

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (UNDAF)
2012-2017 END OF PROGRAMME
EVALUATION**



**December 2015
United Nations in Papua New Guinea**

Terms of Reference

UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation

United Nations Papua New Guinea - Delivering as One

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 Development Context

Papua New Guinea (PNG) achieved independence from Australia in 1975 and is home to 7,275,324 million people according to the 2011 National Population and Housing Census. This figure was a 40% increase from the population count captured in the 2000 Census. PNG has experienced strong GDP growth since 2010 however the 2014 National Human Development Report (NHDR) notes that 'there is a widespread perception within the country that the extractive-based form of development has not been inclusive or reached as many Papua New Guineans as it could and should have'. In 2014 PNG was ranked 157th out of 187 countries in the Human Development Index placing in the low human development category- this represents a fall of four places from the 153 rank achieved in 2011.

The country faces a range of complex challenges including service delivery to a diverse, dispersed and mostly rural population spread over 600 islands, poor accessibility to parts of the country, high logistical costs and supply management difficulty. In 2012 only 7 per cent of the population had access to the electric grid and reticulated water, and two-fifths of health/sub-health centres and rural health posts had no electricity or essential medical equipment.

Another challenge faced by the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) and development partners is the relatively high level of crime and violence in PNG contributing to a high cost of security overheads. In addition to these costs the high rate of crime, including domestic violence, has a long-term social impact constraining mobility and negatively impacting development interventions. The country has also faced periods of political instability including the 2011-2012 constitutional crisis.

PNG has a high level of decentralisation with 22 provinces, 89 districts, 313 Local Level Governments (LLGs) and 6,131 Wards. In May 2012 two new provinces officially came into existence, the Hela Province and the Jiwaka Province continuing the general trend in PNG towards increased financial devolution to provinces, districts and LLGs. The NHDR notes that with the recent trend towards decentralisation 'central government policy making and fiscal control remains strong while implementation and service delivery is limited by weak capacity among both line government agencies and the sub-national service providers. This has led to inefficiencies in the public service, including corruption'.

There are 15 resident UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes (AFPs) operating in PNG of varying sizes each with a specific mandate, capacity and role to play in the development process. During the preparation stage of the UNDAF (2012-2017) the UN Country Team (UNCT) in PNG identified dramatic increases in operational costs as a threat to programme delivery. To mitigate this potential impediment the UNCT developed an operational strategy that focuses on a dual approach of resource mobilisation and reducing operational overheads.

1.2. The Papua New Guinea UNDAF 2012- 2017

The UN Country Programme (UNCP) in Papua New Guinea is a 'self-starter' for the Delivering as One (DaO) approach, since 2006. This approach has been built on the key elements of results-based management (RBM) such as a focus on performance management, alignment of the UNCP Results and

Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks with national policy, strategic documents and planning frameworks, and building on the comparative advantage of the UNCT's strategic position in PNG. In line with this approach the current UNDAF cycle outlines the strategic programme framework for the UN in PNG and is accompanied by an UNDAF Action Plan that operationalising the UNDAF strengthening partnership between the UN system and GoPNG.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provided the basis for the UN's strategic positioning and support to national development plans while the UNDAF Action Plan introduced new ways of providing assistance in line with ongoing UN Reform as well as the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Both the UNDAF and Action Plan aim to simplify and harmonize the UN's contribution to national development, ensure alignment with GoPNG priorities and to utilize national systems and procedures for programme delivery to reduce transaction costs.

The current UNDAF and Action Plan were originally planned to be for a four year period (2012-2015). However, following a GoPNG request, the UN extended the UNDAF for a further two years (from 2015 to 2017). The agreement to extend the UNDAF was in order to align with GoPNG's Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) 2 2016-2017. Upon agreeing to extend the current UNDAF cycle in 2014 the UN team, together with a representative from PNG's Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM), reviewed progress against the existing UNDAF and made some changes to the plans and expected outputs, which remain closely aligned to GoPNG priorities for the period up to 2017.

The UNDAF was themed as 'Supporting PNG to accelerate MDG Achievement' and the following development pillars were identified and agreed upon by the UN and GoPNG as priority outcome areas in support of the GoPNG's MTDP Plan 2011-2015:

1. Governance for Equitable Development
2. Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality
3. Access to Basic Services
4. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

The key strategies underpinning the UNDAF are capacity development, the promotion of human rights and the application of a human rights-based approach to programming, the empowerment and strengthening of civil society, promotion of evidence-based monitoring systems, mainstreaming of gender equality and opportunities for women, and fighting HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases.

1.3 UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation in the context of Papua New Guinea

The UNCT PNG, in collaboration with its GoPNG partners is currently in the process of preparing an End of Programme UNDAF Evaluation, which will serve as a major input for the planning process of the next UNDAF and an accountability tool for the delivery of results during the current UNDAF cycle. This is a joint evaluation being co-managed by the UN and DNPM.

The UNDAF Evaluation will seek to be independent, credible and useful, and will adhere to the highest possible professional standards in evaluation including the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation. The evaluation will be responsive to the needs and priorities of the UN system and GoPNG and engage the participation of a broad range of stakeholders.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Purpose

The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will be completed by May 2016 so as to inform the next programme cycle by generating evidence and lessons learnt based on the assessment of the current performance of the UNDAF outcomes and process. The evaluation will determine how the UNDAF helped UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to national development efforts, including aligning with GoPNG priorities and strategies and shaping the development agenda. The purpose of the evaluation is twofold, it is a learning tool informing future programming and will also support greater accountability of the UNCT to UNDAF stakeholders.

The primary users of the evaluation will be the UNDAF partners, i.e. the UNCT, GoPNG, donors and partners who support the programmes. The timing of this evaluation is crucial in feeding into the preparation and planning phase for the next UNDAF cycle which is scheduled to commence in the final quarter of 2016.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the UNDAF Evaluation are:

1. To assess the relevance and contribution of the UNDAF to national development results and MDG achievement given the PNG context.
2. To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution and assess how the UNDAF has been implemented, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks supporting greater accountability to UNDAF stakeholders.
3. To generate a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions. These recommendations will include specific guidance on how to implement, monitor and evaluate the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the next UNDAF cycle.

2.3 Scope and Key Questions

Given the context described above, the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will focus on programme relevance, effectiveness and efficiency while also looking at the sustainability of interventions moving into the next UNDAF cycle and the process of mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

While the evaluation will be conducted mainly in Port Moresby, capital of PNG, the Evaluation Team is encouraged to consider including 1-2 field visits in their methodology. When choosing sites to visit, the Evaluation Team should consider the availability of baseline data for these sites, and make the choice of the locations to visit based on the implementation of relevant UN programmes in these areas. The proposed field visits should be presented in the inception report, and should be discussed with the Evaluation Management Group (EMG).

The evaluation will examine the following areas:

- A. **Relevance** of the UNDAF in relation to the issues it was designed to address as well as their underlying causes in the context of national policies and strategies:
 - Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by GoPNG strategic plans and priorities?
 - To what extent has the UNDAF results matrix been sufficiently flexible to adjust to evolving national policies and strategies (e.g. National Development Plans and Goals,

