**UNDP NEPAL**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Outcome Evaluation: UNDAF/CPAP Outcome 2**

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

Based on the United Nation Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF, 2013-2017), UNDP Country Programme was formulated on the principle of human rights, gender equality, environmental sustainability, capacity development, and result based management. While outcomes and indicators are directly drawn from UNDAF, UNDP’s country programme is anchored around three interlinked areas; advancing equality through equity, protecting development gains and creating an enabling environment for enhanced international cooperation. UNDP contributes to 9 out of 10 UNDAF outcomes.

UNDAF Outcome 2 – “Vulnerable groups have improved access to economic opportunities and adequate social protection” primarily focuses on economic empowerment and employment creation for vulnerable groups for poverty reduction and reduced inequality by creating enabling policy and institutional environment and capacity building of government and community institutions and expanding livelihood assets of vulnerable groups. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and M&E framework for UNDAF Outcome 2 is in ***annex-1***.

Prolonged political transition, expected to end in early phase of UNDAF, continues even after the promulgation of constitution in October 2015. Hence Nepal could not focus much on economic agenda that can support growth promotion and employment opportunities for the poor and vulnerable. While UNDP remains focused to achieve the results defined under outcome 2, it had to make some adjustments in its strategy and approaches and has revised some targets and indicators.

**National Context**

Nepal has gone through unprecedented changes over the past one decade. Following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) that ended a decade long armed conflict in the country, Nepal, in 2006, entered into a complicated political transition. The promulgation of a new constitution of Nepal in 2015 implies fundamental changes in the country’s governance system. Nepal is moving from being a constitutional monarchy to a republic and from a unitary system to a federal structure. Nepal’s new constitution has several fundamental rights such as right to food, right to education, right to employment that are directly linked to human development and poverty. The federal structure will change substantially the way development activities are carried out in the country. The provincial government will play a major role for development activities and service delivery that directly contribute to poverty reduction and economic empowerment of people.

On the economic side, Nepal has been performing poorly for the last several years. The average economic growth of the past one decade has remained below 4%. There has, however, been a satisfactory progress in poverty reduction. According to the Nepal Living Standard Surveys, % of people below national poverty line, which was 42% in 1996/97, went down to 31% in 2004 and further reduced to 25% in 2010/11. The poverty rate was estimated at 23.8% before the start of the thirteenth plan in mid-2013. The draft approach paper for the fourteenth plan has estimated that the poverty rate in the past three years has further reduced to 21.6% - two percent point reduction. Despite the challenges, Nepal aims to graduate from the status of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) by 2022 and upgrade to middle income status by 2030.

Inequality continues to remain a challenge for Nepal. Gini-coefficient that measures income inequality remained at 0.33. Despite good progress in national poverty reduction, disparity by location and social groups is still very high. According to Nepal Living Standard Survey Report III, poverty is still concentrated in rural areas (27%) against 15% in urban areas. The poverty in Far-west (45%) is over twice higher than in the eastern region (21%). Hill Dalits (43%) have as high as four times higher poverty rate than that of hill Brahmin (10%). As these data come from NLSS only, no further updated data is available.

Economic growth is fundamental to employment creation. Due to low economic growth, Nepal has not been able to create sufficient employment opportunities. The employment growth has remained at 2.9%. Out of the total population, 30% are under-employed. This is primarily because of the low growth of the agriculture sector where most of the poor are concentrated and as a result, roughly 450,000 youths migrate abroad in search of employment opportunities, every year.

Access to energy plays an important role to advance people’s economic opportunities. In Nepal, renewable energy is the best possible solution for providing energy access to vulnerable groups and people living in remote areas. In the past three years, additional 289,523 households (HHs) were connected to solar energy and additional 589,000 households (HHs) with improved cooking stoves. Households benefitting from renewable energy has increased to 15% from 13%.

In 2015, or third year of CPAP implementation, devastating earthquake of April 25 and May 12 caused approx. 8500 human casualties and damage of over 500000 houses was incurred, followed by fuel crisis and shortage of goods and materials as a result of the border blockade in the south. Nepal suffered huge loss both socially and economically. According to the Post Disaster Needs Assessment, the earthquake will end up pushing an additional 2.5 to 3.5 percent Nepali to poverty in FY 2015/16 which translate into at least 700,000 additional poor. The economic growth fell to 0.77% in the last fiscal year. It is estimated that approx. USD 7 billion is required for the recovery.

Despite the political instability and armed struggle coupled with low economic growth, Nepal’s MDG achievement has been remarkable. It is primarily due to government commitment and proactive role in creating an enabling environment for mainstreaming MDGs in its development planning and programming from the early stage. Regular monitoring of MDGs contributed to inform government and stay focused for the achievement of MDGs. As MDGs have come to an end after 2015, the United Nations with the endorsement of world leaders brought Sustainable Development Goals, a new global development agenda by 2030. SDGs are the agenda of people, planet and prosperity. Unlike MDGs, SDGs give more emphasis on economic agenda. Accordingly, the economic agenda is expected to take centre in the coming days globally, including Nepal.

**UNDP’s support and engagement**

Under the outcome 2, UNDP’s support is structured into three broad areas: 1) creating an enabling environment for evidence based policy making through generation of information and knowledge products to inform pro-poor policies, 2) support for enterprise development and employment creation for the poor and vulnerable, 3) enhancing livelihoods asset through energy access and environmental services. Institutional capacity development cuts across all areas.

Under pro-poor policy support, UNDP supported the formulation of national development plans, assessment of national policies, strengthening national M&E system and support for data generation and statistical system of Nepal through its partnership with National Planning Commission and Central Bureau of Statistics. While UNDP intended to support NPC for the preparation of National Inclusive Growth Strategy as a tool to inform national plans and programmes, we had to replace it with the preparation of LDC graduation strategy which is the government’s key priority.

Under support for enterprise development and employment creation, UNDP has applied a two-pronged approach – 1) capacity building of the Ministry of Industry and DDCs, business development service providers to create micro-entrepreneurs in an efficient and sustainable way, and 2) direct support for creation of entrepreneurs from poor and vulnerable groups.

Under the third component: enhance access to energy and environment services, UNDP’s support is directed to the promotion of natural resource based enterprises, wetland management, climate risk management and promotion of renewable energy services in rural areas. This is to link energy services with the expansion of energy based enterprises and economic opportunities for rural development. In addition, this component also aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Alternative Energy Promotion Centre (AEPC) as one of the key strategies to ensure access to energy and energy services in remote parts of Nepal.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

**2.1. Purpose of evaluation**

The main purpose of the outcome evaluation is to assess programme results, review UNDP’s strategies and approaches in relation to the achievement of outcome 2 and also to provide forward looking recommendations for UNDP’s programme focus and strategies for poverty reduction and inclusive growth to inform upcoming UNDAF and Country Programme Document (CPD).

**2.2. Evaluation objectives**

Main objective of this evaluation is to assess UNDP’s contribution towards the achievement of outcome 2. Specific objectives of the outcome 2 evaluation are to evaluate:

1. the extent to which planned outcome and the related outputs have been, are being achieved, or likely to be achieved;
2. the causal linkage by which outputs contribute to the achievement of specified outcome;
3. concrete evidence of the UNDP contribution to the outcome including the use of case studies as a tool to explain results;
4. factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome, both in terms of external and internal environment to the portfolio interventions, including: weaknesses in design, management, human resource skills, and resources;
5. UNDP’s partnership strategy for the achievement of outcome 2;
6. strategic values and comparative advantages of UNDP in contributing to the outcome and
7. lessons learned from the implementation of the interventions.
8. **EVALUATION SCOPE**

The scope of this evaluation is to evaluate the collective results of UNDP’s contributions towards improved access to economic opportunities and employment creation for poor and vulnerable groups .In addition to the projects directly under outcome 2, Livelihood Recovery for Peace (LRP) that is under outcome 9 will also be assessed to document UNDP’s contribution and lessons for area-based integrated poverty reduction/livelihood support programme for ultra-poor and excluded groups.

Key projects to be evaluated:

1. **Micro Enterprise Development Program (MEDEP, 2013-2018**), which started as a pilot initiative in 1998 has come a long way with financial support from Australian Aid, DFID, New Zealand Aid, and CIDA. Aimed at promoting off-farm employment and catering to the needs of socially excluded groups, MEDEP has created 70,000 micro-entrepreneurs. It gives high priority to gender and social inclusion (GESI). 68% of beneficiaries are women, 23% Dalit, 36% indigenous nationalities, 19% Madhesi, and 55% youth aged between 16 and 40. MEDEP entrepreneurs have produced goods and services worth Rs 9.5 billion with a production cost of Rs 2.6 billion and earned a whooping profit of Rs 6.9 billion. After successful implementation for the past 18 years, MEDEP is now on the fourth phase (MEDEP IV, 2013-2018) focusing on helping the Government of Nepal (GoN) institutionalize the MEDEP model into its Micro-Enterprise Development for Poverty Alleviation (MEDPA). It also supports capacity development to government and stakeholders for sustainable delivery of micro-enterprise development services.

