Inception Report

Mid-Term Evaluation
of the

Joint Programme on
Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation
(A2J JP)

Submitted to
UNDP Rwanda
by Craig Naumann

November 5, 2015

List of Acronyms

A2J – Access to Justice
A2J JP - Joint Flagship Programme on Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation
AWP – Annual Work Plan
BOS – Business Operations Strategy
BPR – Business Process Review
CEDAW – Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women
(C)CPD – (Common) Country Programme Document
CSO – Civil society organization
DHS – Demographic and Health Survey
DaO – Delivering as One
EDPRS – Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
GBV – Gender-based violence
GoR – Government of Rwanda
IC – International Consultant (= the hired evaluation expert carrying out the MTR)
IP – Implementing partner
JP – Joint Programme
JGA – Joint Government Assessment
JRLOS - Justice, Reconciliation, Rule of Law & Order Sector
KAP-B – Knowledge, attitude, practices and behavior (qualitative dimensions of data, survey and indicator designs)
MAJ - Maisons d'Accès à la Justice
MINECOFIN – Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINIJUST – Ministry of Justice
M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC – Most significant changes
MTR – Mid-term review
NCHR - National Commission for Human Rights
NGO – Non-governmental organization
NURC - National Unity and Reconciliation Commission
OECD-DAC – Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
OHCHR – Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
ProDoc – Programme Document
PUNO – Participating United Nations Organisation
RBM – Results-Based Management
RGS – Rwanda Government Scorecard
RNP – Rwanda National Police
ROAD – Results Oriented Annual Report
RRB – Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer
SOPs – Standard Operating Procedures (here: in DaO context)
ToC – Theory of Change

ToR – Terms of Reference
UN – United Nations
UNDAF – United Nations Development Action Framework
UNDAP – United Nations Development Assistance Plan
UNDP – United Nations Development Programme
UNEG – United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF – United Nations Children's Fund
UN Women – United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UPR – Universal Periodic Review
VAW – Violence against Women

Table of Contents:

1. Introduction

In September 2013, the One UN in Rwanda signed two joint flagship Programmes, one on Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizen Participation and Accountable Governance (DDAG) and the second on Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation (A2J). The purpose of the A2J joint programme is to strengthen the capacities of key national institutions to promote access to justice, human rights and peace consolidation.

The A2J joint programme has the following UN partners: UNDP, UNICEF, UNWOMEN and OHCHR. Its Implementing Partners are the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST), which implements activities related to access to justice and human rights protection; b. the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), which implements Human Rights related activities; c. the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which promotes unity and reconciliation among Rwandans; and d. the Rwanda National Police (RNP), which implements activities related to crime prevention through implementation of community policing concepts.

In terms of programme design the A2J JP was designed around three strategic concerns, viz.: (1) access to justice with special focus on the most vulnerable groups, including women and children; (2) human rights; and (3) peace consolidation. These strategic areas were moulded into five JP outputs, namely: 1) Strengthened Capacity of the Justice Sector (JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for women, children, and the most vulnerable; 2) Enhanced national capacities for the promotion, mainstreaming human rights and implementing treaty body and UPR recommendations; Output 3: Fundamental rights of children promoted through birth registration; Output 4: Enhanced mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, unity and reconciliation; and Output 5: Project management and oversight functions enhanced.

In line with the accountable governance priorities formulated in the EDPRS 2 and UNDAP as well as the Justice, Reconciliation, Law & Order Sector (JRLOS) strategic paper 2013-2018, the programme specifically contributes to the achievement of Result 2, Outcome 2 of the UNDAP which is "Human rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels".

The strategic focus of the A2J JP built upon progress made in the fields of governance, peace building/transitional justice and human rights. The CCPD notes that through the UN's support to justice sector reforms and the introduction of the sector-wide approach during preceding programming cycles, significant improvement had been registered in terms of national reconciliation, rule of law and good governance in general.

For instance, support to the home-grown grassroots initiative of the *gacaca* courts is reported to have resulted in over 1.5 million cases related to the 1994 genocide being successfully processed, in addition providing valuable lessons for future transitional justice programmes. Furthermore, in terms of support to the human rights agenda, support to ratification and/or or reporting on related conventions, treaties, laws etc. was provided (e.g., CEDAW, the UPR).

Based on the lessons learned from EDPRS1 and the review of the predecessor UN programmes, a particular focus was given to the issue of capacity building targeting key institutions at central and local level; the underlying logic and ultimate aim being to improve service delivery in the justice sector and the promotion of human rights principles. Related activities included capacity building support for, inter alia, the "Maisons d'Accès à la Justice" (MAJ) in all 30 districts of the country, and the "Abunzi" community mediators.

The following excerpts from the A2J ProDoc (pg. 7-9) present the backbone of the programme design, as well

as related core assumptions and objectives, which will all need to now be put to the test during the MTR in terms of to what degree assumptions provedcorrect, whether the overall strategy still holds up after the test of the first couple of years of implementation, etc.:

1. *Theprogramme will respond to the EDPRS2 foundational issues which consider the rule of law, Unity and Reconciliation, Security and Stability as key drivers for economic transformation.*
2. *The programme will strengthen the capacities of national institutions including decentralised institutions and CSOs to deliver quality justice to all with special emphasis on the most vulnerable people. It also intends to promote human rights, peace, unity and reconciliation.*
3. *In the area of access to justice, the programme will provide support to the key national institutions and in particular the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST), the Supreme Court, the National Prosecution Authority, the Supreme Court and the Rwanda National Police, to ensure access and delivery of justice for all, with special focus on the provision of legal aid to the most vulnerable groups including children, women and inmates. Special focus will be placed on supporting the JRLOS to improve the vertical and horizontal coordination of justice segments including monitoring and evaluation both at central and decentralized level. Community justice mechanisms such as Abunzi and the MAJ will be strengthened for better service delivery at local level.*
4. *The UN will also contribute to Rwanda's efforts to bring the remaining suspects of the Tutsi genocide in 1994 before the specialized chamber for genocide crimes. In this regard, the UN will provide technical advice to support research, case investigations and advocacy on genocide justice.*
5. *The programme will further support the improvement of case management within the justice sector institutions especially through the establishment of an integrated case management system which will help in tracking the incoming cases and the way they are processed.*
6. *Support will also be provided to the implementation of the new Justice for Children Policy and Strategic Plan which will contribute to the enhanced access to justice for children by making the justice system in Rwanda responsive and child-friendly, including giving due weight to the voice of the child.*
7. *In order to engender JRLOS reform, the UN will support a gender audit which will serve as a basis for UN support to the gender related interventions in the JLROS.*
8. *In the area of human rights promotion, the programme will strengthen the capacity of national institutions namely the MINIJUST, National Commission on Human Rights, and Civil Society Organisations to comply with Rwanda's reporting obligations and implementation of Treaty Body and UPR recommendations. The UN Support will specifically strengthen national capacities (including government and CSOs) to promote and mainstream human rights and implement Treaty Body and UPR recommendations by ensuring timely and quality reporting, including parallel reports by CSOs.*
9. *Support will be provided to the National Commission for Human Rights to conduct a capacity assessment exercise that will take stock of past achievements, assess capacity gaps and make recommendations on areas that need capacity development. Special focus will also be on building capacity of the National Commission for Human Rights and other relevant stakeholders to develop and implement human rights related strategies.The UN will also work with key national institutions to ensure the recognition, promotion and incorporation of international human rights law in all national processes and initiatives.*
10. *In the area of crime reduction and prevention, the programme proposes to conduct a crime rate survey that will help the Rwanda National Police to more accurately determine the crime rate in the country and to better analyse the crime statistics. The findings of the survey could be of importance to other researches mainly the Governance Score Card and the Reconciliation Barometer.*
11. *Special attention will also be paid to institutional capacity strengthening of the Rwanda National Police force to prevent, investigate and adequately respond to crime, particularly related to Gender Based Violence (GBV), domestic violence and violence against children. The programme will strengthen the capacity of the Community Policing Committees to prevent crimes in their communities.*
12. *In the area of Unity and Reconciliation of Rwandans, this programme will sustain the progress made in restoring relationships and rebuilding trust among Rwandans following the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi. In particular, the UN will support strengthening of the capacities of NURC and community actors to promote dialogue, undertake further research, mediation, unity and reconciliation processes at both central and local level including the strengthening of reconciliation forums. To ensure availability of quality data on peace, unity and reconciliation, the UN will support further research initiatives including sustaining the reconciliation barometer.*

