



Terms of Reference

Title:	External Evaluation Consultant (International) – Rapid Assessment/Final evaluation of the UN Human Security Trust Fund Joint Project <i>Applying Human Security concept to stabilize communities in Canton 10 (Canton 10 Project)</i>
Cluster:	Office of the Resident Coordinator
Reporting to:	Office of the Resident Coordinator / Development, Research and M&E Specialist
Duty Station:	Sarajevo
Contract Type:	Individual Contract
Duration:	30 expert days (in the period 1 September 2016 – 15 December 2016)

Background

Seventeen years after the end of the war BiH has made visible progress, yet its transition from conflict to sustainable peace remains incomplete and fragile. The consequences of the 1992-95 conflict in B&H, which resulted in tens of thousands of casualties, approximately 2.2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, as well as the destruction of homes, infrastructure, cultural and religious monuments and shrines, are still felt today. Although the Dayton Peace Agreement ended the war, the multi-layered institutional and governance structure it established has not managed to address fully the social, economic and security needs of the population. Significant parts of the population, in particular vulnerable groups such as IDPs and returnees, still feel insecure and face particular challenges and hardships at reintegration.

Returnee populations living in regions of BiH where they constitute an ethnic minority are found to be one of the most neglected and vulnerable of all groups. They often live in the most underdeveloped regions of the country, with far fewer resources and investments allocated to them to address housing, infrastructure, employment, education and other needs. They also tend to face a non-responsive local administration run by members of other ethnic groups who are in the majority, and therefore in most cases receive far less support even though their needs tend to be greater. In an assessment conducted prior to the start of the project design the UNCT concluded that of all vulnerable populations in B&H returnees and IDPs living in Canton 10 were one of the most at threat from social, economic and other insecurities. This was confirmed further by assessments made by Madam Sadako Ogata, former UN High Commissioner for Refugees and former member of the Advisory Board for Human Security, and Ms. Anne Willem Bijleveld, Personal Envoy of UNHCR High Commissioner to the Balkans, who visited Canton 10 in April 2013. Given the needs identified in Canton 10, response to mediate situation was elaborated in the 3-year Canton 10 project funded by the United Nations Human Security Trust Fund (UNHSTF).

The project is a joint effort of UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF and IOM, and was developed after extensive consultations with cantonal and municipal authorities, other international agencies, as well as with civil society and other relevant stakeholder groups. Although the project is designed to address the needs of returnee populations in Canton 10, which are found to be one of the most at risk in terms of their economic, social, health and political security and wellbeing, it also seeks to address the needs of the receiving population by partnering with local municipal and cantonal governments and administrations in order to ensure local buy-in and support, as well as secure the long term sustainability of the project.

The project has five objectives.

1. To ensure sustainability by establishing strong partnerships with local authorities and stakeholders through a joint Steering Committee, that will be the main operational partner during implementation.
2. To enhance the capacity of cantonal and municipal administrations to provide social services and other means of support to vulnerable groups, as well as develop partnerships between civil society and governmental structures.
3. To bolster the capacities of cantonal and municipal authorities to prevent discrimination and conflict with a particular focus on the education system.
4. To strengthen local community responsiveness to risks posed by mines and other ordinances, and

5. To develop the capacity of the canton to make certain that vulnerable groups have equal access to employment opportunities and economic sustainability through activities such as income generation projects and vocational training.

Situation in Canton 10 at the outset of the project

Canton 10 consists of six municipalities, three in the north with a Serb returnee majority population (Drvar, Bosansko Grahovo, and Glamoc) and three in the south (Livno, Kupres, and Tomislav Grad) with a Croat majority. There are notable examples that clearly indicate that the population in the northern municipalities of Canton 10 is being neglected. In the field of education, for example, there is an absence of secondary schools in the northern municipalities, and Serb returnees are not offered courses on their own culture, history, and language, which are available for other ethnic groups. There are no specialized health care centers in the northern municipalities; consequently, people must travel at least 80 kilometers in one direction to the main health center in Livno for treatment. Centers for Social Welfare in the northern municipalities are underfunded, understaffed and do not have enough professionals, such as psychologists, social workers, or lawyers with relevant skills to provide essential services, especially to persons with disabilities, or victims of sexual violence. Referral mechanisms for sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) are not established in the northern municipalities either. A significant portion of the population in the north, therefore suffers from multiple vulnerabilities (due to ethnicity, returnee status, gender, living remotely etc).

The intervention of the project is foreseen to be conducted in a holistic and integrated manner to address the complexity of human security needs in Canton 10 and seeks to apply the human security concept and intends to target various threats to the security of vulnerable communities, including economic, health, personal, community, and political insecurities, their interconnectedness and how this contributes to exacerbating further the fragile human security environment in Canton 10.