2) **Strengthening National Planning and Monitoring Capacity (SNPMC, 2013-2017)** provides support to the National Planning Commission (NPC) and the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) to enhance evidence-based planning and policy making. It intends to generate high quality data and statistics, strengthen the national M&E system, and develop institutional capacity. SNPMC gives high priority to mainstream environmental and climate change issues into planning and policy formulation. The total budget is USD 4.9m funded by UNDP, UK aid, and UNEP. SNPMC supported to align line ministries to National M&E system, good number of government officials are trained on M&E, evaluation national capacity is enhanced, supported the production of result framework of 13th development plan, National Human Development Report 2014, MDG Progress Report 2013, SDGs National Report 2015, Annual Household Survey Reports 2013/14 and 2014/205 and Climate Budget Code. By the end of the project, it is expected that National Strategy for the Development of Statistics (NSDS) is prepared and implemented, Annual Household Survey is introduced and institutionalized, and NPC's capacity is strengthened.

1. **Support to Knowledge and Lifelong Learning Skills (SKILLS, 2015-2017)** programme was developed in April 2015 by the Government of Nepal, Ministry of Education (MoE), and UNDP with the objectives to promote policy coherence and design Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system design for quality assurance and knowledge management. It has involved public, private sector, organizations, and donors in the reform of TVET policy 2012, and conducted studies to bridge gaps in TVET provisions in relation to employment, income and livelihood improvement potentials. The programme is planned for 3 years between April 2015 and December 2017.
2. **Livelihoods Recovery for Peace (LRP, 2009-2015)** was an integrated community-based development initiative that aims to strengthen the capacities of local institutions and poor households and communities to respond to livelihood recovery needs and contribute to peace building. LRP was implemented in three of Nepal's Southern districts where poverty, conflict and natural disasters have hindered development. Lack of livelihood recovery opportunities and abject poverty seriously threaten peace and social harmony between people of multiple ethnicities. Women, youth, conflict-affected people, and poor and socially excluded communities were in the target groups for the project. The project period was from 2009 to 2015. The project was funded by UNDP and Norwegian Government with the budget amounting to US$ 9.68 million. The implementing partners for this project were the District Development Committees, Women and Children's Office, Non-Governmental Organization and Youth Networks.
3. **Rapid Enterprise and Livelihoods Recovery Project (RELRP, 2015-2016)** is designed to provide quick enterprise recovery support to micro-entrepreneurs severely affected by earthquake in seven MEDEP districts: Nuwakot, Rasuwa, Sindhupalchowk, Kavre, Dolakha, Ramechhap and Sindhuli. Funded by the Australian government, RELRP also promotes social cohesion and local economic recovery by supporting selected earthquake survivors to establish new micro-enterprises. Its activities include enhancing technical skills, settling up Common Facility Centers, marketing and business counseling, psycho-social counseling, and entrepreneurship skills training. Through the programme, 12,059 affected MEDEP/MEDPA entrepreneurs were revived and at least 1,500 new micro entrepreneurs were created.
4. **Community Infrastructure and Livelihood Recovery Project (CILRP, 2015-2016),**supported by the Government of Mauritius, aims to rehabilitate communities and reconstruct infrastructures to promote local enterprise recovery. Community infrastructures cover those that are productive to the people who have been worst affected by the disaster and who are vulnerable to future disasters. These include community building, rural access, and support to agriculture, rural energy and basic service, such as community lodge, trail, irrigation, water mill, and waste management.
5. **Renewable Energy for Rural Livelihood (RERL, Transition phase, 2011-2014)** was initiated upon the successful completion of Rural Energy Development Programme (REDP, 1996-2011) and funded by the Government of Nepal (GoN), UNDP, and the World Bank (WB). The objective of RERL was to contribute to economic, environmental and social benefits of the rural people by removing barriers that have hindered the wider promotion and use of renewable energy resources particularly in rural areas of Nepal. It provided technical and managerial support to AEPC to fulfil its commitments under partnership agreements signed with the WB in regards to implementation of MHVEP.
6. **Renewable Energy for Rural Livelihood (RERL, 2014-2019)** was developed as an integral part of Alternative Energy Promotion Centre (AEPC)’s National Rural and Renewable Energy Programme (NRREP) which represents the collective baseline activities on renewable energy. The main objective of RERL is to support AEPC to remove barriers for scaling up promotion of lesser disseminated larger renewable energy systems such as mini hydro, large micro hydro and large solar PV systems. RERL intends to provide incremental support to NRREP by providing technical assistance to develop sustainable implementation modalities. The core strategies of RERL include demonstration projects and private sector involvement for financing and attainment of financial sustainability through promotion of productive energy use.
7. **Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wetlands in Nepal (CSUWN, 2008-2013)** was a joint undertaking of the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation (MoFSC), Government of Nepal, Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNDP Nepal. It was designed to address the root causes of wetland degradation and loss of wetland habitats by integrating wetland management and conservation issues into national policies and plans and to strengthen national capacity by linking national actions with activities in its project sites namely Koshi Tappu Wildlife Reserve and Ghodaghodi Lake Area. CSUWN has accumulated some key experiential learnings on wetland biodiversity conservation values, its policy and planning frameworks, building institutional capacity and awareness raising and collaborative management of wetland resources for the conservation and sustainable livelihoods during its five years implementation. For effective and pragmatic implementation, it adopted a community based wetland management and conservation approach and paid equal attention to conservation and development issues by involving women, poor, indigenous and wetland dependent communities. CSUWN has envisioned three major outcomes, *viz*. (i) wetland biodiversity conservation values integrated into national policy and planning frameworks; (ii) strengthened national institutional, technical and economic capacity and awareness for wetland biodiversity conservation and sustainable use; and (iii) enhanced collaborative management of wetland resources for conservation and sustainable livelihoods.
8. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATING**
	1. **Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Evaluation Questions** The evaluation will assess UNDP programmes and projects based on the following evaluation questions mentioned under different criteria: |
| **Relevance** | It assesses how UNDP programmes/project interventions are relevant with UNDAF outcome 2, CPAP, UNDP mandates, and national priorities, includ9ing:  1. To what extent have UNDP objectives, programmes and interventions addressed national priorities of poverty alleviation, achieving MDG targets, LDC graduation, etc. to which CPAP was aligned?
2. How appropriately are UNDP interventions (MEDEP, SNPMC, SKILLS, RELRP, CILRP, RERL, and LRP projects) designed in line with UNDP’s mandate and principles of gender equality, social inclusion, and human development?
3. To what extent is UNDP’s engagement in the area of poverty and policy reform a reflection of strategic considerations given UNDP’s comparative advantages and role in Nepal’s development context
4. Whether the UNDP current approaches, strategy, resources, intervention models and conceptual framework are relevant to achieve the planned outputs and outcomes?
5. How UNDP has been able to adapt its programmes to the changing context of Nepal and to address priority needs of the country?