(While the evaluation matrix presented in this inception report presents the broad outline of key questions, the above issues and many others that will crop up throughout the first days of intense desk review of the literature will be fed into the detailed semi-structured interview guidelines that will use the general evaluation matrix as general guidance and stepping stone.)

Overall, the underlying theory of change for capacity building support through the A2J JP maintains that the strengthening the capacity of service providing institutions and their respective staff will result in improved services to the ultimate A2J JP beneficiaries, namely the Rwandan citizens at community level.

Other than UNDP core resources, the A2J joint programme is financed through multiple sources of funds. Other than in-kind contributions by the GoR, the resources include core fund resources from UN agencies, and resources from the "One UN Fund" pooled fund mechanism with UNDP as its Managing Agent. The One Fund monies are partly managed via pooled funding with the remainder being funnelled through parallel funding, by UNICEF.

For the 5-year programme duration (01 July 2013-30 June 2018), the support to be provided by the participating parties comprised in-kind support by GoR, US$ 5,202,295 of UNDP core resources, UN WOMEN to contribute US$ 330,000, OHCHR US$ 100,000, UNICEF providing US$ 712,500, US$ 4,000,000 through the One Fund, and an unfunded component of US$ 2,771,715. In total, the budget planned for in the A2J JP ProDoc amounted to US$ 13,116,510 out of which US$ 10,344,795 (almost 79%) were declared as being effectively secured and thus available funding. UNICEF's parallel funding component amounted to some 5.4% of the entire estimated budget, or roughly 6.9% of the budget component declared as secured.

2. MTR's Purpose and Scope

The present inception report is a means to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders - MINIJUST, NCHR, NURC, RNP, the programme teams, UNDP, etc.) - have a shared understanding of the objective(s), scope, expected contents and structure of the evaluation and its related deliverables or outputs in the form of reports and (de)briefings. The inception report, which is the first contractual deliverable of the MTR, presents the Individual Consultant (IC)'s understanding of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. As key element, the inception report contains the evaluation matrix that summarizes the evaluation's overall design and methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection/analysis tool(s) for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated.

By September 2015, the A2J JP had been implemented for a period of two years and in line with the programme documents, has by now become eligible for a mandatory independent mid-term evaluation. This report marks the beginning of the independent mid-term review of the A2J JP programme. As such, the present Inception Report is the first of three deliverables of the mid-term review evaluating the A2J JP's design, scope, implementation status and overall capacity to achieve expected outcomes.

The mid-term evaluation covers the 24 months period from September 2013 to September 2015, with a focus on the actual implementation of the programme rather than initial ramp-up activities. The evaluation will be conducted in November 2015 and will conclude in early December, at the latest, upon submission of the final evaluation report incorporating stakeholder comments and reactions to the draft final report.

The mid-term evaluation will address the "classic" UNEG/OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability; as well as the added criterion of (initial) signs for (potential) early impact of the JP's programme interventions. As such, the evaluation does not differ from an end-of-programme cycle, or "summative", evaluation. However, the fundamental difference here is that the IC is now tasked with conducting a formative evaluation.

Hence, this Mid-Term Evaluation of the A2J JP is to determine the extent to which the Programme objectives as outlined in the project document (and other relevant programme frameworks the JP is articulated with, such as the UNDAP and related to this the agency (C)CPDs, annual A2J WP annual work plans etc.) have been achieved.

In cases where the performance against planned milestones or preliminary targets has been sub-optimal, the evaluation will strive to identify the roadblocks and barriers preventing the IPs to move forward. Likewise, the evaluation will probe for hints and ideas to accelerate and/or enhance the quality of implementation even in cases of activities that were implemented according to the initial plan. Possible gaps, challenges and lessons learnt for the scope, design and implementation modalities of the joint programme going forward during the remaining three years of the JP's life span will be looked into.

Synergies and catalytic effects realized, be they planned for or unforeseen, will be duly noted. Similarly, unforeseen negative effects will also be recorded. Data-driven observations and findings will serve as evidence for the MTR to present actionable recommendations to address the long-term stability of the JP. In this context, it is worthwhile mentioning that, all things being considered, the recommendations that shall be emanating from this MTR can still influence almost 60% of the actual implementation period of the JP if swift action will be taken.

Moreover, the MTR will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the second phase of implementation (up to June 2018) of the joint programme. The evaluation will assess the programmes' design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. In view of the fact that the MTR is prospective, i.e. forward looking, it will capture lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the A2J 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 programmes 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 A2J joint programme's intent was for it to be 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 (EDPRS2 (2013-2018)) and the UN Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP (2013-2018)). The degree to which this has been achieved in its final design will be part of this imminent mid-term review.

In this regard, the logic and "finishing" of the JP's architecture in terms of the pitch and respective articulation of interfacing results levels will be reviewed in the vertical sense of the results chain, i.e. top-down (from Vision 2020 to EDPRS2 to JRLO Strategic Plan to relevant UNDAP result(s) and outcome(s) to JP outcome(s), and from the bottom upwards.

As has been mentioned before, the A2J Programme is meant to respond to the EDPRS2's 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 which focuses mainly on strengthening access to justice, rule of law, human rights, safety and peace. The A2J JP was specifically designed to contribute to achieving UNDAP Result 2, Outcome 2 which is: "*Human rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*".

Finally, the outcome for the A2J programme as such is: *"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 programme is thus expected to contribute to the realization of Rwanda's vision 2020 that aims at making Rwanda a middle income country by 2020.

The A2J mid-term evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the chosen implementation strategy. This will include the implementation modalities, the targeting of IPs, and the financial arrangements including elements of national execution as well as 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 programmes development process.