- legislative reforms) and changing development circumstances during the current programme cycle?
- To what extent have the UNDAF outcomes been relevant to internationally agreed goals and commitments guiding the work of UN AFPs?
 - To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNDAF?
 - How can the next the planning phase for the next UNDAF cycle best incorporate the SDGs to ensure that the post 2015 development agenda is fully reflected?
 - To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equality and other cross-cutting issues reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set and if so have they been met?
- B.** Assess the ***effectiveness*** of UNDAF implementation and performance in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes. Identify lessons learnt for future programming, particularly how the UN can best contribute to mainstreaming and localising the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda:
- What progress has been made towards the realization of UNDAF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of National Priorities and the MDGs? What lessons learnt can be identified and used to guide planning for mainstreaming and localising the SDGs in the next UNDAF programme cycle?
 - What are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the outcomes?
 - Were expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe, AFPs' capacities and resources?
 - To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context and contributed to streamlining the work of the UN in PNG?
- C.** Assess the ***efficiency*** of the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework:
- To what extent and in what ways has the UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN AFPs?
 - To what extent the effectiveness of programme support by individual AFPs been enhanced as a result of joint programming?
 - Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?
 - Have the external and internal structures for programme delivery facilitated the efficient and effective delivery of UNDAF results and reduced duplication?
 - Are the funding allocations, task team budgets and overall expenditures aligned with the stated UNDAF priorities and sufficiently targeted to maximise efficiency?
- D.** To the extent possible, assess the medium term ***impact*** of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized in PNG, notably in the realization of MDGs and MTDP:
- Determine whether there is any major change in UNDAF and national development indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF implementation.
 - Identify the contribution the UNDAF has made to working with key strategic partners in reaching the poor, vulnerable and marginalized through UNDAF implementation.
 - Based on the human rights and gender equality principles applied during UNDAF implementation what observable or measurable impact has the UNDAF had on human rights and gender equality in PNG to date?

- E. Analyse to what extent results achieved and strategies used by the UNDAF are **sustainable** (i) as a contribution to national development and (ii) in terms of the added value of UNDAF for cooperation among individual AFPs:
- To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs in order to enable these actors to continue achieving positive results without the UN/development partners' support?
 - To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?
 - Have complementarities, collaboration and /or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Donors intervention in the country?
 - Does the UNDAF respond to the challenges of national capacity development and promote ownership of programmes?

III. PROPOSED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will utilise a mixed method approach and 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 UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports. The evaluation will be conducted in close collaboration with the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), UNCT, EMG, the UN's RBM Committee, the United Nations Evaluation Development Group for Asia and the Pacific (UNEDAP) and national counterparts.

3.1. Methodology

Once the Evaluation Team members for the UNDAF Evaluation have been selected, during the inception phase, a thorough preparatory work should be conducted by the team members, including a comprehensive desk review, to define their specific evaluation approach, data collection methods and required evaluation tools. A Harmonized Evaluation Plan will be developed accordingly including qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the UNDAF implementation and performance and to make recommendations informing the next programming cycle.

3.2 Data Collection

The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN and its thematic task teams, GoPNG institutions, CSOs as well as development partners and beneficiaries. Field visits to selected project sites and briefing and debriefing sessions with UN and GoPNG officials, development partners, and civil society are envisaged.

In order to use existing information and avoid duplication, secondary data will be mainly collected from various data sources including a comprehensive desk review and analysis of relevant documents as well as triangulation of different studies. Data is to be presented/disaggregated (by sex, age and location), where possible. Primary data will also be collected from stakeholder key informant interviews, discussions, field visits and consultative processes. At the beginning of the field mission, the Evaluation Team will present the inception report and seek agreement on the evaluation methodology.

3.3 Processes

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases:

Phase 1- Preparation:

- Collection of reference material: The UN RCO, in close consultations with the RBM Committee, will compile a list of background materials, documents, and reports relevant to the UNDAF Evaluation.
- Identification and selection of consultants: The UNCT will jointly identify and select the appropriate consultants for the UNDAF Evaluation Team. The UN RCO will take the lead, jointly with the EMG, in soliciting CVs of available consultants.
- Development of evaluation strategy and design: Prior to the main data collection phase, the UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader will assess the availability of evaluative evidence, and develop an operational plan (a 'Harmonized Evaluation Plan'), which will include a design matrix, data collection and analysis methods and potential sites for field visits.