Whether the UNDP program/project designs are appropriate in terms of geography, population coverage, and meeting the needs of women and marginalized groups in Nepal’s context? |
| **Effectiveness** | It is a measure of how UNDP has contributed to address the developmental challenges initiated and achieved by the government or other UNDP counterparts. Following set of questions would be used to find out the effectiveness:1. To what extent have UNDP programmes and projects (MEDEP, SNPMC, SKILLS, RELRP, CILRP, RERL, and LRP) achieved/not achieved or are on the right track in achieving planned outputs and outcomes?
2. How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affected the outcomes, and in what ways have they been effective?
3. What is the effectiveness in utilization of technical assistance provided by UNDP and its programmes/projects during implementation?
4. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
5. What are the contributing and hindering factors for effective implementation of UNDP programmes and projects?
6. What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP’s work?
7. To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
8. To what extent outcomes achieved benefitted women and men equally?
9. How did UNDP promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?
10. How have the UNDP interventions targeted beneficiary groups and geographical areas to respond to women, marginalized populations and other target groups?
11. How women, the poor, socially and geographically marginalized people including Madheshi, Janajati and people living with disabilities were mainstreamed in UNDP program/project interventions?
12. To what extent has UNDP’s approach to GESI mainstreaming been effective?
 |
| **Efficiency** | This is a measure on how UNDP organized itself in delivering quality outputs in a cost effective way. Following questions are suggested to assess efficiency of UNDP related outcomes:1. Whether there have been any efforts from UNDP to minimize duplication among UNDP’s own interventions and interventions delivered by other organizations or entities in contributing to the outcome?
2. What is the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR), Financial Internal Rate of Return (FIRR) and economic internal rate of return in community level intervention projects like Micro Enterprise Development Project (MEDEP) and Livelihood Recovery for Peace Project? And how the per unit cost is in selected interventions? (E.g. development of a micro-entrepreneur, micro-entrepreneur skill building training, etc. compared with cost incurred in other agencies?)
3. Whether UNDP programmes/projects are implemented/completed in stipulated time? If there were any variations, what were the reasons? Whether the reasons were documented well? If yes were they valid? If not what were the reasons?
4. Whether the UNDP social programms/projects (MEDEP, SNPMC, SKILLS, RELRP, CILRP, RERL, and LRP projects) adopted cost effective approach during implementation. If yes, how could they be valid?
5. How was the resource allocation a priority and practice within the UNDP programmes and projects?
6. To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
7. How is the monitoring system? Does it generate data and provide inputs to learn and carry on the implementation accordingly?
 |
| **Impact** | It is a measure on how the UNDP interventions have made changes in the livelihood of people and changes in policy towards the poor and marginalized people. The outcome evaluation would not be able to assess directly on the impact but it will assess some aspects of impacts of the programmes/projects through the following questions: * 1. How many new jobs have been created by UNDP programmes/projects (MEDEP, SKILLS, RELRP, CILRP, LRP and RERL)? Did women, the poor, and marginalized people get into work through those interventions?
	2. How many people directly came out of poverty due to UNDP programme/project interventions? How many of them were women or from disadvantaged groups?
	3. How did UNDP interventions contribute to increase food security at household level among the target population? How did they contribute to reduce youth migration? How the interventions contributed on import substation and LDC graduation of Nepal?
	4. How these programmes have met the development expectation of local people?
	5. Were there any policy changes in favour of the poor and marginalized people created as an effect of UNDP partnership?
 |
| **Sustainability**  | This is a measure on how results generated from the UNDP programmes/projects are sustainable. This can be measured the following questions: 1. How strong the level of ownership over results is derived from UNDP programmes/project intervention by the relevant government counterparts and other stakeholders e.g. NPC, CBS, MOI, MOE?
2. What is the level of commitment from the Government and other stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the results achieved and to support the continuation of benefits?
3. How are the results achieved through UNDP’s support institutionalised into national and local institutions including government institutions?
4. Are there policies and regulatory frameworks in place that support the continuity of benefits/results?
5. What are the challenges to sustain the achieved results?
6. Are there sustainability strategies developed and implemented to ensure sustainability of results, systems, and structures?
 |

