comprised of the Programme's implementing partners' representatives, will contribute to this assignment and support the process at technical level and provide regular reports to the A2J Steering Committee. The Chief of the Management Support Unit will provide technical oversight, quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria.

## **11. Time-Frame for the Evaluation Process**

- The evaluation will be conducted in October 2015 for an estimated 30 working days. Upon signing of the contract, the consultant will be given the necessary working documents for reference. The consultants will be provided with information.

**Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:**

- A. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- B. Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar evaluations, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- C. Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- D. Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

## **12. Selection Criteria**

***Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:***

The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%. A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and compared. Only proposals that achieve above the minimum of 49 points (i.e. at least 70% of the total 70 points) on the technical proposal shall have their financial proposals reviewed.

#### Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)

If the technical proposal achieves the minimum of 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial proposal will be taken into account in the following manner:

The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g.

$[30 \text{ Points}] \times [\text{US\$ lowest}] / [\text{US\$ other}] = \text{points for other proposer's fees.}$

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

<b><u>Criteria</u></b>		<b>Max. Points</b>
<b><u>Technical</u></b>		
At least master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Law, Conflict Prevention, Development studies, International Development or any other relevant university degree	10%	10
Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance, inclusive participation, support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections; rule of law, access to justice, human rights and conflict prevention	20 %	20
Overall Methodology	40%	40
Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation; experience in evaluating similar programmes	20%	20
At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors; and demonstrable experience working for the United Nations System	5%	5
Fluency in English and a working knowledge of one of the other language	5%	5

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>
--------------	-------------	------------

### 13. Annex 1; Recommended List of Documents

- Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
- Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013 – 2018), September 2013
- Republic of Rwanda, Annual Progress Reports on the implementation of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) – 2008
- Republic of Rwanda, Education Sector Strategic Plan (2006-2010), Ministry of Education, 2006
- United Nations Rwanda, One UN 'Delivering As One' in Rwanda Concept Paper, April 2007
- United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018
- United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, Common Operational Document (2008-2012)
- United Nations Rwanda, Communication Strategy
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Evaluability Assessment of Delivering as One Pilots, Assessment Report on Rwanda, March 2008
- United Nations Rwanda, Annual Reports 2013 & 14
- United Nations Rwanda, Stocktaking report 2008 & 2009 for Delivering as One in Rwanda
- Project document: A2J
- Annual progress reports 2013-2014 and 2014-2015
- End of the Programme Evaluation of the Support to Access to justice for all, the Foundation for Good Governance and Poverty Reduction, Rwanda (2008-2013).
- Governance outcome Evaluation
- JRLOS strategic Plan 2013-2018
- Joint Sector Review Report for the Justice Sector (2013-2014, 2014-2015)
- Documentation of 20 years of Reconciliation (NURC)
- 2015 UPR report for Rwanda (CSO, NCHR, UN Compilation, GoR)
- Relevant web links

#### **Studies, Surveys and Evaluations**

- THE RWANDA Demographic and Health Survey Reports (2010 RDHS)
- Integrated Household Living Condition Survey (2007-2008)
- United Nations & Republic of Rwanda, Country-led Evaluation of the Delivering As One, 2010
- The Independent evaluation of the DaO in Rwanda
- Sectoral studies and evaluations
- Rwanda Governance Score Card (RGS 2012, 2014)

### **Annex 2; Structure for Mid-Term Programme Evaluation Report for A2J**

#### **Title page**

Name of programme or theme being evaluated  
Country of project/programme or theme  
Name of the organization to which the report is submitted  
Names and affiliations of the evaluators  
Date

#### **List of acronyms**

#### **Executive summary**

A self-contained paper of 1-3 pages.

Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the

A2J Programme Evaluation, methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order.

**(Main Report; Maximum 35 pages)**

**Introduction**

(Context and national priorities, goals, and methodology, brief description of the results)

Describe the project/programme/theme being evaluated. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, the outcomes, the outputs, the scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention.

Summarize the A2J Programme purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria.

Describe the methodology employed to conduct the A2J Programme Mid-Term Evaluation and its limitations if any.

Detail who was involved in conducting the A2J mid-term Programme Evaluation and what were their roles.

Describe the structure of the A2J mid-term Programme Evaluation reports.

A Reflection on the main findings which considers: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with all the stakeholder categories

- Results by UNDP Outcome: national progress, (specific contribution of UN agencies and resources mobilized etc.

**Partnership and collaboration** strategy among UNDP/GoR/IPs, Donors; and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the A2J programme as a partnership framework

**Major Challenges**

**A2J Financial Management**

**Assessment of M&E process**

**Findings and conclusions**

State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Assess the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles, gender mainstreaming and human rights based approach. In providing a critical assessment of performance, analyse the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact. To the extent possible measure achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms. Analyse factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative. Discuss the relative contributions of stakeholders to the achievement of results. Assess how/if the intervention has contributed to gender equality and fulfilment of human rights.

Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected. They must relate to the A2J objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions. They should also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors.

**Recommendations and lessons learned:**

Based on the findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)' overall experience in other contexts if possible provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.

Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, conclusions made and lessons learned. Discuss their anticipated implications. Consult

key stakeholders when developing the recommendations.

List proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order.

**Annexes may include the following (maximum 10-15 pages)**

Attach ToR (A2J mid-term Programme Evaluation).

List persons interviewed, sites visited.

List documents reviewed (reports, publications).

Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, Survey, etc.).

- Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.  Photos
- Stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC])

***\*The Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation Programme Evaluation Report should be developed in accordance with the UNEG “Standards for Evaluation in the UN system”, “Norms for Evaluation in UN System and “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.” Analysis should include an appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results. It will consider the evaluation objectives as per relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of results, as well as the key issues of design, focus and comparative advantage.***

**Annex 3: Sample Evaluation Matrix**

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis