



## UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TERMS OF REFERENCE

### 1. Consultancy Information

**Consultancy title:** Outcome Evaluations for UNDP South Sudan Country Programme Outcomes 1: Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational, and Outcome 5: Access to Justice and the rule of law improves

**Department /Unit:** Programme and Partnership Support Unit, UNDP South Sudan

**Supervisor:** Team Leader, Programme and Partnership Support Unit

**Duty Station:** Juba, South Sudan

### 2. Context

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. UNDP provides policy advice and helps build institutional and human capacity that generates equitable growth. In South Sudan, UNDP is committed to promoting good governance at all levels of society and building coalitions for actions on issues critical to sustainable human development and conflict prevention.

Post-independence, the UNDP programme was guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD), 2012-2013. In February 2013, the GRSS extended the SSDP to 30 June 2016, maintaining the original development objectives across four priority areas: (1) Governance; (2) Economic Development; (3) Social and Human Development; and (4) Conflict Prevention and Security. The Government and the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), at the request of GRSS, agreed to extend the initial United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2012-2013) to 30 June 2016. The UNDAF maintained the five outcomes; 1) Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational; 2) Chronic food insecurity is reduced and household incomes increased; 3) Key service delivery systems are in place; 4) Violence is reduced and community security improves; and 5) Access to justice and the rule of law improves. UN Development Group Executive Board extended the UNDP Country Programme Document to 30 June 2016. UNDP South Sudan revised and extended the CPAP to June 2016

Working at all three levels of Government: national, state and county; UNDP South Sudan employs a knowledge-based approach that provides support to policy formulation and implementation, capacity development, and service delivery towards achieving five outcomes:

- 1) Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational
- 2) Chronic food insecurity is reduced and household incomes increase
- 3) Key service delivery systems are in place
- 4) Violence is reduced and community security improved
- 5) Access to Justice and the Rule of Law improves.

In accordance with the CO's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, UNDP South Sudan plans to execute an outcome evaluation for Outcome 1) Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational and for Outcome 5) Access to Justice and the Rule of Law improves. Both outcomes and the underlying programmes are aligned to the national priorities and programming cycle of the Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS) and United Nations through the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP 2011-2016) and the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF (2012-2016)).

The signing of the Peace Agreement "Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan" in August 2015 is a significant milestone in the country's transition back to peace and development. The UN Country Team decided to replace the UNDAF 2014-2016 with an Interim Cooperation Framework 2016-2017 to be able to respond to changed circumstances and support the implementation of the Peace Agreement. Against this backdrop, UNDP is in the process of formulating a Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2017.

UNDP South Sudan is, therefore, looking for individual consultants to undertake the evaluation of the

two outcomes.

### **3. Purpose of the Evaluation**

The outcome evaluations are forward looking and will capture effectively lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the implemented programmes. The evaluations will assess the programmes' design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. They will collate and analyse lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the Country Programme Document (July 2016 - December 2017).

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 evaluation 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 findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the relevant ministries and institutions of the Government of the Republic of South Sudan, UNDP and other UN agencies.

### **4. Scope of the evaluation**

#### **4.1 Scope**

The outcome evaluations will cover the period 2012-16. The outcome evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy. 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 during programmes development process. It will assess whether the programmes results are on track; capacities built, and cross cutting issues of gender and human rights have been addressed. It will also assess whether the programmes implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The outcome evaluation will also assess the synergy between the programmes as well as other programs implemented under the CPAP and suggest ways of creating more synergy. The linkage of results to overall UNDAF/CPAP results framework will be analysed including the relevance of the indicators set.

Specific evaluation objectives are:

1. To determine the relevance of the project under the two outcomes and whether the initial assumption remained relevant the whole duration of the project;
2. To assess the effectiveness in terms of progress towards agreed results and identify the factors that influenced achievement of results;
3. To assess the efficiency of project planning and implementation (including managerial arrangements, partnerships and co-ordination mechanisms);
4. To identify best practices and lessons learned for UNDP and partners and provide actionable recommendations for future projects; and
5. Identify the unintended outcomes as well as sustainability of the results.