The evaluation scope, purpose and objectives:

Under the direct guidance and supervision of the UN RCO Development, Research and M&E Specialist and Canton 10 management team consisted of representatives of UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF and IOM, the Evaluation Consultant is going to provide evaluation services ensuring high quality, accuracy and consistency of work. The Evaluation Consultant will demonstrate a client-oriented approach and should meet the standards outlined in the Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System. The evaluation will also be based on a stakeholder approach, where all groups and individuals, who affect and/or are affected by the achievement of the programme results and outcomes, are involved in the analysis. Moreover, the evaluation will take into consideration the institutional, political and economic context, which affected the programme during its implementation. Evaluation Consultant will work in close collaboration with the Canton 10 Programme Manager, participating agencies, programme staff and key programme stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this final evaluation is the UNHSTF Joint Project Applying Human Security concept to stabilize communities in Canton 10, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities that were detailed in the JP documents and in associated modifications made during implementation. The approach of the evaluation shall be participatory, that is, be flexible in design and implementation, ensuring stakeholder participation and ownership, and facilitating learning and feedback.

Two distinct outputs are expected to be delivered by the selected expert:

- **Rapid Assessment Report;** and
- **Final Evaluation Report**

Human Security Rapid Assessment

Format for the Rapid Assessment Report, including **key questions and guiding questions has been elaborated on pages 24-29 of the [UNHSTF Handbook](#)**. The assessment delves very much into the application of the concept of Human Security and is an important product both for the project but in particular for the UNHSTF. Evaluator is to use the allocated expert days for exploration of all elements and evaluation questions that are identified in this ToR and identified in the Handbook relating to Rapid Assessment. Both reports are due at the end of the expert engagement, and time in country, as well as desk-review, interviews, etc. should inform both reports.

Final Evaluation

The final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in this ToR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultant is expected to use all available information sources that will provide evidence on which to base evaluation conclusions and recommendations. Anticipated approaches to be used for data collection and analysis by the evaluator are desk review, interviews with key stakeholders, field visits, questionnaires, participatory techniques and any techniques which may be applied to adequately gather evidence needed for the final evaluation report.

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent in-depth assessment of the achievements of programme results and outcomes against the planned results and the implementation modality of the Canton 10 project. The final evaluation will be a systematic exercise, thorough analysis of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: programme design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, based on the scope and criteria as defined in this ToR. The entire evaluation process including reporting and preparation of conclusions and recommendations for the Joint Programme is to be completed within a period of maximum 4 months / 30 expert days.

Objectives of the final evaluation are:

- Assessment of the programme's quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it aimed to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, national development strategies and priorities, the Sustainable Development Goals at the local and country level, the level of contribution to the objectives of the Human Security Trust Fund and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action;
- Assessment on how the joint programme operated and what is the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and operational and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks, collaboration and synergies and will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the JP modality and make recommendations to guide future joint programming among UN agencies in BiH;
- Assessment of design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme and the level of achievement of envisaged programme results and outcomes (thorough assessment of all programme components is required);
- Assessment of quality, results and impact potential of local programme interventions financed through the programme, including the assessment of co-financing modality and implementation capacities on a local level;
- Assessment of programme's internal and external M&E systems and tools developed including data collection, statistics, research and analytical outputs, databases, guidelines, etc. and assessment of programme's communication strategy and outreach activities
- Identification of key recommendations and lessons learned through the evaluation process of the Joint Programme

Evaluation questions

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them.

Programme Relevance and Design: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention address the real problems and the needs and interest of its target groups, country priorities, the Millennium Development Goals, associated national policies and donor priorities.

Guiding questions:

Relevance: a) Are the Joint Programme objectives and outcomes consistent and supportive of Partner Government policies, sectoral priorities, EU accession agenda, Paris Declaration, SDGs, Human Security Trust Fund priorities, Accra Agenda for Action? b) Is project's Theory of Change sound and were there any departures in the course of the project's implementation? c) Does the programme respond to the needs of identified target groups? d) To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid? e) To what extent have the country's national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention? f) Was the programme timely and well identified given the developmental and sectoral context of the country? g) Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the Joint Programme?

Design: a) Was the design of the Joint Programme appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes? b) What is the quality of the programme's implementation framework, are results and outcomes defined in the programme

clear and logical? c) What is the quality of programmes' results and M&E matrices, are indicators well defined and SMART? d) Were risks and assumptions well identified? e) Were changes made to the programme design during the inception phase? If yes, did they lead to significant design improvements? f) Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and did they support institutional strengthening and local ownership? g) Does the Joint Programme take into account cross-cutting issues and specific interests of women, minorities, people with disabilities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?

Programme Efficiency (processes): Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results and what is their quality.