Phase 2 – Conduct of data collection activities and the preparation of the evaluation reports:

- Desk review of reference material: All Evaluation Team members are responsible for reviewing the reference documents, reports and any other data and information provided by the RCO.
- Main data collection mission: The Evaluation Team will conduct data collection activities as guided by the Harmonized Evaluation Plan. The team will conduct agreed-upon interviews with stakeholders, surveys, questionnaires and site visits etc. facilitated by the EMG.
- Data analysis and reporting: The Evaluation Team will conduct further data analysis based on all information collected, and present the preliminary findings to stakeholders prior to preparing a draft evaluation report. The UNDAF Evaluation Team will write and submit the draft report to the UNCT. The UNDAF Report will be written in accordance with its respective Terms of Reference, the Harmonized Evaluation Plan and other established guidance documents.
- Review of the draft report and finalisation of the report: the draft UNDAF Report will be submitted to key stakeholders for factual correction and feedback. The Evaluation Team Leader, in consultation with the UNCT, will prepare a comment matrix to indicate how the comments were taken into account, and together with the team of consultants, will finalise the UNDAF Evaluation Report. Stakeholder workshops: A meeting with the key stakeholders will be organized in the country, to present the UNDAF Evaluation results and discuss ways forward. UNCT to prepare a Management Response.

Phase 3 - Follow-up:

The UNCT together with the RCO will conduct follow-up activities, as guided by their respective processes and mandates. In the context of the UNDAF Evaluation:

- Organization of a stakeholders' meeting/workshop to validate and refine findings, conclusions and recommendations, discuss dissemination and communication strategies and plan for implementation of evaluation recommendations. The follow-up plan should determine a process for ensuring that lessons learnt are incorporated into the next UNDAF programming cycle.
- Dissemination of the evaluation findings and recommendations.
- Implementation of a follow-up plan, in particular focusing on the design of a new UNDAF cycle.

IV. TEAM STRUCTURE FOR THE UNDAF EVALUATION

The UNDAF Evaluation Team will be led by the UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader (UNDAF Evaluation Expert) and consist of the Team Leader plus a National Evaluation Specialist and National Evaluation Consultant. The Evaluation Team Leader will be an international position and all consultants will be mobilized through the individual contracting modality. The Evaluation Team will demonstrate a high

level of capacity and experience with evaluations in the UN context, as well as knowledge and understanding of the four UNDAF outcome pillars and development context of PNG. The Evaluation Team Leader is tasked with managing and ensuring the quality of the work conducted by Evaluation Team members and has ultimate responsibility for delivering results- they will be responsible for the quality and timeliness of all deliverables and guide and supervise the National Evaluation Specialist and National Evaluation Consultant. Payment of Evaluation Team members is subject to validation of the quality and timeliness of their work by the Evaluation Team Leader.

All consultants shall be charged with incorporating human rights and gender equality assessments into their relevant portfolios. The selected consultants are expected to be independent and should not have been involved in the implementation of the UNDAF (2012-2017) in any of the UN agencies. See ANNEX 4 for outline of required expertise and qualifications of the Evaluation Team.

V. DELIVERABLES

1. **Inception report-** The Evaluation Team will collect data using the proposed methodologies: surveys, questionnaires, desk review, observation, interviews and focus group discussions including participation of relevant stakeholders within DaO etc. The Evaluation Team will develop a full methodology and survey instruments and an Evaluation Plan as part of the Inception Report which will include a stakeholder stake map, the final list of evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, the overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase, and a description of the roles and responsibilities of the individual team members.
2. **A PowerPoint presentation** highlighting the main components of the final inception report, reflecting the comments provided by the EMG and key stakeholders, to be presented to the EMG and the UNCT.
3. **A PowerPoint presentation** and stakeholder meeting to share and explain findings to stakeholders after data collection phase has ended.
4. **Draft UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report.** The Evaluation Team will write a draft UNDAF report and a proposed action plan for implementation of evaluation recommendations (ANNEX 5), keeping in mind the proposed structure of the final UNDAF report (ANNEX 2) distributing to members of the EMG for review and comments. The revised draft report shall thereafter be submitted to the UNCT and Steering Committee with a validation workshop being held to validate the preliminary findings and recommendations.
5. **Final UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report.** The final report should be based on two rounds of commenting on draft evaluation reports, taking into account potential comments from the Steering Committee, EMG and the UNCT. The final version will be submitted in English to the UN Country Team and Steering Committee through the Resident Coordinator for review by the Steering Committee. It will include a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions, and identify lessons learnt to improve the strategies, implementation mechanism, and management of the next UNDAF as well as a proposed Action Plan for the next programme cycle. There will be clear guidance provided on mainstreaming the SDGs into the next UNDAF cycle.

