 ** **

**Strengthening Political Parties Project**

**Project ID: 00071927**

**End of Term Evaluation**

**Terms of Reference**

1. Context:

**1.1 Background**

The project is designed to support the development of accountable and institutionalized political parties in Malawi so that they become meaningful players in the consolidation of democracy.

To achieve this broad objective, the project has been supporting the review of the Political Parties (Registration and Regulation) Act as a legal framework within which political parties in Malawi operate. The project has also been supporting the entrenchment of issues-based politics through the policy development training sessions provided to political parties. Following the electoral cycle management approach, the Centre for Multiparty Democracy (CMD) has been pursuing this drive in between elections so that political parties can grow and get entrenched in issue based politics, other than just doing that for the sake of the elections. Further, as CMD continues to play its role as a platform for dialogue for political parties, the project has been supporting the nurturing of the interparty dialogue space. This is in realization that politics is indispensable for the achievement of a developmental state, and that interparty dialogue has a potential of being a vehicle for the negotiation and the construction of an effective democratic order that leads to such a developmental state.

In furthering the culture of dialogue, the project has been supporting the engagement between political parties and the Malawi Electoral Commission. Again, following the electoral cycle approach, the project has been supporting political parties in CMD to continue the interaction with the Electoral Commission, in between elections so that they can continue to build on the positives that were registered in the previous cycle, and continue working on whatever outstanding issues that may be there. In the same spirit, the project has been supporting CMD to work with the Multiparty Liaison Committees and this support was meant to continue even in between elections so that the culture of dialogue can continue.

The project was also expected to strengthen organizational structures of political parties to ensure stable and functioning secretariats, which are very critical for the progressive institutional and organizational development of the political parties.

The project commenced in 2013 and is expected to close in December 2016 with a total estimated cost of USD 2,800,000.00 and out of this USD 1,600,000 was committed. Funding is provided by Department for International Development (DFID)and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The project is implemented by the CMD, an inter-party dialogue platform established in 2005.

* 1. **Project Outcome and outputs**

The Strengthening Political Parties Project is aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2012-2016) outcome 4.1 “National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially women and children by 2016”.

**UNDAF AP Output 4.1.1:** Democratic Governance Sector Strategy Operationalized.

**Expected Project Outputs:**

1. Revised Political Parties Registration and Regulations Act enacted by the National Assembly by December 2014;
2. Political Parties' Issue Based platforms for 2014 Elections developed and disseminated;
3. Governance structure for political parties developed to foster transparency and accountability by December 2015;
4. Platform for inter-party dialogue strengthened to promote transparency & accountability as well as enhance credibility and legitimacy of political parties at all levels;
5. Effective and Efficient Management, partnership formation and M&E of the project.
6. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

The purposes of the end of 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 DFID’s contribution to the project outcome;
3. Document the achievements and lessons learnt during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar interventions.
4. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery channel and determine whether the delivery channel was fit for purpose.
5. Determine the extent to which value for money was achieved throughout project implementation

The main users of the evaluation results include:

* The Programme Steering Committee;
* Centre for Multi-Party Democracy (CMD);
* Political Parties with representation in Parliament;
* National Peace Architecture Secretariat ;
* Public Affairs Committee (PAC);
* Malawi Electoral Commission;
* Malawi Government;
* UNDP;
* DFID.

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

**Evaluation Scope**

The evaluation should focus on all the five outputs to assess the extent to which the expected results have been achieved. To effectively achieve this, the evaluation is expected to be guided by the **Theory of Change (TOC**) within the **Political Economy framework** which is critical in unearthing central processes or drivers that generate change at different levels. The evaluation is expected to identify some processes or drivers that potentially generated the success or failure of the program. The TOC is further expected to include the analysis of stakeholder involvement and collaboration in the sector within which the Centre for Multiparty Democracy operates. In addition, the evaluation will assess the contribution of the project steering and technical committees in the effective delivery of the project.