Guiding questions: a) To what extent does the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contributed to obtaining the envisaged outputs and results? b) To what extent participating UN agencies have coordinated with each other and with the government and with civil society? To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place? c) Were programmes' financial and personnel resources managed in a transparent and accountable manner and were they cost-effective? d) To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources? e) What monitoring tools and mechanisms were used by the programme management? f) If applicable, how flexible and responsive was the programme in adapting to changing needs? g) How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate? h) Were work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions, other Joint Programmes? i) To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's outcomes and produce results and impacts?

Programme Effectiveness (results): Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance. How well programme's results contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives?

Guiding questions: a) What was the quality of the programme's key outputs and/or products (per component)? b) To what extent were the key programme results achieved (per component)? c) To what extent and in what ways the joint programme addressed Human Security concept on a local level and the country level? d) To what extent and in what ways the joint programme contributed to the objectives set by the UN Human Security Trust Fund? e) What factors contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results? f) In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? g) What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified? h) Did all planned target groups had access/used programme results? i) What is the quality of local interventions and results achieved on a local level?

Programme Impact: The effect of the programme on its environment - the positive and negative changes produced by the Joint Programme (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended).

Guiding questions: a) What difference the programme intervention made to programme stakeholders? b) Which target groups and how many direct and indirect beneficiaries were affected by the programme? c) What impact has been made in the targeted sectors in terms of institutional development, legislative development, capacity development? d) What impact has been made through the programme on key institutions, municipal administrations, local communities? e) Were cross-cutting issues taken into account? f) Was good governance mainstreamed in the programme? g) How did the programme contributed to the promotion of Human Rights? h) To what extent joint programme helped to influence the country's public policy framework? i) What factors favorably or adversely affected the spirit of Joint Programme delivery and approach?

Programme Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the programme continuing in the long term.

Guiding questions: a) To what extent will the benefits of a programme continue after activities have ceased? b) How well is the programme embedded in institutional structures (national and local) that will survive beyond the life of the programme? c) Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to continue working in the development direction set by programme and to continue using results and applying good practices? d) Is there an exit strategy or a follow up action/intervention planned after the programme ends? e) Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme? f) Was the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure sustainability of the interventions? g) What lessons learned or good transferable practices to other programmes or countries have been observed during the evaluation analysis? h) To what extent and in what ways joint programme contributed to progress towards United Nations reform and future joint programme planning and implementation? i) How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes? j) What additional measures (if any) could have improved the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact or sustainability of the Joint Programme?

Support of the Joint Project to the evaluation process

The Regional Programme Manager / Joint UN Project Coordinator will support the Evaluation Consultant with the following:

- Appointment of a focal person in the programme that will support the consultant for the duration of the evaluation process
- Gathering additional data/information where data gaps are identified by the Evaluator and where feasible to be collected
- Securing relevant background documentation required for a comprehensive desk review
- Provision of list of contacts in advance and additional upon request
- Provision of vehicle and driver for field visits
- Organisation of group consultative meetings, briefing and debriefing sessions
- Provision of translation services
- Provision of office/working space during the assignment. The consultant will however have to use his/her own computer/laptop

Deliverables and timeline

Evaluation Process

The Evaluation consultant will be responsible for conducting the evaluation. This entails among other responsibilities designing the evaluation according to this terms of reference; gathering data from different sources of information; analyzing, organizing and triangulating the information; identifying patterns and causal linkages that explain programme performance and impact; drafting evaluation reports at different stages (inception, draft, final); responding to comments and factual corrections from stakeholders and incorporating them, as appropriate, in subsequent versions; and making briefs and presentations ensuring the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are communicated in a coherent, clear and understandable manner once the report is completed.

The evaluation process is expected to contain three phases: inception phase, evaluation field visit; and analysis and reporting.

- **Inception Phase (5 days)** - the Evaluation Consultant will review documentation, agree on the meetings and field visit locations with the Programme Coordinator, and produce Evaluation Inception Report (which includes a clear evaluation work plan and tools).
- **Evaluation Field Visit (in country 10 days)** – the Evaluation Consultant will gather information through group and individual interviews and field visit to Canton 10. At the end of the mission, presentation with preliminary findings and recommendations will be presented to the programme team/Evaluation Reference Group/Heads of Agencies and the Resident Coordinator.
- **Analysis and Reporting (4 days for draft Rapid Assessment, 8 days for draft Evaluation Report and additional 3 days for finalization of two reports/incorporation of comments)** – the Evaluation Consultant will prepare the draft rapid assessment and evaluation reports based on the analysis of findings, and will submit the reports to the Evaluation Reference Group for factual review and comments. Opportunity to comment on the draft report will be open to Reference group for a maximum of 15 working days. After this process ends, the Evaluation Consultant will proceed with production of the final evaluation report.