* 1. E**valuation Rating**

Overall evaluative conclusions and recommendations will be rated as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **Criteria** | **Rating Standard** |
| A | Relevancy | * + 1. Highly relevant B. Relevant C. Not relevant
 |
| B | Effectiveness  | 1. Highly effective B. Effective C. Not Effective
 |
| C | Efficiency | 1. Highly efficient B. Efficient C. Not Efficient
 |
| D | Impact | 1. High impacted B. Impacted C. Not impacted

(Should consider both positive and negative)  |
| E | Sustainability | 1. Highly sustainable B. Sustainable C. Not Sustainable
 |
| F | Gender, Inclusion and Human Right  | * 1. Highly satisfactory B. Satisfactory C. Unsatisfactory
 |
| G | Partnership  | 1. Highly satisfactory B. Satisfactory C. Unsatisfactory
 |
|  | Overall conclusion  | 1. Highly satisfactory B. Satisfactory C. Unsatisfactory
 |

1. **METHODOLOGY**

The outcome evaluation team has to develop evaluation methodologies including approach, tools and techniques for data collection and information analysis, as well as evaluation matrix in the proposal as per the format attached in ***Annex-2****.* The evaluation team is expected to apply a mixed method approach to collect both quantitative and qualitative data, primary and secondary data to validate and to triangulate data. The data collection methods used are expected to be participatory and inclusive of disadvantaged and marginalized populations. The evaluation will follow the guidelines below:

Outcome evaluations include four standard categories of analysis:

* An assessment of progress towards the outcome,
* An assessment of factors affecting the outcome,
* An assessment of key UNDP contributions to outcomes, and
* An assessment of the partnership strategy used.

  The data collection methods should include, but not limited to,

* Desk reviews of relevant documents (UNDP Strategic Plan 2013-2017, UNDAF Nepal, CPAP, Sustainable Development Goals 2016-2030 National Report, project documents, progress reports, relevant evaluation reports and studies, etc.);
* Review key government policy documents e.g. 13th plan, SDGs national report, MDG terminal report, 13the plan review report etc;
* Key informant interviews at the national and sub-national level;
* Focused group discussions at the national, sub-national and community level;
* Direct observations during field visits to selected sites;
* Administration of surveys/questionnaires

**Evaluation Process**

The evaluation will unfold in three phases, each of them including several steps.