#### **4.2 Evaluation questions**

The following key questions will guide the outcome evaluation:

##### **i. Relevance**

- To what extent are the programme in line with UNDP's mandate, national priorities and the requirements of targeted women and men?
- How did the programmes promote UNDP principles of gender equality, human rights and human development?
- To what extent is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent was UNDP's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?

- ii. **Effectiveness**
  - To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement?
  - How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affected the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective?
  - What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
  - What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP's work?
  - To what extent did the outcomes achieved benefit women and men equally?
- iii. **Efficiency**
  - To what extent have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
  - To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
  - Could a different approach have produced better results?
  - To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
  - How is the programme management structure operating?
  - To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
  - How did UNDP promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?
- iv. **Sustainability**
  - What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
  - To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
  - To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
  - To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
  - How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?
- v. **Gender considerations**
  - How were gender issues implemented as a cross-cutting theme in programming, and if programmes gave sufficient attention to promote gender equality and gender-sensitivity?
  - To what extent did the programmes pay attention to effects on marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups?
  - To what extent were the programmes informed by human rights treaties and instruments?
  - To what extent did the programmes identify the relevant human rights claims and obligations?
  - How were gaps identified in the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations, including an analysis of gender and marginalized and vulnerable groups, and how the design and implementation of the programmes addressed these gaps?
  - To what extent did the programmes evaluate, monitor and review results within the rights framework.
- vi. **Social inclusion**
  - How did the programmes take into account the plight and needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged to promote social equity, for example, women, youth, disabled persons?

## 5. Methodology for the evaluation

The outcome evaluation 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 (2016). This outcome evaluation involves qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate programme implementation and their performance

and to make recommendations for the next programme cycle.

### 5.1. Data Collection

The outcome evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the GRSS institutions, CSOs as well as development partners, and right holders. Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP 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 GRSS programmatic documents & reports, the UNDP South Sudan 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 UNDP inputs to the GRSS. The outcome evaluation of the selected outcomes will benefit from and use optimally the data collected through other evaluation exercises such as the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and independent project evaluations.

### 5.2. Basic Documents for Desk Review

The outcome evaluation will take cognisance of UNDP reports, other UNDP evaluations, and other agency evaluations/reports to determine the effectiveness of the programmes to support achievement of national priorities. Other documents to be reviewed are in Annex 1.

The outcome evaluation should also take into account the lessons learned from the UNDAF and other relevant evaluations in terms of:

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

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception report	5 days
Inception Meeting Initial briefing		
Documents review and stakeholder consultations	Draft report	20 days
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 South Sudan.	Final evaluation report	5 days
Total number of working days		30 days

## 6. Deliverables

Under the guidance and supervision of the Programme and Partnership Support Unit, and the outcome evaluation reference group, the consultant shall provide the following deliverables:

- i. **Inception report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders 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. (**Structure Annexe 2**)

<p>ii. <b>Draft outcome evaluation report</b> - The consultant will prepare the draft evaluation report for 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 Local Programme Appraisal Committee (LPAC) through the UNDP Country Director for validation. Comments from the LPAC 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.</p> <p>iii. <b>Final outcome evaluation Report.</b> The final report (30-50 pages) will include comments from the LPAC and other stakeholders will be submitted 10 days after receiving all comments. This will be submitted to LPAC through the UNDP Country Director for validation. It will include recommendations, policy options and conclusions. <b>(Structure in Annexe 3)</b></p>
<p><b>7. Competencies</b></p>
<p><b>Functional competencies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting;</li> <li>• Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views;</li> <li>• Ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way.</li> </ul> <p><b>Corporate competencies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated integrity by upholding the United Nations' values and ethical standards;</li> <li>• Appreciate differences in values and learning from cultural diversities;</li> <li>• Promotes UNDP vision, mission and strategic goals;</li> <li>• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age-based sensitivity and adaptability;</li> <li>• Demonstrates diplomacy and tact in dealing with sensitive and complex situations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Professionalism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter;</li> <li>• Demonstrated ability to negotiate and apply good judgment;</li> <li>• Is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results.</li> </ul> <p><b>Planning &amp; Organizing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishes, builds and maintains effective working relationships with colleagues to achieve the planned results.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Qualifications of the successful consultant</b></p>
<p><b>Education:</b> At least master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development Studies, International Development, or any other relevant university degree.</p> <p><b>Experience</b> An individual consultant with the following expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors;</li> <li>• Extensive experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation;</li> <li>• Experience in evaluating similar programmes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong communication skills - Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Institutional arrangements</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultant will work full time, based in UNDP South Sudan. Office space and limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultant will use her/his own laptop and cell phone.</li> <li>• The consultant will report to the UNDP Programme and Partnership Support Unit Team Leader and the evaluation reference group that will review progress and will certify delivery of outputs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. How to apply</b></p>