VI. ESTIMATED BUDGET

International Consultant	US\$
National Consultant(s)	US\$
Internal Travel*	US\$
Validation Workshop*	US\$
Total Budget	US\$

PNG UNDAF 2012-2017 Evaluation Terms of Reference

* Please note that internal travel and meetings/workshops/stakeholder consultations costings will not be required as these will be calculated according to the experiences of the UN in PNG. Outline proposed meetings, field visits and workshops including number of participants etc. and the costing will be worked out on a basis applicable to all received proposals.

The costs of the UNDAF evaluation will be covered by UNCT's budget and payment of fees will be based on the delivery of outputs, as follows:

- Upon selection and signing of contract: 10%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the inception report: 10%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the draft evaluation report: 30%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the final evaluation report: 50%

UNDAF Evaluation ToR's | Annexes I - VI

ANNEX 1: Management, Roles and Responsibilities

Who: Actors and Accountability	What: Roles and Responsibilities
Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission and oversee the evaluation. • Ensure decisions are made on time. • Provide the overall, high level, oversight and approval of the Evaluation process, findings, recommendations and all key deliverables. • Develop a follow-up plan and management response to the evaluation and ensure the implementation of committed actions.
RC Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate solicitation, selection and recruitment of the Evaluation Team members. • Establish the Evaluation Management Group. • Day-to-day management, in close coordination with the EMG (through Evaluation Manager). • Ensure close communication with the Evaluation Team during the whole evaluation process. • Facilitate communication between the Evaluation Team and the SC/UNCT/EMG • Help arrange the travel to the project site and other logistic issues. • Consolidate the feedback on the UNDAF Evaluation reports, and with the Team Leader in a timely manner. • Facilitate dissemination of evaluation reports to stakeholders.
Evaluation Management Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare ToR for the evaluation. • Rate and shortlist CVs choosing Evaluation Team. • Contribute to the final selection of evaluation questions. • Participate in the review of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the Evaluation Team. • Help identify the projects to be visited. • Facilitate access of the Evaluation Team to information sources (documents and interviewees) to support data collection. • Provide technical inputs, comments and quality assurance on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the design, draft, and final reports. • Clarify questions raised during the evaluation. • Monitor the progress of the evaluation and report progress to UNCT. • Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and advise on the quality of the work done by the Evaluation Team. • Assist in the integration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation into future programme design and implementation. • Approve final report. • Support the UNCT in the development of a management response.
United Nations Evaluation Development Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide quality assurance support on evaluation process and tangible deliverables and products. • Provide expertise and guidance as requested by the EMG.

for Asia and the Pacific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the use of global norms and standards in Asia and the Pacific and promote networking on evaluation as a profession across the region.
Evaluation Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have overall responsibility for producing the UNDAF Evaluation Report and for quality and timely submission of the same Report to the UN RC Office and UNCT. • Lead the evaluation process in a timely manner. • Produce the inception report including Harmonized Evaluation Plan outlining methodology and timeline. • Agree final methodology and evaluation focus in consultation with EMG. • Communicate with UN whenever it is needed, particularly the EMG on a regular basis highlighting progress made/challenges encountered. • Conduct thorough desk review. • Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data. • Conduct key informant interviews, focus group discussion etc. for data collection as needed. • Conduct stakeholder consultations including validation workshop followed by presenting the UNDAF Evaluation results and ways forward upon submission and approval of the final report. • Responsible for producing the UNDAF Evaluation draft and final reports and for quality and timely submission of the report to the EMG, UN RC office and the UNCT.