The MTR will assess whether the programme's 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's implementation strategy has been optimal and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The mid-term evaluation will also assess the synergy between the Access to Justice Program and other programs implemented in the area of accountable governance and suggest ways of creating more synergy. The linkage of results to the overall UNDAP results framework will be analyzed including the relevance of the indicator set.

The findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation will inform key A2J JP stakeholders including the Government of Rwanda (GoR) – namely, the Ministry of Justice (MINJUST), the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and the Rwanda National Police (RNP) –, the PUNOs (i.e., UNDP,UN Women, UNICEF, OHCHR), and civil society.

The remaining deliverables of the MTR comprise the draft MTR evaluation report and the final report. The Draft Mid-term Programme Evaluation report will be submitted to the A2J Programme Steering Committee through the UNDP Country Director for validation. The final report (30-50 pages) will include the final set of recommendations, policy options and conclusions. Through amending, adding or eliminating content in line with comments received, it will address and/or incorporate feedback provided by the Steering Committees, UNDP, the evaluation review panel and stakeholders.

3. Methodology and Data Sources

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 (2006). The MTR will capture and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data.

The mid-term evaluation 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. Briefing and debriefing sessions with One UN and the Government officials, as well as with development partners are envisaged. Data collected will 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 continuous 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 and other formal and informal consultative processes.

The literature review of relevant documents will look at GoR programmatic documents and reports, the body of reports on One UN Rwanda, recent studies and research reports, developmental and social reports. The MTR will also determine the effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality to support achievement of national priorities. Thus, it will critically analyze available data with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UN inputs to the GoR.

Data for a DaO-related analysis of the A2J JP will be derived from previous studies and assessments including the Country-Led Evaluation of DaO, the UNDAP annual reports, the Independent Evaluation of DaO, the UNDAF end-of-programme final evaluation report and independent project evaluations. Other related key reference documents comprise the mid-term Evaluation of the UNDAP One UN Annual Reports, the governance outcome evaluation report etc.

General and specific governance, JP and A2J-related lessons learned in the context of DaO as presented in those key documents will be collated and critically analyzed. This analysis of the A2J through the prism of the DaO approach will focus on the combined potential and actual performance of the A2J JP in the context of DaO, in terms of a. responsiveness, support and contribution to the national development objectives in the field of governance and EDPRS2's foundational issues (programme relevance); b. sustainability and potential or actual evidence for, or concrete elements in favour of the creation of, a common, coherent and results-oriented strategy for successor programmes; c. facilitating joint programmes to the extent possible (reducing overall transactions costs).

The detailed, comprehensive list of key literature and reference material to be consulted comprises the following documents:

1. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
2. Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013 – 2018), September 2013
3. Republic of Rwanda, Annual Progress Reports on the implementation of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) – 2008
4. Rwanda Governance Score Card; for years 2012 and 2014
5. United Nations Rwanda, One UN 'Delivering As One' in Rwanda Concept Paper, April 2007
7. United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, Common Operational Document (2008-2012)
8. United Nations Rwanda, Communication Strategy
9. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Evaluability Assessment of Delivering as One Pilots, Assessment Report on Rwanda, March 2008
10. United Nations Rwanda, Annual Reports "One UN Rwanda" 2013 & 2014
11. United Nations Rwanda, Stocktaking report 2008 & 2009 for Delivering as One in Rwanda

12. United Nations & Republic of Rwanda, Country-led Evaluation of the Delivering As One, 2010
13. The Independent evaluation of the DaO in Rwanda (2011)
14. A2J project documents
15. Annual JP review/progress report 2013-2014
16. Annual progress report 2014-2015 (alternatively: semi-annual report and/or quarterly reports, if available)
17. Results Oriented Annual Report / ROAR (2014; 2013)
18. End of Programme Evaluation of the Support to Access to justice for all, the Foundation for Good Governance and Poverty Reduction, Rwanda (2008-2013)
19. Governance outcome Evaluation
20. JRLOS strategic Plan 2013-2018
21. Joint Sector Review Report for the Justice Sector (2013-2014, 2014-2015)
22. Documentation of 20 years of Reconciliation (NURC)
23. 2015 UPR report for Rwanda (CSO, NCHR, UN Compilation, GoR)
24. Relevant Web links

In addition to the above, relevant web links, studies, and survey and evaluation reports such as the RWANDA Demographic and Health Survey Reports (2010 and 2014-2015 RDHS), the Integrated Household Living Condition Survey (2007-2008; 2014) and sectoral studies and evaluations will be consulted; as well as UNDP's official checklist used for the assessment of evaluation reports, and the official UNEG evaluation literature including "Standards for Evaluation in the UN system" etc.

In terms of the tools to be applied and data to be collected, overall, a mix of quantitative and qualitative data will be captured. Whenever possible, opportunities for data triangulation will be seized for cross-validation purposes. For instance, this will allow for trends, hypotheses and tentative statements to be tested. Draft versions of paragraphs/chapters will be shared with key stakeholders for preliminary commenting to enhance the quality and degree of tacit endorsement of the draft report, ensuring the smoothness of the process and requisite levels of buy-in for the final product.

A detailed log of stakeholder views will be kept which could also be submitted at the end of the mission to serve as added by-product of the analytical report for One UN UNCT/JP agency-internal consumption and reference.

Key methodological techniques and/or tools that are suggested for this MTR comprise the following items:

1. A critical review of the (overt or covert) underlying theory/theories of change as well as related risk analysis and respective employment/application thereof at Results, Outcome and output level will be closely scrutinized and submitted to an analytical critique.
2. A visual mapping (or graphic representation) of the JP results chain of key results and related performance indicators including concrete targets/milestones, incl. corresponding national strategic goals/results and indicators. This should help to assess the strategic relevance and responsiveness of the A2J JP's support in view of contributing to specific needs and requirements as laid out in the national development agenda. It will also allow to gauge the "vertical and logical fit" of the JP results chains.
3. The consultant will use the initial days of the in-country stay to review the logic and language of the results statements vis-à-vis their respective indicators, target sequence, data collection tools, MoVs. Related discussions on the vertical coherence of the indicator design etc. might result in revising the remaining annual targets either upwards or downwards. Metrics might also need to be amended if

the analysis and subsequent discussions see the need for "tweaking" the language and/or the substance of the results statement(s) and/or related indicator(s). Potentially, additional indicators might need to be introduced.

4. Since Rwanda is a DaO pilot country and the JP to be revised is a DaO Flagship, the results chains of the A2J JP outcomes will be vetted for their "jointness" at the activity cluster/key result level, including the operational coordination this requires. This will allow to determine the degree of maturity of the JP in terms of jointness (first generation JP of single agency outcomes; second generation of joint outcomes but single agency activities; third generation of joint key activities?).