1. **Design phase**
	* Document and desk review as mentioned above,
	* Stakeholder mapping (a mapping of stakeholders relevant to the projects contributing to poverty reduction and livelihood promotion. The mapping exercise will include government and civil society stakeholders and indicate the relationships between different sets of stakeholders,
	* Analysis of the UNDAF, CPAP and Poverty and Inclusion related Projects' Result Resource Matrixes, the Evaluation Matrix),
	* Finalization of the list of evaluation questions,
	* Development of data collection and analysis strategy as well as concrete work plan for the field phase,

At the end of this phase, the review team will produce an inception report, displaying the results of the above mentioned steps and tasks.

1. **Field phase**

After the design phase, the evaluation team will undertake in‐country field visits to collect and analyze the data required in order to answer the final evaluation questions and consolidate during the design phase. The evaluation methodology should be representative to cover different types of poverty interventions done under UNDP projects and programmes. The evaluation team should make a visit to at least four sites in four different districts covering all projects (Please see ***Annex-3*** for the reference on project field presence). At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will provide the UNDP and stakeholders a debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the review, with a view to validate preliminary findings and teste tentative conclusions and/or recommendations.

1. **Synthesis phase**

During this phase, the evaluation team will continue the analytical work initiated during the field phase and prepare a first draft of the outcome report, taking into account comments made by the UNDP and stakeholders at the debriefing meeting. The first draft of the report will be submitted to the Reference Group, Implementing Partners and stakeholders through UNDP for comments in writing. Based on the comments from the Reference Group, Implementing Partners and stakeholders, the second draft of the report will be prepared. The second draft will be presented at the In‐country validation meeting, which should be attended by the key programme stakeholders, including Implementing Partners, and UNDP staff. The final report will be drafted shortly after the meeting, taking into account comments made by the participants.

**Key Stakeholders to be consulted**

* National Planning Commission
* Central Bureau of Statistics
* Ministry of Industry (DCSI, CSIDB)
* Micro enterprise Development –Service providers
* NEDC, NMEFEN, DMEGA
* MOFALD/DDCs
* MOPE/AEPC
* MOCPA
* Ministry of Education, CTEVT
* DFAT, DFID, KOICA, SDC, DDCs, NGOs, youth clubs and networks, cooperative divisions
1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS**

The evaluation team is expected to produce the following deliverables:

* **Evaluation Inception Report** detailing the evaluation team understanding of what is being evaluated and why, an evaluation matrix outlining which data collection methodologies will be used to address each of the evaluation questions, a proposed schedule of tasks. A presentation of the inception report will be made to and discussed with UNDP including and key stakeholders. Please ***Annex-4a*** for the requirements of what to be included in the Inception Report.
* **Draft Evaluation Report** to be shared with UNDP and relevant stakeholders for feedback and quality assurance.
* **Evaluation debriefing** meeting with UNDP and key stakeholders where main findings will be presented.
* **Final Evaluation Report** (Content format is attached in the ***Annex-4b****)*
* **Sharing presentation** of the final Evaluation Report - a concise summary of the evaluation findings in plain language that can be widely circulated. This can be in a form of a PowerPoint presentation
* **Submission of the Final Evaluation Report**, electronic as well as hard copies.
1. **EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS**

The evaluation will be carried out through a firm to be selected through competitive selection process. While the firm will assume overall responsibility to ensure the quality of evaluation products and process to be followed as per the TORs: it is envisioned that it will have a gender balanced team of experts.

The consultancy period for the firm will be between June and the end of August 2016.

* 1. **Evaluation Team Leader cum Policy Expert (one International position, 30 working days)**

**Roles and responsibilities:**

* Assume overall responsibility to produce inception, draft and final outcome evaluation reports;
* Be responsible for the designing of evaluation, coordination of the Evaluation Team and timely submission of all deliverables, assuring quality;
* Lead the team for desk review analyses, discussions and meetings, assign clear roles/responsibilities/deliverable for each of the team members, prepare presentation and present the findings of the report to different stakeholders;
* Assess UNDP’s contribution in creating enabling policy environment for pro poor and inclusive growth policies/plans/programmes for poverty and inclusion;
* Provide specific recommendations and way forward for UNDP’s policy level engagement for pro poor policy and inclusive growth.

**Qualification/Experience**

* Ph. D in economics and other related field with sound technical knowledge on poverty, employment and inclusive growth;
* At least 10 years of working experience in one of the following fields – pro poor policies, inclusive growth, employment creation and poverty reduction;
* At least seven years of experience evaluating poverty programmes with experience as a team leader for minimum two evaluation;
* Expertise, familiarity, knowledge on gender and social inclusion,
	+ Excellent command of written and spoken English.