Evaluation Deliverables

The Evaluation Consultant will be accountable for producing the following products/deliverables:

- Inception Report
- Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations
- Draft Rapid Assessment Report
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Final Rapid Assessment Report
- Final Evaluation Report

The **Inception Report** should detail the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The Inception Report is foreseen to be amended by findings from the first field visit and further finetuned to reflect Impact Assessment approach that will be applied based on findings in the field in terms of data availability and usefulness.

Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations- at the end of the evaluation field visit, the Evaluation Consultant will present his/her draft findings and provisional recommendations through a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the main findings recommendations and lessons learned and conclusions.

Draft **Rapid Assessment Report** is to have structure and will address questions as identified in the 2016 UNHSTF Handbook of approximately 15 pages in length.

Draft **Evaluation Report** should be at least 40 pages of length containing unique narrative analysis and should incorporate (as a minimum):

- Title and opening pages
- Table of Contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- An Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Scope of Evaluation
- Evaluation Methodology and Guiding Principles
- Details of the JP activities and desired key results
- Programme Analysis (per component)
- Findings
- Lessons Learned
- Best Practices
- Recommendations
- Methodological constraints
- Additional background data-Annexes (including interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, ToR, etc.)

Final Rapid Assessment and Evaluation reports, will encompass all key sections required in the draft reports and will include additional stakeholder feedback. Final reports need to be clear, understandable to the intended audience and logically organized based on the comments received from stakeholders. The final reports should be presented in a solid, concise and readable form and be structured around the issues as identified in this Terms of Reference. The consultant should refer to United Nations Evaluation Group guidelines for fine detail on conduct of evaluation and expectations from evaluation in the UN System. The Evaluation Consultant is responsible for editing and quality control of final reports that should be presented in a way that directly enables publication.

Timeframe

Action/Deliverable	No of Expert Days	Time period
Inception Phase/Inception Report	5 days	September 2016
Evaluation, field visit / Presentation with key findings	10 days	Sept/October 2016
Analysis and Reporting / Draft R. Assessment/Evaluation Report	12 days	October 2016
Analysis and Reporting / Final R. Assessment/Evaluation Report	3 days	November 2016

Evaluation Ethics:

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Critical issues that evaluator must safeguard include the rights and confidentiality of information providers in the design and implementation of the evaluation.

At every stage of the evaluation process, the following principles should be observed:

- Independence - the evaluation team should be independent from the operational management and decision-making functions of the JP
- Impartiality – the evaluation information should be free of political or other bias and deliberate distortions
- Timeliness - evaluations must be designed and completed in a timely fashion
- Purpose - the scope, design and plan of the evaluation should generate relevant products that meet the needs of intended users
- Transparency - meaningful consultation with stakeholders should be undertaken to ensure the credibility and utility of the evaluation
- Competencies - evaluations should be conducted by well-qualified experts/teams. The teams should, wherever feasible, be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries

or regions concerned

- Ethics - evaluators must have professional integrity and respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and to verify statements attributed to them. Evaluations must be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments and must be conducted legally and with due regard to the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its findings.
- Quality - All evaluations should meet the standards outlined in the Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System. The key questions and areas for review should be clear, coherent and realistic. The evaluation plan should be practical and cost effective. To ensure that the information generated is accurate and reliable, evaluation design, data collection and analysis should reflect professional standards, with due regard for any special circumstances or limitations reflecting the context of the evaluation. Evaluation findings and recommendations should be presented in a manner that will be readily understood by target audiences and have regard for cost-effectiveness in implementing the recommendations proposed.

Remuneration and Terms of Payment

The Evaluation Consultant will be paid based on milestones accomplished:- 30% after the Inception Report is submitted and agreed, and 70% after submission of a satisfactory Final Rapid Assessment and Evaluation Report.

Competencies:

- Shares knowledge and experience and provides helpful feedback and advice;
- Conceptualizes and analyzes problems to identify key issues, underlying problems, and how they relate;
- Ability to identify beneficiaries' needs, and to match them with appropriate solutions;
- Excellent communication and interview skills
- Excellent report writing skills
- Responds positively to critical feedback and differing points of view;
- Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints;
- Strong IT skills
- Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Remains calm, in control and good humored even under pressure.

Minimum Requirements:

- Advanced University degree in international development, evaluation, social sciences, human security and other related fields;
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations;
- Substantial international track record of conducting different types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations in different countries and organizations;
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System and the UN Reform process;
- Experience in evaluation of human security interventions is considered an asset;
- Understanding of the development context and working experience in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an asset;
- Fluency in spoken and written English.

Signatures		
Incumbent <i>(if applicable)</i>		
Name	Signature	Date
Envesa Hodzic-Kovac Supervisor		
Name / Title	Signature	Date
Sezin Sinanoglu UN Resident Coordinator		
Name / Title	Signature	Date