5. A matrix of standard queries and tools (cf. "MTR Evaluation Matrix" further below) to be applied in stakeholder interviews will serve as guideline and scaffolding for data collection among participating UN agencies contributing to the JP under review, and analyzing/presenting qualitative analytical as well as assorted quantitative findings; likewise, IPs, recipients (both institutional and non-institutional beneficiaries) as well as interested or neutral observers will also be approached with the same tools, to the extent possible, to collect their view (about the perceived subjective quality of services delivered etc.).

6. The matrix is likely to be complemented with customized specialized queries building on the issues addressed in the generic evaluation matrix and the answers to those standard questions will elicit from various stakeholders. The questions will serve as semi-structured interview guide allowing for "heuristical flexibility" along the way as the dialogues or multi-logues (key informant interview, focus group discussion, plenary discussion etc.) will unfold, rather than quelling interesting thoughts developing by means of associating experiences etc. through a mechanical application of pre-formulated standard queries. Room will be made to systematically probe for key human interest stories as miniature research studies documenting "most significant changes" (MSC). Those MSC might qualify as game changers that could be presented as evidence for (likely) early impact of A2J JP interventions.

7. A simple trend projection tool serving to elicit discussions about likely progress against targeted results until the end of the joint programme period as well as related identified and projected/anticipated possible or likely future reasons for setbacks, delays, short-falls etc. and suggested (operational, logistical, procedural, sequential and/or strategic) solutions or, for anticipated issues, response mechanisms to address or avoid such challenges, bottlenecks and other related problems identified.

8. Progress mapping: Compiling "as is"/status quo-related performance data within the M&E matrix to confront the respective state of advancement per indicator (at output and outcome level) against the projected one-year and two-year performance marks. This will comprise M&E matrices at the various key levels of results frameworks covering relevant results and related indicator of the EDPRS2, the JRLOS, and the A2J JP. - A sample of the relevant sub-set of indicators from the EDPRS2's foundational issues section follows hereunder (N.B.: current progress data is not yet inserted and the design of the grid not yet amended, accordingly, to accommodate such status data in appropriately designed, inserted additional data fields or boxes):

EDPRS OUT COME	INDICATORS	UNIT	BASELINE (2012) VALUE	2015/16 TARGET	2017/18 TARGET	responsibility for reporting	Data source (MoV)
FOUNDATIONAL AND CROSS CUTTING ISSUES							

(Source: Annex 2/EDPRS Monitoring Matrix; EDPRS2 – Shaping our Development 2013-2018 (May 2013, MinFinRw); pg. 137)

28	Enhanced rule of law, accountability and business competitive-ness environ-ment	(a) Adult pop-ulation with confidence in the Rule of law	Percent	73.3 (2012)	74	>75	JRLOS	RGB
		(b) Adult pop-ulation with confidence in safety and security	Percent	91.3 (2012)	92	93	JRLOS	RGB
		(d) Adult pop-ulation with confidence in the Respect for Human Rights (Political Rights and Civil Liber-ties)	Percent	73.6 (2012)	75	76	JRLOS	RGB

(N.B.: A tentative recommendation can already be made in looking at the above indicator design: the inherent margin of error linked to the power of precision of related sampling approaches is such that the tiny incremental progress that is projected hereabove (the exception being the ">75" 2017/18 target for the first indicator) can in reality not be meaningfully measured. Hence, it would make more sense to recalibrate the indicators towards measuring change at the district level. This could be done by i.measuring change only for a sample of specifically targeted geographical areas for which the most significant progress is planned for, assuming that the incremental steps would be in the range of at least 10-15 percentage point increases; or ii. by changing the indicator's unit from % to "number of administrative units (if possible, at district level, if not then at the meso/macro-level of provinces or regions) showing significant progress" (e.g., increases >15 points). This is of course assuming that the actual data collected will reflect a level of progress in the range of significant, effectively measurable change outweighing the margins of error of inherently imprecise sampling techniques applied for qualitative surveys/KAPB indicators. While these indicators could potentially already be used for the sake of this evaluation should the collected raw data be accessible and allow for the required calculations, the recommendation will in all likelihood not be actionable straight away since it is assumed that access to the raw data and/or their suitability for the suggested re-design of the indicators will not be straightforward.)

An additional, related analysis would consist in looking closely at the (internal/off-line) risk log design and actual related data, specifically at the level of the A2J JP results matrix, which is likely to also be reflected in stakeholder interview data pertaining to challenges and bottlenecks encountered. Financial bottlenecks might also be mentioned here, which calls for another sub-set or related analyses (cf. the following item).

9. Ideally, pertinent financial breakdown data (planned, actually committed, actually spent at outcome and output level) could also be analyzed and confronted with implementation progress data against performance indicators (cf. Annex 2 for a few evidence-based discussion points related to this issue). The idea here would be to verify whether poor performance in moving towards planned results might be attributable to financial constraints. Lacklustre implementation might of course also be reflected in poor spending, hence the actual causal relationship (what is the cause and what the effect: poor financial performance leading to poor implementation results or vice versa) will always need to be taken into account. Here, one would draw on qualitative interview data. This type of more advanced analysis that would attempt to systematically look at the connection between financial data and results performance might not always be possible. Indeed, it is likely that it would only make sense in a few cases where a direct relation between funding against planned results and indicator design can be established. - The table of financial data against specific activities shown below (imported from pg. 26 of the A2J ProDoc) could be quickly amended in excel to then import actual spending data and analyze financial performance in terms of % against planned spending and similar analyses. This is of course based on the assumption that the detailed updates on actual spending can be quickly located in the various A2J JP reports or, if not, that they can be easily extracted from integrated corporate

admin/finance, accounting and payroll systems (ATLAS etc.).

8 WORK PLANS AND BUDGETS

Result hierarchy	Key implementing partners	Responsible Agency	Planned Budget in USD			Timeframe				
			Total Budget	Requested to One Fund	Agency contribution	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5
UNDAP Focus Area: Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights										
Expected Outcome: Human rights, justice and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels										
Output 1 : Capacity of the justice sector strengthened to increase access to justice, including for women, children and other the most vulnerable groups										
Key Action 1.1 Support the justice system to improve case management										
Activity 1.1.1: Establish an integrated automated case management system in the Justice Sector	*MINIJUST*	*UNDP*	770,000	370,000	400,000	231,000	308,000	231,000	-	-
Activity 1.1.2: Build the capacities of the Justice Sector[17] personnel to use the integrated automated case management system	MINIJUST	UNDP	589,165	289,165	300,000	35,281	302,154	251,730	-	-
Activity 1.1.3: Provide technical assistance and financial support for the maintenance of the established systems	MINIJUST	UNDP	435,660	235,660	200,000	102,330	102,330	77,000	77,000	77,000
Key Action 1.2: Provide technical and financial support to strengthen capacities for improved service delivery in the justice sector										
Activity 1.2.1. Provide technical support to judges in the higher courts in order to improve quality and timely judgments	MINIJUST/SUPREME COURT	UNDP	100,000	0	100,000	35,000	35,000	30,000	-	-
Activity 1.2.2. Assess the judicial system's capacity to manage and respond to genocide and international crimes	MINIJUST/NPPA	UNDP	150,000	50,000	100,000	150,000	-	-	-	-

[17] MINIJUST, SUPREME COURT, NPPA, RNP, COURTS

10. Stakeholder mapping, including the mapping of other stakeholders' activities in contributing to national goals, to inform the assessment of the JP's relative contribution (beyond lower to mid-level results exclusively attributable to the various UN agencies contributing to the JP that is being reviewed).
11. For overall assessment purposes, a ranking scale based on various (weighted) elements including financial efficiency, average delivery against milestones by indicator, overall progress against final (initial and/or revised) final target etc. could be employed, allowing to draw up a report card per outcome or (key)activities against specific criteria, as well as a final general grade or "traffic light".