ANNEX 2: Structure of the UNDAF Report

Title page

Name of programme or theme being evaluated

Country of project/programme or theme

Name of the organization to which the report is submitted

Names and affiliations of the evaluators

Date

Table of Contents

List of acronyms

Executive summary

- A self-contained paper of 1-3 pages.
- Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order. **(Maximum 5 pages)**

(Main Report; Maximum 35 pages)

Introduction

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

- Describe the project/programme/theme being evaluated. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention.
- Summarize the UNDAF purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria.
- Describe the methodology employed to conduct the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and its limitations if any.
- Detail who was involved in conducting the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and what were their roles.
- Describe the structure of the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation report.
- A Reflection on the main findings which considers: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with Heads of UN Agencies, selected senior programme staff, and selected senior Government officials.
- Results by UNDAF Outcome: national progress, specific contribution of UN agencies and resources mobilized etc.

Partnership and collaboration strategy among UNCT and other donors; and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of UNDAF as a partnership framework

Major Challenges

UNDAF Financial Management

Assessment of M&E process

Findings and conclusions

- State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Assess the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles and human rights based approach. In providing a critical assessment of performance, analyse the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact. To the extent possible measure achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms. Analyse factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative. Discuss the relative contributions of stakeholders to achievement of results. Assess how/if the intervention has contributed to gender equality and fulfilment of human rights.
- Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected. They must relate to the UNDAF objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions. They should also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors.

Recommendations and lessons learnt

- Based on the findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)' overall experience in other contexts if possible provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.
- Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, conclusions made and lessons learned. Discuss their anticipated implications. Consult key stakeholders when developing the recommendations.
- List proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order. Maximum of ten recommendation points.

Follow up Plan

- This may include current UNDAF
- Next UNDAF
- Provide suggested time lines and cost estimates (where relevant) for implementation.

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

- Attach ToR (for the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation).
- List persons interviewed, sites visited.
- List documents reviewed (reports, publications).
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.).
 - Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.
 - Photos
 - Stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC])
 - List of used documents and persons met.

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

ANNEX 3: Recommended List of Documents

1. Papua New Guinea Medium Term Development Plan 2 2016-2017
<http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/pdf/MTDP2.pdf>
2. Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan 2010-2030
http://www.health.gov.pg/publications/PNGDSP_Final%20Version%20for%20Print.pdf
3. Papua New Guinea Vision 2050
http://www.treasury.gov.pg/html/publications/files/pub_files/2011/2011.png.vision.2050.pdf
4. The Alotau Accord 2012
<http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/papua-new-guinea-alotau-accord-summary-oneill-gov-priorities.pdf>
5. Papua New Guinea National HIV & AIDS Strategy 2011-2015
http://www.nacs.org.pg/attachments/article/74/PNG_NHS_Implementation.pdf
6. Papua New Guinea National Health Plan, 2011-2020
http://www.wpro.who.int/papuanewguinea/areas/papua_new_guinea_nationalhealthplan.pdf
7. Papua New Guinea National Strategy for Sustainable Development 2nd Edition
<http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/pdf/StaRS.pdf>
8. UN Annual Progress Reports and individual agency Annual Reports (2012-2015)
<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/PG100>
[Annual Progress Report 2014](#)
[Annual Progress Report 2013](#)

[Annual Progress Report 2012](#)

9. UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation
https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/eva_techref/UNEG_Standards_for_Evaluation.pdf
10. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607>
11. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607>

Survey and Studies

Demographic Health Survey 2006

http://phtpacific.org/sites/default/files/surveys_dev_reports/90/files/PNG_DemographicHealthSurvey-2006_2009-07_GoPNG.pdf

The National Population and Housing Census 2011

ANNEX 4: Required Expertise and Qualifications of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team will be composed of three members, an international UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader, a National Evaluation Specialist and a National Evaluation Consultant. Each team member has a separate Terms of Reference attached to their Individual Consultant Procurement Notice for their reference and attention.

