

Terms of Reference (ToR)

Mid -Term Evaluations of the Two Programmes:

UNDP Support to Deepening Democracy and Accountable Governance in Rwanda (DDAG) and Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation (A2J)

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 joint programmes is: 1) deepen democracy and strengthen citizen participation and accountability in governance, building on the foundation laid by the two predecessor programmes (Programme for Strengthening Good Governance/PSGG and Inclusive Participation in Governance/IPG I); and 2) strengthen the capacities of key national institutions to promote access to justice, human rights and peace consolidation.

Both joint programmes are aligned to the national priorities and programming cycle of the Government of Rwanda and the One UN through the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy II (EDPRS II (2013-2018)) and the UN Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP (2013-2018)). The DDAG programme specifically contributes to the achievement of Result 2, Outcome 1 of the UNDAP which is “*accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision making processes at all levels Improved.*” It lays special focus on women and youth in their increased participation in decision making and development processes. The joint programme has four main components which include: inclusive participation, accountability of institutions, evidence-based governance and capacity development of national coordinating authorities in order to improve their performance.

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

The outcomes of the DDAG programme are: citizens will participate more in decision making, be able to access public information, and policy makers will use evidence based information for decision making as well as for planning their own development; services to citizens will be delivered in a timely manner and be of high quality at all levels and there will be gender parity in leadership at all levels. This will eventually result in a more peaceful and democratic society, where freedoms and human rights are fully protected and respected and management of public affairs, including resources is conducted in a more effective, accountable and transparent manner at national and decentralized levels.

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

The joint programmes have the following UN partners: UNDP, UN Women, UNV and OHCHR for DDAG and UNDP, UNICEF, UNWOMEN and OHCHR for the A2J. The implementing partners of the DDAG programme are the Rwanda Governance Board, which implements components related to generating evidence based research and assessments such as the production of the Rwanda Governance Score Card (RGS), the Joint Governance Assessment as well as the Citizen Report Card, Mobile School of Governance and media reform activities; the Media High Council, which is responsible for media capacity building activities; the Rwandan Parliament, which is responsible for legislative and oversight components; the National Forum for Political Organisations, which works towards strengthening the political engagement

and dialogue among the youth and women; and the National Electoral Commission, which is responsible for delivering free, fair and credible parliamentary, local level and presidential elections, which will be conducted during the life of the programme.

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

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

By September 2015, the two programmes will be implemented for a period of two years and in line with the programme documents, are due for mid-term evaluation. The One UN is, therefore, looking for individual consultants to undertake the evaluations of the two programmes. The programmes will be evaluated independently from each other by one individual consultant for each program.

2. Purpose of the Mid Term Evaluation

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

The midterm 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 DDAG and A2J programmes. The evaluations will assess the programmes' design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. They will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the second phase of implementation (October 2015 - June 2018) of the joint programmes.

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 findings and recommendations of the evaluations will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the Government of Rwanda- through the Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), the Parliament, The Media High Council (MHC) and the National Forum for Political Organization (NFPO), the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST), the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and the Rwanda National Police (RNP), UNDP and other One UN agencies, especially those partaking in the two programmes.

3. Scope and focus of the Mid-term Evaluation

3.1 Scope

The DDAG and A2J mid-term programmes evaluations will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy. This will include the implementation modalities and co-financing by One UN sister agencies, One UN Fund and the Government of Rwanda. It will also look at issues of coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation will include review of the project design, and assumptions made at the beginning of the 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 mid-term evaluation will also assess the synergy between the two

programs as well as other programs implemented in the area of accountable governance and suggest ways of creating more synergy. The linkage of results to overall UNDAP results framework will be analyzed including the relevance of the indicators set.

3.2 The Evaluation Questions

The following key questions will guide the mid-term programmes evaluations:

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

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

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

- Are the programme management strategies for both programmes 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 programmes implementation effective?
- Are the programmes effective in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results can we show?

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

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

iv). **Sustainability**

- To what extent are the benefits of the programmes likely to be sustained after the completion of these programmes?
- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the programme outcomes and benefits after completion of each of the programmes?

- How effective are the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the programmes including contributing factors and constraints?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of the Programmes outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
- How are capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged.
- What are the recommendations for similar support in future?

4. Institutional arrangements

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

5. Methodology for Evaluation:

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

5.1. Data Collection

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

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

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

5.2. Basic Documents for Desk Review

The mid-term Evaluations of the DDAG and A2J Programmes will take cognisance of One UN Annual Reports, the Country-led Evaluation, The governance outcome evaluation report, the UNDAF final

evaluation Report, Independent Evaluation of DaO, and other agency evaluations/reports to determine the effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality to support achievement of national priorities. These

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

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

(Other suggested reference documents are in Annex 3.)

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception report	3 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/One UN Rwanda	Final evaluation report	7 days
Total number of working days (for both programs)		30 days

6. Expected Deliverables:

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

1. **Inception report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders - Rwanda Governance Board, Media High Council, Parliament, National Forum for Political Organizations, the Ministry of Justice, the National Commission for Human Rights, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and the Rwanda National Police, the programme teams, UNDP, etc.) - have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation

design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated.

2. **Draft Mid-term Programme Evaluation reports** - The consultant will prepare draft Evaluation Reports for both DDAG and A2J programmes, cognisant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of evaluation reports (see annexes). The report will be submitted to the DDAG and A2J Programmes Steering Committees through the UNDP Country Director for validation. Comments from the Steering Committee and stakeholders will be provided within 10 days after receiving the Draft Report. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The report will be produced in English in Kigali, Rwanda.
3. **Final DDAG and A2J Mid-term Programme Evaluation Reports.** The final report (30-50 pages) for each programme will include comments from the Steering Committees, UNDP, the evaluation review panel and stakeholders will be submitted 10 days after receiving all comments. This will be submitted to the DDAG and A2J Programmes Steering Committees through the UNDP Country Director for validation. It will include recommendations, policy options and conclusions. **(Recommended structure of the report is in the Annexes)**

7. Duty Station

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

8. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

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

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

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

9. Required expertise and qualification

An individual consultant with the following expertise and qualification:

- At least master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant university degree;
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance , inclusive participation, , access to justice, human rights promotion, conflict prevention and peace building and support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections;
- At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors;
- Extensive experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience in evaluating similar programmes
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Fluency in spoken French will be an added advantage.

10. Management Arrangements for the Evaluation

- UNDP will contract an individual consultants (one individual consultant per program) on behalf of

the Government of Rwanda and the UN Agencies. UNDP as the focal point for the evaluation will facilitate the logistical requirements for consultant including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

- The DDAG and A2J mid-term Programmes Evaluation process will be led by the Steering Committees of both Programmes and shall provide overall guidance and direction for the review process.
- A Technical Committee, led by the DDAG and A2J Programme Managers comprised of both Programmes' implementing partners' representatives, will contribute to this assignment and support the process at technical level and provide regular reports to the DDAG and A2J Steering Committees. The Chief of the Management Support Unit will provide technical oversight, quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria.

11. Time-Frame for the Evaluation Process

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

Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

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

12. Selection Criteria

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

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

Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)

If the technical proposal achieves the minimum of 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial

proposal will be taken into account in the following manner:

The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g.
 $[30 \text{ Points}] \times [\text{US\$ lowest}] / [\text{US\$ other}] = \text{points for other proposer's fees.}$

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

<u>Criteria</u>		Max. Points
<u>Technical</u>		
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
TOTAL	100%	100

13. Annex 1; Recommended List of Documents

- Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
- Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013 – 2018), September 2013

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

Studies, Surveys and Evaluations

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