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1. Context

**1.1 Background**

The Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) is the UN response to enhance development effectiveness by improving systems, tools and mechanisms for national policy and strategic planning, management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability. The programme seeks to entrench the culture of accountability for effective use of resources and achievement of results in public institutions. Key strategic areas of support include:1) institutionalizing results based management practices in the public sector; 2) harmonization and alignment of development planning and budgeting tools including the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) priorities; and 3) strengthening capacity for development assistance management. Ultimately, the programme contributes to the improvements in the management, allocation and utilization of public resources for effective development and service delivery.

* 1. **Programme Outcome**

DEAP is aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2012-2016) outcome 4.2**, “***Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016*”. The scope of the outcome is consistent with objectives of the MGDS II (2011-2016)Theme 5, namely: Improved Governance - Sub-theme 1: Economic Governance. DEAP is contributing to the following MGDS strategies: 1) harmonizing the national budget and priorities in the national develoment strategy; 2) ensuring that external support is aligned to the national development strategy; 3) ensuring that sectoral and local plans are aligned to the national development strategy; 4) strengthening the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the national development strategies and programmes; 5) improving national procurement, audit and reporting systems at all levels; and 6) developing capacity for negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements.

**1.3 Expected Programme Outputs:**

Output 1. National institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results

Output 2: National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for efficient achievement of development results

**Output 3**: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (MOFEPD) is the Implementing Partner (IP) for the Joint Programme (JP) and is responsible for the overall planning and management of the programme and achievement of its objectives. The Debt and Aid Division of MOFEPD, the Economic Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Divisions of the Department of Economic Planning and Development of MOFEPD and the Department of Performance Enforcement in the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) are Responsible Parties for the activities of the JP. The MOFEPD’s Budget Division and the National Statistics Office are responsible for implementation of some specific activities supported by the programme.

DEAP is a four year programme (2013-2016) with financial contributions from the EU, UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP. UNDP and the EU have signed a contribution agreement and comingle their resources while UNICEF and the UNFPA provide parallel financing. The EU/UNDP contribution agreement covers the period 2014-2016.

**1.4 2012-2016 UNDAF and UNDAF Outcome 4.2 Evaluations**

The UNDAF (2012-2016) was evaluated in May, 2015. The evaluation included an assessment of the progress towards achieving UNDAF Outcome 4.2. In addition to the UNDAF evaluation, Outcome 4.2, UNDP Country Programme outcome MWI-30 was evaluated in June, 2015. This included assessment of some elements of DEAP as one of the projects contributing to Outcome 4.2.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

The purposes of the mid - term evaluation are to:

1. Determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of the project have been achieved;
2. Assess UNDP’s and other participating UN agencies’ contribution to the project results;
3. Document the achievements and lessons learnt during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar interventions.

The main users of the evaluation results include:

* Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development
* OPC: Performance Enforcement Department
* OPC: Department of Human Resources Management and Development
* Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
* National Statistical Office (NSO)
* UNDP
* The European Union
* UNICEF
* UNFPA
* UN AIDS
* UN Women
* World Bank
* International Monetary Fund
* African Development Bank
* JICA

1. **THE SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will be conducted during the period July-September, 2016, with a view to providing the status of progress towards the programme outcome and outputs and providing lessons learnt and recommendations for improving programme effectiveness. The evaluation will assess:

1. The relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the joint programme.
2. The progress made towards achieving the outcome and outputs and what can be derived in terms of good practices, lessons learned and recommendations for future joint UN interventions and support together with other development partners, in the field of development effectiveness.
3. The evaluation will consider the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation under UNDAF Outcome 4.2/UNDP CP Outcome 30.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

* Assess and analyse the progress made by the programme to date towards achieving the programme outcome and outputs and the sustainability of these results;
* Determine the impact, both positive and negative, from contribution of the programme to the achievement of the outcome;
* Examine and analyse factors which have positively and negatively impacted on achievement of programme outputs and outcome;
* Assess the relevance of the outputs to the effective achievement of the outcome;
* Assess the relevance of the programme to national priorities;
* Assess the effectiveness of institutional arrangements and partnership strategies;
* Examine the extent to which gender equality and women empowerment and human rights targets as cross-cutting issues were integrated and achieved;
* Distil recommendations, lessons and best practices for future programming and improvement in planning for the remainder of the programme;
* Make recommendations in strategic areas for improving the progamme design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, partnership arrangement, and cross-cutting issues.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**
   1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation will use standard evaluation criteria to assess performance, viz: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