The scheduling of interviews and selection of interlocutors will take into account the gender and social inclusion perspective. To the extent possible, all data will be systematically disaggregated by gender, age, social status, and region; and the analysis will reflect such disaggregation.

Other than the backward-looking part of the analysis which analyzes the ground so far covered, the forward-looking component will provide recommendations for the remainder of the joint programme period (and, if applicable, even beyond). Aspects to be covered in this part comprise the strategic positioning of the participating UN agencies contributing to the JP, funding/fundraising related issues, as well as suggestions related to programming (e.g., about amending/adding/dropping specific outputs/activities; about mainstreaming of capacity building, RBM, the gender dimension, sustainability etc.).

4. Potential Risks and Challenges & suggested related Risk Management Strategy

The following list of potential risks or challenges that the mission might be facing concentrate on factors that might hinder the smooth implementation of the data collection and analytical work foreseen for the in-country phase. It is hoped that only very few of the below factors will actually present themselves, and at a very limited scale, at that. However, experience shows that there is need for a detailed contingency plan. Hence, the various items all come with a number of related risk management strategies attached to them.

1. *Risk or Challenge:* No or incomplete status quo (or baseline) data available and/or no clear indication of data source or responsible data provider, milestones, year the baseline data (as opposed to report/publication) is from etc.) esp. for higher level qualitative metrics. Concern regarding evaluability of high-level indicators (A2J JP output level); and potentially even related UNDAP outcomes should similar issues occur, or even prevail, across the board.
   Risk Management Strategy: If clarifying issues mentioned is not possible, design proxy indicator and collect related data; triangulation and deductive tentative data reconstruction ("connecting the dots" in interrupted time series trend curves etc.); extrapolating from partial (geographically/space-wise or chronologically/time-wise) incomplete data against specific indicators; if spottiness of district and/or time series data too severe thus rendering general extrapolation impossible, data would need to be sifted through to see if robust data clusters can be identified allowing for limited samples of miniature case studies.

2. *Risk or Challenge:* Available estimates for given indicator as provided by different stakeholders or available in data sources are showing a (very) wide array of distribution.
   Risk Management Strategy: Cross-checking and calibration in view of data sources' specific margins of error and respective congruence or lack thereof, or rectification by elimination of specific data sets if seen as lacking in data quality and reliability.

3. *Risk or Challenge:* Results chain and/or related ToCs might be shaky or skewed.
   Risk Management Strategy: Suggest tweaking of indicators and, where necessary, of results (statements).

4. *Risk or Challenge:* No time for field visits might prevent gathering "the people's voice" given assumed differences between Kigali/the Capital and rural areas.
   Risk Management Strategy: Invite civil society to the Capital and/or gather them for meetings; visits to outskirts of Kigali could also be undertaken.

5. *Risk or Challenge:* Cross-cutting issues such as institutional capacity building and gender equality and women's empowerment might suffer from not gaining requisite breadth and width of the analysis, given that mainly institutions will be visited, not leaving enough time for meeting with and interviewing ultimate end beneficiaries (esp. of the most disadvantaged).
   Risk Management Strategy: Rely on existing qualitative and quantitative data available in reports and from IP and UN programme staff, and NGO/civil society personnel. In addition, to alleviate this potential blind spot, some field visits to the outskirts of Kigali could be organized so as to meet with direct beneficiaries.

6. *Risk or Challenge:* Brevity of in-country mission might prevent IC from meeting with all relevant stakeholders due to schedule coordination constraints on part of foreseen interlocutors and/or IC's availability for individual meetings.

Risk Management Strategy: A related counter-strategy could consist in lumping meetings into sub-categories of stakeholders with similar profile/areas of concern and intervention etc.; and also scheduling key meetings that would otherwise not be possible, to take place during week-ends.

7. *Risk or Challenge:* Interlocutors might not be available at all during mission.
   Risk Management Strategy: Writing might be an option if interlocutors are physically not available but can be reached by e-mail or skype; if they have no time during mission but could comment on draft report, this opportunity could be seized upon to gather feedback from these otherwise absent stakeholders, as well, in the interest of inclusiveness and ownership of the MTR's final findings and recommendations.

8. *Risk or Challenge:* If feedback is not provided on time but keeps trickling in way after the stipulated deadline, there is a risk of such late-coming input delaying the process beyond the agreed-upon timelines, or of antagonizing stakeholders whose late comments were not included in the final product submitted by the IC in line with the official schedule.
   *Risk Management Strategy: S*takeholders need to be clearly told that there is a well-defined finite window of opportunity for them to provide feedback, and that there is absolutely no room for negotiation in terms of accepting late input.

9. *Risk or Challenge:* Available financial data presented across various levels of reporting might not sum up. For instance, initial ProDoc planning figures might not be reflected in actual yearly planning figures (cf. Annex 2 where the evidence collected so far seems to indicate that as of year 1, JP budgeting figures against JP outputs were adjusted downwards). Also, unless already available, current (year 2014-2015 and/or Q3-2015) updated financial expenditure data needed for efficiency analysis might not be processed quickly enough and might thus not be available in time, thus preventing the IC from including such related analyses in the report.
   Risk Management Strategy: UNDP staff could carry out the analysis, themselves, and insert it into the final analysis, accordingly (should support be needed in devising a strategy how to do this, the IC could provide necessary guidance).

10. *Risk or Challenge:* 2015 Independent UNDAP 2013-2018 mid-term evaluation data might not be available in time.
    Risk Management Strategy: The IC could strive to calculate key metrics by himself or rely on readily available in-house analyses that are also supposed to feed into the UNDAP MTR. Should the UNDAP evaluation mission be already in-country, the IC will attempt to glean relevant insights from their on-going work for consideration in the context of the A2J JP MTR.

To illustrate some of the potential challenges as well as the envisioned analyses referred to on page 7 under Ch. 3/Methodology and Data Sources (following the sub-heading "Key methodological techniques and/or tools"), the following presents some tabulations the MTR tool-kit is going to attempt to work with and build upon; if possible in view of the risks and challenges referred to just above:

The table below is extracted from pg. 4 of the "Consolidated 2013-2014 A2J JP Progress Report". It is assumed that the first column shows baseline data but for both the baseline and the final target data (2018) the data sources and MoVs are lacking. It is assumed that the programme experts will be able to quickly provide the missing information so as to render the data apt for analysis. However, should this not be the case, then retrieving related details might pose a challenge, esp. with regards to time management.