**The objectives of the evaluation are to:**

1. Assess and analyse the progress made by the project to date towards achieving the project outcome, goal and outputs and the extent to which these results will be sustained after project closure.
2. Examine and analyse factors which have positively and negatively impacted on achievement of project outputs and outcome;
3. Assess the relevance of the outputs to the effective achievement of the outcome and goal;
4. Assess the relevance and adequacy of the project outcomes and goal to address political challenges in the democratic governance sector.
5. Assess the adequacy of the scope of the project interventions relative to the objectives of the project;
6. Assess the extent to which Centre for Multiparty Democracy support Multi-party Liaison Committees in promoting interparty dialogue and reduce political conflicts in relation to Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC).
7. Assess the effectiveness of institutional arrangements, sustainability arrangements and partnership strategies;
8. Assess extent to which the existing financial, political and regulatory frameworks support the operation of political parties represented in the National Assembly;
9. Provide recommendations and document lessons on the design of the project, implementation, sustainability or exit strategies and partnership arrangements to inform future programming;
10. Distil lessons for future programming and improvement in planning for the remainder of the programme.
11. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**
    1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation will use standard evaluation criteria to assess its performance, which includes 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 project addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
2. Whether the target beneficiaries of the project are clearly identified;
3. Whether the outcome and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators;
4. Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the project are logically articulated and relevant to address the problem addressed in the project.
5. Whether the project is relevant to the development of intra-party and multiparty democracy in the country;
6. Given the capacity building objectives of the project, how effective were the project’s capacity building interventions?

**4.2.2 Implementation/efficiency:**

1. Whether the management arrangements of the project were appropriate and analyze the institutional arrangements put in place including coordination arrangements, financing arrangements and actual implementation;
2. What major factors affected project delivery and propose appropriate interventions to address them.
3. The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the project document;
4. The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
5. The monitoring and backstopping of the project as expected by the Government and UNDP;
6. The Project’s collaboration with the public and private sector, faith groups and civil society, if relevant;
7. The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on project delivery.

**4.2.3 Efficiency:**

1. Whether the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality;
2. Whether the project resources are used effectively to produce planned results (Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans) and how the project incorporated value for money principles?
3. Whether the project 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 project (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.
7. What were the main cost drivers and how these drivers could be abated?
8. Assess whether or not the UNDP resource mobilization strategy for the project was appropriate and effective.

**4.2.4 Effectiveness**:

1. What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its outcome and outputs, performance indicators and targets?
2. Whether there is evidence of UNDP contribution to the outcome of the project.
3. Whether there is evidence of DFID contribution to the outcome of the project.
4. What are the potential areas for project success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
5. Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluator(s) 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 project.
7. Have there been any unplanned effects/results?

**4.2.5 Sustainability**

1. Assess whether or not the project’s achievements are sustainable?
2. Is there an exit strategy for any of the elements of the project?
3. What should be done to strengthen sustainability of project outcomes?
4. **EVALUATION METHODS**

The evaluator should provide details in respect of:

1. **Review of project documentation**. Review of key project documents such as approved project 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 project activities; (ii) phone interviews and performance data surveys of institutions not visited in person; 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 evaluator 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 Responsible Institutions and Citizen Engagement (RICE) Portfolio Manager will provide the overall oversight to the project evaluation and ensure timely delivery and satisfactory final product.
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.
4. The Programme Analyst responsible for the Strengthening Political Parties Project will support the Evaluator 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. The Programme Analyst will be supported by the UNDP M&E Specialist to ensure that the evaluation meets the expected UNDP standards.

1. The Evaluator 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 Evaluator will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication and accommodation. Furthermore, the evaluator will be expected to familiarise themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.
2. The Evaluator will provide the RICE Portfolio Manager with regular updates and feedback.
3. **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. A template of the evaluation matrix will be provided to the evaluator. 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 Evaluator will present a Final Evaluation Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments on the draft report from key stake holders.

1. **TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS**
   1. **Qualifications**

The Evaluator must satisfy the following qualifications and experience:

* Master’s degree in political science, public administration, Law or other related social sciences;
* Minimum of 7 years of professional experience in the areas of democratic governance, human rights and Rights Based Approaches to development.
* Proven experience in gender mainstreaming or promoting gender equality:
* Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agency, government or international aid agency projects on democratic governance;
* Excellent communication skills;

**8.2 Evaluator’s competencies:**

* Democratic Governance
* Theory of change analysis
* Political economy analysis
* Human Rights Based Approach to Programming
* Results Based Management
* Gender mainstreaming
* Strategic thinking
* Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
* Result oriented

1. **TIME AND DURATION:**

The evaluator will be hired for a maximum total of 30 person days. Contract Start Date: 8 August, 2016**.** Contract End Date: 15 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**

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