Please submit the following documents:

- Profile (max. 6 pages) detailing suitability, experience and proposed methodology to successfully accomplish the task;
- **Please note that applications which do not have a proposed methodology will not be considered.**
- Completed P11 form downloaded from [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\\_notice.cfm?notice\\_id=23478](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=23478);
- Financial proposal as per Section 11 below.

### 11. Financial Proposal

The financial proposal must be expressed as an all-inclusive lump sum amount in USD, presented in the following template:

	Unit cost (USD)	No.	Total
a) Professional fee:			
b) Daily Subsistence Rate:			
c) Other costs (specify):			
Total (lump sum):			

Notes:

1. The information in the breakdown of the offered lump sum amount provided by the Offeror will be used as the basis for determining best value for money, and as reference for any amendments of the contract;
2. The agreed contract amount will remain fixed regardless of any factors causing an increase in the cost of any of the components in the breakdown that are not directly attributable to UNDP;
3. Approved local travel related to this assignment will be arranged & paid by UNDP South Sudan;
4. The Contractor is responsible for arranging and meeting the cost of their vaccinations and medical/life insurance.

### 12. Selection criteria

Offers received will be evaluated using a combined scoring method, where the qualifications, experience and proposed approach will be weighted 70%, and combined with the price offer, which will be weighted 30%.

Breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
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>

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Financial evaluation (total 30 points):

All technically qualified proposals will be scored out of 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

- $y$  = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- $\mu$  = price of the lowest priced proposal
- $z$  = price of the proposal being evaluated.

### 13. Evaluation team

The evaluation team will comprise two independent members (one national and another international) who were, at no point directly associated with the design and implementation of any of the activities associated with the outcomes. The international consultant will be the team leader.

### 14. Annexes

#### Annex 1: Recommended List of Documents

1. UNEG standard for evaluation in the UN system, UNDP evaluation policy
2. UNDP handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation of development results
3. UNDP Guidance on outcome level evaluation
4. UNDAF documents
  - The first UNDAF 2012-2013
  - UNDAF Prioritization in response to austerity
  - UNDAF 2014-2016
5. Country Programme Action Plans (2012-2013) and the revised CPAP (2012-2016)
6. CPAP M&E framework
7. Project Annual Work Plans (only for those contributing to Outcomes 1&5)
8. Country Office Annual Reports – 2012-2014
9. Project progress reports (including donor and DIM reports for projects contributing to Outcomes 1 &5)
10. Project board minutes and audit reports

#### Annex 2: Structure of inception report

<b>Introduction</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Objective of the evaluation</li> <li>1.2. Background and context</li> <li>1.3. Scope of the evaluation</li> </ol>
<b>Methodology</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions</li> <li>2.2. Conceptual framework</li> <li>2.3. Evaluability</li> <li>2.4. Data collection methods</li> <li>2.5. Analytical approaches</li> <li>2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings</li> </ol>
<b>Programme of work</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. Phases of work</li> <li>3.2. Team composition and responsibilities</li> <li>3.3. Management and logistic support</li> <li>3.4. Calendar of work</li> </ol>
<b>Annexes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Terms of reference of the evaluation</li> <li>2. Evaluation matrix</li> <li>3. Stakeholder map</li> <li>4. Tentative outline of the main report</li> <li>5. Interview checklists/protocols</li> <li>6. Outcome model</li> <li>7. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members</li> <li>8. Reference documents</li> <li>9. Document map</li> <li>10. Project list</li> <li>11. Project mapping</li> <li>12. Detailed work plan</li> </ol>