UNDAP OUTCOME: Human Rights, Justice and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels.		
Indictor:	**Baseline :**	**Target:**
➢ *% of public confident with the justice system (disaggregated by age and sex) at all levels*	*60% public confident with justice system(disaggregated by age and sex);*	*80% public confident with justice system(disaggregated by age and sex)*
➢ *% of Adult population with confidence in the respect for human rights(political rights and civil liberties- (2012*	*77.1% confident with respect for human rights*	*79% confident with respect for human rights*

The following presents another, quite similar example: The original results framework (cf. page 11/original ProDoc; cf. immediately below) refers to UNDAP outcome and A2J JP output targets without specifying whether this is the final target set for late 2018. It is assumed that this is the case but still this would need to be verified. Likewise, there are no yearly milestones or preliminary targets mentioned here, which begs for the question whether this is listed elsewhere or these were supposed to be flexibly set when drafting annual work plans. These issues will be further looked into in discussing with UN staff and GoR stakeholders once the IC has arrived in Rwanda.

4 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

RESULTS FRAMEWORK						
Result hierarchy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Responsible institutions	
UNDAP Focus Area Accountable Governance						
Outcome 1: Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights: Human rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels.	(1) % of public confident with the justice system (disaggregated by age and sex) at all levels (3) % of Adult population with confidence in the respect for human rights(political rights and civil liberties- (2012) ;	1)60% public confident with justice system(disaggre gated by age and sex); 2)77.1% confident with respect for human rights	1)80% public confident with justice system(disaggre gated by age and sex) 2)79% confident with respect for human rights	JGA, RGS , RRB	UNDP,UNW,OHCHR, UNICEF	
Assumptions: GoR commitment to promotion of human rights						
Risks: - Weak national capacity to implement policy and strategies on gender equality and human rights - Lack of understanding on human rights and gender equality among citizens						
Output 1: Strengthened Capacity of the Justice sector (JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for Women, Children, And the most vulnerable.	1)Functional integrated case management system 2) % of the population including women and the most vulnerable satisfied with the judiciary (Abunzi, courts) at all levels 3) % of the population including women and the most vulnerable	1) None 2) Fairness in courts=77.9% (RGS) 3)RNP=94%,	1)Integrated case management system operational 2)Fairness in courts = 90% 3)RNP= 98%,	Reports RGS	MINIJUST, SUPREME COURT, NPPA, ONE UN	

A cursory glance at the related passage in the A2J JP Progress Report (pg. 7 etc.; see table copied below) seems

to indicate that no detailed progress data was available at the top results level (JP output level) for the first comprehensive annual progress review, which hints at the concern about data availability and thus, related evaluability.

OUTPUT 1

OUTPUT 1: Strengthened capacity of the justice sector (JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for Women, Children, and the most vulnerable

Key action (s)
1.1 Support the justice system to improve case management including setting up an automated and well-coordinated system
1.2 Provide technical and financial support to strengthen capacities for improved service delivery in the justice sector Support the establishment of forums and networks for applied research and policy debates
1.3 Support the justice sector to improve the vertical and horizontal coordination of justice segments including monitoring and evaluation
1.4 Provide technical support to improve performance of alternative (including restorative) justice mechanisms
1.5 Facilitate the provisions of legal aid to targeted vulnerable groups including women, children and in-mates

Indictors:	Baseline :	Target:
1) Functional integrated case management system	None	Integrated case management system operational
2) % of the population including women and the most vulnerable satisfied with the judiciary (Abunzi, courts) at all levels	Fairness in courts = 77.9% (RGS)	Fairness in courts = 77.9% (RGS)
3) % of the population including women and the most vulnerable satisfied with the services of Police and Prosecution	RNP = 94%, (RGS)	RNP = 98%, (RGS)

5. MTR Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation criteria	Key Questions (and sub-questions)	Indicator(s)/ Measures of Success	Data Sources/ Means of Verification	Data Collection Method(s)/Tool(s)	Method(s) for Data Analysis
A. Relevance (JP's design and focus)	-Does the programmes continue to be relevant to the GoR priorities in governance? -Is the JP contributing to achieving systemic transformative change as measured and reflected by top level national and sectorial (and UNDAP) outcome/impact level indicators? And if so, to what extent?	-Qualitative metrics incl. population's perception of and degree of satisfaction with services rendered, knowledge about them etc.: *-% of public confident with the justice system (disaggregated by age and sex) at all levels* *- % of Adult population with confidence in the respect for human rights, political rights and civil liberties* -Degree of conflict sensitivity (is the programme design and/or implementation	-EDPRS2; JRLOS; key informants (MINIJUST and general JRLOS; MINECOFIN) ; stakeholder perception/ opinion re any possible negative effects (conflict sensitive?) -Desk review of related key literature (key strategic JRLOS documents; ProDoc etc.)	-National statistical data sets such as household and living standards survey etc.; JGA, RGS, RRB and other related research reports/initiatives -Key informant interviews -Mapping of results chains to assess degree of articulation and alignment of JP outputs with UNDAP outcome and JRLOS and EDPRS2 strategic pitch -Programme/ policy mapping to identify similar or related programmes (contribution/attribution of results; gap analysis; synergies)	-Data triangulation across different data sources: type of data (quantitative/ qualitative; i.e. statistical data from various reports or surveys etc. vs. oral data from stakeholder interviews -Critique of ToC underlying design of results chain (still relevant? holding up against RBM logic etc.?)

Evaluation criteria	Key Questions (and sub-questions)	Indicator(s)/ Measures of Success	Data Sources/ Means of Verification	Data Collection Method(s)/Tool(s)	Method(s) for Data Analysis
		set-up conflict sensitive?)			
B. Effectiveness (The management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery)	-Is the programme management strategy 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 the JP's implementation effective? -Is the programme effective in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and are there any tangible results, so far? -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 Foundational issues related to Rule of Law?	-Qualitative data -Various performance indicators as reflected in results framework and/or M&E matrix (JRLOS, UNDAP, A2J JP, CCPD etc.); against these metrics, collect/collate/ map historical and most recent monthly/quarterly /yearly progress data ("as is"/status quo to measure actual performance delivery at activity/output level and effect at higher result level (JP Output, UNDAP outcomes	-Key informant interviews -Desk review of implementati on and review reports (incl. PUNO and IP reporting, JP consolidate progress reports, UNDAP/DaO-related reviews of JP implementati on etc.)	-Quantitative analysis of A2J JP performance indicators -Mapping of geographical and time spread -Semi-structured interview guidelines and questions -Tools for tracking and assessing performance of cross-cutting issues -Ranking tool (Likaert scale)	-Trend curves mapping data -Triangulation of data across respective types, categories and data sources

	-What factors have contributed to achieving or hindering achievement of the intended outputs and outcomes? -Did the strategy adopted and inputs identified prove 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? -JP/DaO-related value-added in terms of effective application and mainstreaming of UN Programming principles, partnerships leveraged, responsiveness to change in external needs and requirements, effectiveness and efficiency of governance structure, critical mass (strategic pitch; catalytic effect; leverage?)	etc.): number of milestones reached or surpassed etc. and reasons for actual performance realized/results achieved			