* 1. **Employment and Livelihood Development Expert (1 national position, 40 working days)**

**Roles and responsibilities:**

* Take stock of employment/enterprise and livelihood situation of the country,
* Assess UNDP’s contribution towards the achievement of outcome 2 from employment and livelihood perspective,
* Provide specific recommendations to inform UNDP’s future programmes to support employment creation and livelihood promotion programmes.

**Qualification and Experience:**

* Master's Degree or higher from a recognized University/Institution in social development, economics, development studies and related fields,
* Sound knowledge of Nepal’s employment and livelihoods policies and programmes, including issues and challenges,
* At least seven years of experience in the area of employment, microenterprise, livelihoods and poverty reduction,
* Expertise, familiarity, knowledge on gender and social inclusion,
* Experience of evaluating poverty/employment programmes.
	1. **Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Expert (1 position, 25 working days)**

**Roles and responsibilities:**

* Stock taking of Nepal’s GESI policies and programmes,
* Assess UNDP’s contribution to promote GESI under its poverty programmes,
* Provide specific recommendations to promote and mainstream GESI in its poverty and livelihood programmes.

**Qualification and Experience:**

* Master's Degree or higher form recognized University/Institution in institutional development, economics, public administration, gender and development or related fields,
* Solid understanding of national context and issues related to GESI,
* At least seven years of experience in the area of planning, programming, researches and evaluation related to GESI works,
* Expertise, familiarity, knowledge on gender and social inclusion,
* Good understanding of poverty and employment programmes.
	1. **Energy and Environment Expert (1 position, 20 working days)**

**Roles and responsibilities:**

* Stock taking of interlinkages and contribution of the energy and environment sector for livelihood improvement and poverty reduction,
* Assess UNDP’s contribution to sustainable livelihood through promotion of renewable energy access to rural households and use of natural resources,
* Provide specific recommendations to inform UNDP’s future programming for sustainable livelihoods.

**Qualification and Experience:**

* Master's Degree or higher form recognized University/Institution in energy, environment, disaster management or related fields,
* At least seven years of working experience in one of the following fields- renewable energy, environment and disaster management, micro hydro and natural resource management,
* Sound knowledge of Nepal’s natural resource management and renewable energy and its linkages with livelihood,
* Expertise, familiarity, knowledge on gender and social inclusion.
1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluation in the UN will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in both Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and by the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. These documents will be attached to the contract. Evaluators are required to read the Norms and Standards and the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence to them, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

This evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Nepal. An evaluation reference group will be formed to provide critical and objective inputs throughout the evaluation process to strengthen the quality of the evaluation to facilitate the outcome evaluation process, a UNDP evaluation manager will be assigned to oversee the overall evaluation process and provide the evaluation team with any logistics and administrative support needed. Evaluation Management Group representing Implementing Partners will be formed to support to the Evaluation Manager on preparation of the TOR, selection of the evaluation team, inputs on inception report, draft report, and the final report.

1. **EVALUATION WORK PLAN**

The duration of the evaluation will be two and half months (Max.) from June to August 2016. During this period, the consultant team will conduct all necessary processes and evaluation tasks to complete the assignment such as desk review, field visit, travel to the fields, consultations with stakeholders, desk review, report writing and debriefing of the findings and finalization of the report. The following indicative time line is suggested for the evaluation process:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Main Deliverables** | **Timeline** | **Deadline** |
| Commencement of the Evaluation *(Signing of the Contract)*  | 1st June 2016 | 1st week of July 2016 |
| Briefing of Evaluators by UNDP (*projects, key implementing partners and donor expectations and working arrangements, sharing of documents, contact details*)  | 3rd day after contract signing  | 1st week of July 2016 |
| Desk Review : Review of documents and materials | 7 days after the contract signing  | 2nd week of July 2016 |
| Submission and presentation of Draft Inception Report  | 10th day after the contract signing  | 3rd week of July 2016 |
| Debriefing on the draft Inception Report | Next day of the submission of draft inception report. | 3rd week of July 2016 |
| Submission of the final Inception Report  | 2 days after receiving feedback from Evaluation Management Team  | 3rd week of July 2016 |
| Field work: (Stakeholder Consultation, data collection from fields) | 10 days after finalization of the inception report | 1st week of August 2016 |
| Submission of the first draft of the evaluation report and presentation | 10 days after the data collection mission ends  | 2nd week of August 2016 |
| Submission and presentation of the second draft of the evaluation report  | 5 days after receiving feedback from UNDP  | Mid August 2016 |
| Submission of the final report and evaluation brief  | 10 days after receiving feedback from UNDP  | Last week of August 2016 |

*Notes: The time line will be verified and amended by the consultant team based on the findings of the inception report.*