#### Annex 3: Structure for outcome evaluation report

<b>Indicative Section</b>	<b>Description and comments</b>
<b>Title and opening pages</b>	Name of programme or theme being evaluated Country of programme Name of the organization to which the report is submitted Names and affiliations of the evaluators

	Date
<b>Table of contents</b>	
<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>	
<b>Executive summary</b>	This should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. Often, readers will only look at the executive summary. It should be prepared <i>after</i> the main text has been reviewed and agreed, and should not be circulated with draft reports.
<b>Chapter 1: introduction</b>	Introduce the rationale for the evaluation, including mandate, purpose and objectives, outline the main evaluation issues including the expected contribution at the outcome level, address evaluability and describe the methodology to be used. Refer to the outcome model and evaluation matrix, to be attached as annexes.
<b>Chapter 2: the Development challenge</b>	In addition to providing a general overview of historical trends and development challenges, specifically address the evaluation theme. Explain how the theme is addressed by government(s), and how it is reflected in national policies and strategies. Also provide information on the activities of other development partners in the area.
<b>Chapter 3: UNDP response and challenges</b>	Against the background of Chapter 2, explain what UNDP has done in this area (purely descriptive, not analytical). Provide the overarching outcome model, specifying the results frameworks for the programme, programme area or projects (if available), as well descriptions of some of the main UNDP activities, especially if they are going to be assessed later.
<b>Chapter 4: Contribution to results</b>	<p>Against the background of Chapters 2-3, analyse findings without repeating information already provided. Also, minimize the need to mention additional factual information regarding projects and programmes (these should be described in Chapter 3). Focus on providing and analysing <i>evidence</i> relating to the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Preferably, structure the analysis on the basis of the main evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance (of UNDP's involvement and its approach)</li> <li>• Effectiveness (in contributing to the achievement of outcomes). <i>Pay particular attention to this criterion, demonstrating how UNDP initiatives have, or have not, contributed to the achievement of outcomes.</i></li> <li>• Efficiency (in delivering outputs)</li> <li>• Sustainability (of the outcomes)</li> <li>• Gender considerations</li> <li>• Social inclusion</li> </ul> <p>In addressing the evaluation criteria, the narrative should respond to the corresponding questions identified in the evaluation matrix and provide a summary analysis of the findings. Partnerships play a key role in ensuring that primary stakeholders achieve outcomes. As such, all evaluation criteria should cover relevant aspects of partnership: i.e., how were they relevant; how effective were they in contributing to the achievement of outcomes; how efficiently were they managed; and how sustainable are they?</p> <p>Where appropriate, discuss cross-cutting themes separately using the main evaluation criteria.</p> <p><b>Do not allow the discussion to drift into conclusions and recommendations.</b></p>
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<p>Conclusions are judgements based on evidence provided in Chapter 4. They are pitched at a higher level and are informed by an overall, comparative understanding of all relevant issues, options and opportunities.</p> <p>Do not provide new evidence or repeat evidence contained in earlier chapters.</p> <p>Recommendations should be derived from the evidence contained in Chapter 4. They may also, but need not necessarily, relate to conclusions. In line with the nature of the evaluation, some recommendations may be more strategic in nature while others may be more action-oriented. Recommendations should be important and succinct.</p> <p><b>Please limit to 5-10.</b></p>
<b>Annexes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ToR for the outcome evaluation.</li> <li>• List persons interviewed, sites visited.</li> <li>• List documents reviewed (reports, publications).</li> <li>• Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, Survey, etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Photos</li> <li>○ Stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC])</li> </ul>
--	--

**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