Evaluation criteria	Key Questions (and sub-questions)	Indicator(s)/ Measures of Success	Data Sources/ Means of Verification	Data Collection Method(s)/Tool(s)	Method(s) for Data Analysis
C. Efficiency (of Programme Implementation)	-Are the intervention strategy, related modalities and the implementation process achieving results efficiently? - 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's 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? -Are there specific indications for reduced transaction costs due to the adopted JP governance and implementation mechanisms incl. financial/general management? And conversely, did transaction costs increase in specific areas or	-Absorption rate of allocated (estimated and/or effectively available) funding by JP output and strategic activity -BOS/DaO SOPs-related metrics of operational performance and robustness	-JP progress reports (monthly, quarterly, annually) -JP ProDoc -PUNOs corporate integrated admin-finance data management systems (ATLAS etc.) -"Historical" evaluations of 1st generation DaO interventions	-Financial expenditure analysis; also, and especially, in relation to the actual implementation progress against planned results (measured by respective performance indicators) = Analysis of financial data (expenditure/absorption rate etc.): budget allocations, expenditure/by agency/by category of expenditure/by JP Output/by JP activity; all by year and cumulative total	-Calculating quantitative efficiency metrics (input vs. output and relative cost) -Comparative inquisitive analysis guided by cost effectiveness concerns (cf. related key questions) -Cross-country/regional comparison of costs for similar activities (per unit of output and according to scope/scale)

	not? If so, do gains outweigh losses; in other words, is the JP/DaO approach worth it? -Were DaO principles applied to the letter and if not, why so? Is there room for enhancing DaO and thus, overall JP efficiency and effectiveness? -Could a different approach (other than JP modality, specific design of results chains in terms of focus/substance/strategic pitch etc.) have produced better results? -Is the program management structure operating effectively, producing efficient results and synergies (in terms of reduced transaction costs etc.)? -How efficient are the management and accountability structures of the programme? -Are there issues related to the NEX/DEX (or NIM/DIM) question? -Has the parallel funding arrangement generated hoped-for efficiencies? Or is it disrupting the overall financial implementation of the JP as well as its general degree of cohesion?		-"Jointness" mapping along results chains and related BPR-inspired analysis of operational coordination and disbursement mechanism -Tailored interview questions to different groups and categories of key informants (GoR IP and PUNO senior managerial and technical JP Programme and A/F staff etc.); incl. individual interviews and focus group discussions	

	-Are there any concerns regarding the MA/pool fund arrangement and if so, what are they? -How did its financial management processes and procedures affect the programme's implementation? -What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the programme's implementation process?				
Evaluation criteria	*Key Questions (and sub-questions)*	*Indicator(s)/ Measures of Success*	*Data Sources/ Means of Verification*	*Data Collection Method(s)/Tool(s)*	*Method(s) for Data Analysis*
D. Sustainability (of JP's general implementation structure, modalities and processes, in the long run)	-To what extent are the benefits of the programme likely to be sustained after the completion of the JP? -What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the programme outcomes and benefits after completion of each of the JP? -How effective are the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the programme including contributing factors and constraints?	-Qualitative contextual data and high level indicators on political and social stability, economic development etc. (foundational issue indicators' meta-analysis) -Review of capacity building related results (cf. related indicators' progress in light of a parallel	-Key informants (IP/GoR, NGO/CSO community, PUNO JP staff) -Strategic documents (JP ProDoc) -UNDAF and UNDAP/DaO reviews -Donor community	-Analysis of risk log and phase-out plan/exit strategy -Gender and social inclusion analysis -Document Review -Key informants at IP level and among stakeholder institutions (incl. PUNOs), INGOs etc.	-Projection tool beyond end of JP implementation period (synergy with analysis of effectiveness dimension) -Triangulation of qualitative data from various sources (based on desk review and discussions)

		-What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of the JP's outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?	discussion of the SMARTness of these metrics)	(Development partners)	-Direct observation (visual evidence?)	
		-How are capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?				
		-What are the main lessons that have emerged from the implementation of the JP, so far?				
		-What are the recommendations for similar support in future?				
		-How keen are donors on providing further and/or future funding, i.e. both during and beyond the current 5-year programme implementation cycle?				
		-Are GoR IPs committed and "own" the programme? To what degree do they display a sense of commitment and ownership and is there any tangible proof for this that can serve as evidence?				

Evaluation criteria	Key Questions (and sub-questions)	Indicator(s)/ Measures of Success	Data Sources/ Means of Verification	Data Collection Method(s)/Tool(s)	Method(s) for Data Analysis
E. Early (indications for potential) Impact	-Are there any indications for (potential) impact triggered by the A2J JP? -Have there been any (potentially) quick-impact game changing effects that can be directly or indirectly linked to the JP (attribution or contribution/ indirect effects via catalytic chain of events that were willingly or unwittingly triggered by A2J interventions)? -What has been the impact of the programme on the MDGs and its future contribution to the SDGs, in particular SDG16/*Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development,provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels*, but also SDG5/*Achieve gender equality and empower all womens and girls* (and possibly SDG10/*Reduce inequality within and among countries*)?	-Qualitative evidence -Observational data -High-level results and statements and indicators (incl. MDGs and SDGs)	-Key informant interviews -If applicable, also national data sets (DHS etc.)	-(Early) Impact screening and peace building and social cohesion -MSC (most significant changes) garnered from formal and informal (key informant or beneficiary) interviews and desk review	-Systematically sifting through body of literature to extract concrete evidence/ human interest stories -Analysis of narrative/qualitative data collected through key informant interviews -If applicable, triangulation of qualitative with quantitative data

6. MTR Management Arrangements and Schedule

The management arrangements for the evaluation are as follows:

- The IC has been contracted by UNDP on behalf of the Government of Rwanda and the UN Agencies.
- Overall, the evaluation is being managed by the One UN (UNDP) in collaboration with a review panel made of representatives of implementing agencies.
- The A2J mid-term Programmes Evaluation process is carried out under the auspices of its Steering Committee, which will provide overall guidance and direction for the review process, as applicable.
- A Technical Committee, led by the A2J Programme Manager comprised of the programme's implementing partners' representatives, will support the process at the 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.
- 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.

Comments from the Steering Committee and stakeholders will need to be provided within 5 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. The final report will be finalized within 5 days after the consultant will have received final comments; and will subsequently be submitted through the UNDP Country Director to the A2J Programme Steering Committee for final validation.