The evaluation members must have considerable experience in conducting evaluations and broad knowledge of the four UNDAF Outcome Pillars and cross-cutting issues (gender equality and human rights). The Evaluation Team Leader (UNDAF Evaluation Expert) should have profound knowledge of One UN reform and Delivering as One and experience conducting UNDAF End of Programme Evaluations.

The Evaluation Team Leader should be able to demonstrate:

- a. A minimum of 10 years' relevant professional experience in evaluation in developing countries is required.
- b. Documented previous experience in managing and leading complex UNDAF evaluations, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
- c. Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to the four outcome pillars of the 2012-2017 UNDAF as well as strong understanding of and experience with gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights as cross-cutting development themes.
- d. Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, particularly in the following areas: understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming; gender considerations; Results Based Management (RBM) principles; logic modelling/logical framework analysis; quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches.
- e. Excellent knowledge of the UN system and UN common country programming processes.
- f. Demonstrated knowledge of Delivering as One.
- g. Knowledge and sensitivity in terms of the political context of Papua New Guinea.
- h. Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice.
- i. Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.

- j. Excellent presentation and drafting, report writing skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
- k. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.

The National Evaluation Specialist should be able to demonstrate:

- A. Minimum 7 years' experience in evaluation in developing countries.
- B. Documented previous experience in evaluations in the UN system, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
- C. Substantive knowledge of development issues (in particular, programmatic areas covered by UNDAF in the country) and understanding of the development context of Papua New Guinea.
- D. Strong skills and experience in evaluating programmatic areas covered by UNDAF in the country (governance for equitable development, social justice, protection and gender equality, access to basic services and environment, climate change and disaster risk management).
- E. Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice.
- F. Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.
- G. Excellent drafting skills and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
- H. Conceptualizes and analyses problems to identify key issues, underlying problems, and how they relate.
- I. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.
- J. Fluency in written and spoken English and Tok Pisin.

The National Evaluation Consultant should be able to demonstrate:

- A. Proven experience in the field of development cooperation in Papua New Guinea.
- B. Experience conducting evaluations in Papua New Guinea, combined with a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
- C. Substantive knowledge development issues in PNG and their institutional and social context.
- D. Familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
- E. Strong inter-personal, teamwork, organizational and interview skills.
- F. Knowledge of Papua New Guinea, its institutions, key development stakeholders and partners.
- G. Ability to build and sustain effective dialogue with main constituents, communicate effectively and sensitively across different constituencies.
- H. Fluency in written and spoken English and Tok Pisin.
- I. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.

ANNEX 5: Suggested Format of Proposed Action Plan for Implementation of Evaluation

Recommendations

Recommendations	Strategy (how)	Responsible parties (who)	Deadline/ follow-up and note, if any

ANNEX 6: The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Process & Timeframe

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
October- December 2015	Preparatory Activities:	RCO, UNCT, Evaluation Management Group and RBM Committee
	UNDAF ToR drafted, discussed, finalized & adapted in collaboration with GoPNG.	
	UNDAF conceptual framework & management arrangements organization in place	
	Secretariat to facilitate UNDAF process identified	
	Advertisement and evaluation of short listed consultants	
	Reference checks for shortlisted consultants	
	Contract signed with consultants	
January-February 2016	Consultants on board	EMG, RBM Committee and Consultants
	Finalisation of methodology and Inception Report including Harmonized Evaluation Plan and PPT summary presentation to UNCT and EMG	
	Desk review	
	Participatory data gathering	
	Data analysis and report drafting	
March 2016	Workshop for review of preliminary findings and their shaping	Consultants, EMG and Evaluation Manager
	First Interim Report	
	Review of the report by key stakeholders	
	2 nd Interim report (Draft UNDAF Report)	
April 2016	Submission of draft full report	Consultants & Steering Committee, EMG, RBM Committee & RCO
	Validation workshop	
	Final report	