**4.2 Evaluation questions:**

In order to meet the objectives and purpose of the evaluation, the evaluators will among other tasks answer the following questions:

# 4.2.1 Design and Relevance:

1. Whether the problem the programme addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived?
2. Whether the target beneficiaries of the programme are clearly identified?
3. Whether the outcome and outputs of the programme were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators?
4. Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the programme are logically articulated?
5. Whether the programme is relevant to the development priorities of the country?
6. Did the design of the programme take into account scale and scaling up into consideration?
7. Given the capacity building objectives of the programme, how effective were the programme’s capacity building interventions?

**4.2.2 Efficiency/Implementation Arrangements:**

1. Whether the management arrangements of the programme were appropriate?
2. What major factors affected programme delivery and propose appropriate interventions to address them for the remainder of the programme and for any future planned interventions in support of development effectiveness?
3. Analyse the institutional arrangements put in place including coordination arrangements, financing arrangements, selection of sub-grantees, identification of beneficiaries, scheduling of activities and actual implementation;
4. The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the programme document;
5. The responsiveness of the programme management to significant changes in the environment in which the programme functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
6. Determine whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant programmes/projects were incorporated into the programme;
7. The monitoring and backstopping of the programme as expected by the Government and UNDP;
8. The Programme’s collaboration with industry, associations, private sector, academia and civil society, if relevant;
9. The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on programme delivery.

**4.2.3 Efficiency:**

1. Whether the programme resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality?
2. Whether the programme resources are used effectively to produce planned results (Are the disbursements and programme expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans)?
3. Whether the programme is cost-effective compared to similar interventions?
4. Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable?;
5. Whether there is evidence to support accountability of the programme (to be used by UNDP in fulfilling its accountability obligations to its development partners)?; and
6. The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of personnel, premises and equipment.

**4.2.4 Effectiveness**:

1. What are the major achievements of the programme vis-à-vis its outcome and outputs, performance indicators and targets?
2. Whether there is evidence of UN’s contribution (alone and with the financial support from the EU) to the outcome of the programme?
3. Whether there is evidence of joint UN contribution to the outcome of the programme?
4. What are the potential areas for programme success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development?
5. Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success?
6. Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced the outcome of the programme?
7. Have there been any unplanned effects/results?

**4.2.5 Sustainability**

* Assess whether or not the programme’s achievements are sustainable.
* Is there an exit strategy for any of the elements of the programme?
* What should be done to strengthen sustainability of programme outcomes?
* Assess whether or not the UN resource mobilization strategy for the programme was appropriate and effective.
* Provide specific recommendations for future potential interventions beyond the current programme with due regard to impact and sustainability of current support.

1. **EVALUATION METHODS**

The evaluation team should provide details in respect of:

1. **Review of programme documentation**. Review of key programme documents such as approved programme document, recent studies, reviews, project monitoring documents, disbursement reports, progress reports and other information available with implementing partners.
2. **Construct a theory of change, identify detailed evaluation questions, methods (mixed methods) and instruments**, stakeholder mapping, etc.
3. **Data collection**: (i) visits to selected stakeholders to carry out in depth interviews, inspection, and analysis of programme activities; (ii) phone interviews and performance data surveys of institutions not visited in person; (iii) interviews with implementing partners. For each of these interviews, the consultants should first develop and present their ideas for the content and format of the interview forms that will be applied to capture the information required, as well as the method to be used in administering them and tabulating the results.
4. **Analysis:** Data triangulation and analysis triangulation to validate evidence and arrive at findings.

The evaluators will be expected to develop and present detailed statement of evaluations methods/approaches in an inception report to show how each objective, evaluation question and criterion will be answered.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**
2. The DEAP Programme Analyst will support the Evaluation Team on a daily basis with respect to providing background information and progress reports and other documentation, setting up stakeholder meetings and interviews, arrange field visits and coordinating with the IP, grantees, beneficiaries and Development Partners. The Programme Analyst will be supported by the UNDP Planning, M&E Specialist to ensure that the evaluation meets the expected UNEG standards.
3. A reference group will be established to assist in key aspects of the evaluation process including reviewing evaluation Terms of Reference, providing documents, providing detailed comments on the inception and draft evaluation reports and dissemination of evaluation findings, lessons learnt and recommendations.