The following MTR implementation schedule is suggested:

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan (Days 1-3)	*Inception report*	*3 days (home-based/ outside Rwanda)*
Inception Meeting Initial briefing (Day 4)	*Draft mid-term evaluation report*	*12 days (Rwanda-based)*
Documents review and stakeholder consultations/IP visits (specific calendar of possible meetings to be developed together with UNDP during first 3 days of stay in Rwanda); continuous iterative data collation, preliminary triangulation and analysis (Days 5-12)		
Final data analysis and triangulation, report writing (draft final report) (Days 13-14)		
Debriefing and presentation to various constituencies of draft Evaluation Report, in one joint session or several meetings (Day 15)		

Steering Committee and stakeholders to review draft final report and provideofficial comprehensive specific feedback within 5 days after receiving the Draft Report		
Finalization of Evaluation report incl. finetuning of analysis, editing, incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP on behalf of the UNCT Rwanda (Days 16-20)	*Final mid-term evaluation report*	*5 days (home-based/outside Rwanda)*
Total number of working days		*20 days*

The final version of the MTR report will be wrapped up and submitted to UNDP by the IC within 5 working days after the latter having received the final set of comments. Thereafter, the final mid-term review report will be subsequently submitted through the UNDP Country Director to the A2J Programme Steering Committee for final validation.

7. Annex 1 - Structure for A2J JP MTR Final Draft Report

Title page
Name of programme
Country of project/programme or theme
Name of the organization to which the report is submitted
Names, affiliations and signature of the evaluator
Date

List of acronyms

Executive summary
-A self-contained paper of 1-3 pages; summarizing essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the A2J Programme's mid-term evaluation, methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order.

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

i. Introduction
(Context and national priorities, goals, and methodology, brief description of the results)
-Describing the project/programme/theme being evaluated. This will include 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.
-Summary of A2J Programme rationale, purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria
-Description of Methodology utilized to evaluate A2J Programme and its limitations if any
-Discussing structure of A2J mid-term Programme Evaluation report.
-Presentation of MTR's main findings considering: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with all the stakeholder categories
-Results by UNDAP Outcome: national progress, specific contribution of UN agencies and resources mobilized etc.

ii. Critique of Partnership and collaboration strategy among UNDP/GoR/IPs, Donors; and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the A2J programme as a partnership framework in light of DaO and its correlated modalities (pool fund, MA, pros and cons of parallel funding and its justification in light of an optimal JP design etc.), assess the role of the Development Result Group (DRG) and the One UN M&E group, etc.

iii. Major Challenges

iv. A2J Financial Management

v. Assessment of M&E framework, indicators, results chains, data management process etc.
-Critical assessment in light of RBM principles
-Critical assessment of results chain design incl. recommendations suggesting possible improvements
-Suggestions on how indicator design and sets of indicators per result could be enhanced
-Revise existing processes in light of DaO

i. Findings and conclusions

-Findings will be based on the evidence derived from the information collected both from the desk review and the interviews, in light of triangulation and cross-checking results whenever applicable.
-Assessment of the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles, gender mainstreaming and human rights based approach as well as South-South and triangular cooperation.
-Critical assessment of performance, analysis of the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact.
-To the extent possible measuring achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms.
-Analysis of factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative.
-Discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to the achievement of results.
-Assessment of how/if the intervention has contributed to gender equality and fulfilment of human rights.

vii. Recommendations and lessons learnt:
-If possible, based on the findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)' overall experience in other contexts, lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well, including both positive and negative lessons.
-Relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, conclusions made and lessons learned; incl. discussion of their anticipated implications.
-List of proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order.

Note A: The Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation Programmes Evaluation Report will 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 shall 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.

Note B: Conclusions and recommendations will be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected, relating them to the A2J objectives and providing answers to the evaluation questions. They will also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors.To the extent possible and as applicable, during the process of developing recommendations, key stakeholders will be contacted. This will serve the purpose of testing the degree of clarity with which the recommendations are formulated and exposing their inherent and explicit assumptions and substance to critique. Whenever necessary, this might then result in the finetuning of the recommendations that drew any such comments. However, it should be made clear here that a rebuttal of any recommendations on the mere grounds of vested agency interests or opinions rather than evidence and logic, shall be duly noted but will not affect the independent final judgment and set of recommendations to be presented in the final (draft) report. If the feedback to the final draft report includes reservations against, or a rejection of any given recommendation on the grounds of higher-level selective choices, pressure or preferences, then the final report might eventually not include the incriminated passage(s), or it will be moved to a footnote with a comment that for this specific item, there was no consensus whether it should be part of the official final set of recommendations.

Annexes (maximum 10-15 pages)

-ToR (A2J mid-term Programmes Evaluation).
-List of 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.
-Human interest stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC]).

Annex 2 – Financial Analysis / Reference Tables (Sample of potential Challenge re Data Consolidation)

The tables shown below stem from pg. 26 of the Consolidated 2013-2014 A2J JP Progress Report (1st table/"Annex 1-Programme Budget per Output (To be updated)") and pg. 31 of the A2J JP ProDoc, respectively (2nd table/"8.1 Budget summary per output"). This confrontation shows differences in the financial volume of annual budget lines against the specific JP outputs, as well as in the total budget amount for year 1 of the implementation cycle. This might indicate that the annual budget for 2013-2014 adjusted (downwards) after the signature of the initial budget provisions that are reflected in the ProDoc. The veracity of this assumption needs to be clarified at the beginning of the in-country data collection phase. Should there indeed be differences between the initial budgeting reflected in the original design of the JP and the actual, "actionable" budgeting which is relevant for the scale and scope of the implementation of activities contributing to the JP Outputs, the implications for the actual analysis during the MTR need to be discussed. Essentially, the issue would boil down to the question whether to reference actual expenditures against the original JP budget or a revised version of the annual budget volume (in a nut-shell: "which absolute USD figure represents 100%?").

ANNEX 1 — PROGRAMME BUDGET PER OUTPUT (To be updated)

	Annual Budget(US$)	Annual Expenditure Budget(US$)	Balance (US$)
Output 1 Capacity of the Justice sector strengthened to increase to justice, including for women, children and other the most vulnerable groups	700,641	203,772	496,869
Output 2 National capacities strengthened to promote and mainstream human rights and implement Treaty body and UPR recommendation	262,056	83,952	178,104
Output 4 Mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, unity and reconciliation strengthened/deepened	631,500	494,955	136,545
Output 5 Project management and oversight strengthened	100,000	19,845	80,155
TOTAL	1,694,197	802,523	891,674

8.1 Budget summary per output

Outputs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total per output
Output 1. Capacity of the justice sector (JRLO) strengthened to increase access to justice, including for women, children, and the most vulnerable.	1,116,156	2,459,029	1,373,643	622,367	391,406	6,012,597
Output 2. National capacities strengthened to promote and mainstream human rights and implement Treaty Body and UPR recommendations	596,971	316,441	243,289	219,515	169,515	1,545,731
Output 3: Fundamental rights of children promoted through birth registration	130,545	277,755	147,210	108,110	77,511	741,131
Output 4. Mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, unity and reconciliation strengthened/deepened	1,083,491	710,649	911,131	710,649	911,131	4,327,051
Output 5: Project management and oversight improved	100,000	100,000	120,000	100,000	120,000	540,000
TOTAL PROGRAMME BUDGET	3,027,163	3,863,874	2,795,273	1,760,641	1,669,563	13,166,510