1. The evaluation will be conducted by two evaluators: an international evaluator who will be the team leader and one national evaluator, team member. Evaluation Team leader will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc).

1. The Evaluation Team will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication and accommodation. Furthermore, the evaluators will be expected to familiarise themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.
2. **DELIVERABLES**

* **Inception report** – within 5 days of the start of the assignment. The report will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. The work plan should also include an outline of the evaluation report. The evaluator will also **propose a rating of the performance in the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.**
* **Key emerging issues paper** – a presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders orally and in writing will be made after the data collection and analysis exercise, i.e. within 4 weeks after presentation of the inception report. The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and elaboration of the evaluator’s observations and analysis.
* **Draft evaluation report** – The Evaluator will present a Draft Report within 5 weeks after presentation of the inception report.
* **Lessons learnt report**
* **Final Evaluation Report**. The evaluators will present a Final Evaluation Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments on the draft report from key stake holders. The Evaluation Report shall be compliant with the UNEG standards and should include the following components:
* Executive Summary.
* Description of the DEAP programme (including theory of change and relevant information)
* Purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and evaluation criteria
* Description of the evaluation methodology (including evaluability assessment, limitations and ethical issues)
* Findings broken down by evaluation criteria
* Conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations
* Appendices, including the Terms of Reference, data collection tools, people contacted and other relevant information

1. **EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS**

**The Evaluation Team Leader will work with a national consultant who will be employed by UNDP Malawi.**

* 1. **Qualifications**

The Evaluation Team Leader must satisfy the following qualifications:

* Minimum of Master’s degree in in economics, business administration, political science, development studies, international relations or any other related social sciences.
  1. **Experience and other requirements**
* Proven experience in leading consultancy teams;
* Track record of conducting evaluation of national development projects in any of the following areas: 1) aid and development effectiveness; 2) national development strategy planning; 3) capacity building for development planning, budgeting, M&E or Results Based Management for the UN, governments and international aid organizations;
* Experience in gender mainstreaming or promoting gender equality;
* Excellent communication skills for report writing.

**8.3 Team leader competencies:**

* Team work and leadership skills
* Strategic thinking
* Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
* Team work skills and experience in leading teams
* Result oriented
* Excellent drafting skills in English language

1. **TIME AND DURATION:**

The evaluator will be hired for a maximum total of 35 man/days.

Contract Start Date: 20 July, 2016**.** Contract End Date: 30 September, 2016.

1. **TIME TABLE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Weeks** | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Contract and Entry meeting | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception report, draft revised | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| Drafting and submission of Evaluation Report |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Receipt of comments from stakeholders and reference group members |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Revision and submission of Final Report |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

1. **EVALUATION ETHICS and Ethical Considerations**

Responsibility of the CO to ensure credibility and independence of evaluation; responsibility of TL to provide impartial, evidence-based, report adhering to international evaluation standards, etc.

The evaluation will follow UNEG guidelines on the ethical participation of human participants, including children and other vulnerable groups. All participants in the study will be fully informed about the nature and purpose of the evaluation and their requested involvement. Only participants who have given their written or verbal consent (documented) will be included in the evaluation.

As part of the inception report, the prospective consultant is expected to provide a detailed plan on how the following principles will be ensured throughout the study: 1) respect for dignity and diversity;2) fair representation; 3) compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (e.g., ethics of research involving young children or vulnerable groups); 4) redress; 5) confidentiality; and 6) avoidance of harm.

Specific safeguards must be put in place to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of both respondents and those collecting the data. These should include:

* A plan is in place to protect the rights of the respondent, including privacy and confidentiality
* The interviewer or data collector is trained in collecting sensitive information, and if the topic of the study is focused on violence against women and children, they should have previous experience in this area
* Data collection tools are designed in a way that are culturally appropriate and do not create distress for respondents
* Data collection visits are organized at the appropriate time and place so as to minimize risk to respondents
* The interviewer or data collector is able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support

Ethical approval for this study should be sought, as appropriate, from the Malawi National Committee on Research in Social Sciences and Humanities.