**Annex 1: UNDP CPAP M&E framework for UNDAF Outcome 2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes and Outputs** | **Indicator(s)** | **Baseline (s)**  | **Target (2017)** | **Source(s)/Means of Verification; (Timing)** |
| **UNDAF/CDP Outcome 2: Vulnerable groups have improved access to economic opportunities and adequate social protection** | Gini coefficient (UNDAF 1 # 2.1) | 0.35 (2011) | % reduction equal to the inverse of GDP growth rate | NLSS |
| % of employed people living below USD 1 (PPP) per day (UNDAF 1 #2.2) | 22% (2010) | 17%(2015) | MDG Progress Report Indicator Under Target 1B) |
| **UNDAF Ouput 2.1 GoN and relevant stakeholders have increased capacity to d+6:11evelop, review and implement inclusive labor and economic policies and legislation that bolster productive employment and income opportunities** | LDC graduation strategy developed  | No strategy | Strategy developed | NPC records |
| **UNDP Country Programme Output 2.1.1** GoN has increased capacity to develop inclusive growth policies, national plans budget and institutional capacity to increase vulnerable groups' access to employment and economic opportunities | Result framework of 13th plan prepared  | No result framework of periodic plan  | NA | NPC records |
| **UNDP Output 2.1.2** NPC and CBS have improved capacity for gender and social inclusion responsive data collection and M&E system that promote inclusive growth and evidence based policy making, planning, and programming | NPC has a streamlined and GESI responsive national M&E system in place  | NPC is currently updating its M& E Framework and the framework is expected to be finalized by end of December | revised national M&E framework in line with the SDG targets and indicators | NPC records |
| Periodic plan annual progress report  | 0 | Prepare annual progress report of periodic plan | NPC records |
| CBS conducts annual household survey on consumption and labor | No  | (First survey in 2013) | CBS records |
| Knowledge products and analytical reports using data from HH surveys to inform inclusive growth | No | At least 6 knowledge products including two NHDR two MDG report, one NSDS and master sampling framework  | CBS records/UNDP reports |
| **UNDAF Output 2.2** GoN has improved capacity to design, execute and manage economic development programmes and strategies | GoN's microenterprise development program is multi-donor/multi-partner developed at the national level (UNDAF 1 #2.2.3) | No such programme exists | Programme in place | MoI reports |
| **UNDP Country Programme Output 2.2.1** 35,000 micro-entrepreneurs created and 40,000 existing ones scaled up for poverty reduction, employment generation and sustainability | # of new job holders (disaggregated by sex, age and social group) | 58000 (as of Dec 2012) | Additional 35,000 | DCSI, CSIDB and MEDEP Annual Progress report |
| **UNDP output 2.2.2** GoN has increased capacity to design, implement and monitor a multi-partner supported micro-enterprise development programme | Ministry of Industry has a functional MIS system in place to track the results of MEDPA | No such system in place in MoI | MIS system in place | MoI |
| **UNDAF Output 2.4** Vulnerable groups have increased access to sustainable productive assets and environmental services | # of households benefitted from forest-based livelihood opportunities (UNDAF 1 #2.4.4) | TBD ( new project yet to formulate) | 30,000 | UNDP evaluation reports |
| # of households in remote areas connected to energy services (UNDAF 1 #2.5.3) | 59,172 households | 25,000 additional HHs | UNDP reports |
| **UNDP Output 2.4.1** AEPC's capacity enhanced for scaling up energy services in the rural areas | Comprehensive Renewable Energy Policy/Act formulated |   | Comprehensive Renewable Energy Policy/Act approved and a sustainable programmatic approach for scaling up RE services implemented by AEPC | AEPC Report |
| **UNDP Output 2.4.2** Capacities of MoFSC's and local communities enhanced for effective management of natural resources, watershed and biodiversity. Proposed addition component in output statement | Performance based incentive mechanism/guidelines developed for user groups working on forest & wetland management | no tool exists to measure performance of user group work | MoFSC applies the performance based incentive across the sector tool | Guidelines published by MoFSC report |

**Annex 2: Evaluation Planning Matrix**

| **Evaluation criteria** | **Main evaluation questions (derived from the scope of work)** | **Sub-questions** **to be developed** **by evaluators** | **Basis for****judgement** | **Data****needed**  | **Source of****data** | **Data** **collection** **method** **(i.e. sampling)** | **Data** **analysis** **method** | **Responsible persons and** **required** **time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 3: Projects Field Presence**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Projects | No. of covering districts | Covering districts |
| RERL | 57 | Achham, Arghakhanchi, Baglung, Baitadi, Bajhang, Bajura, Bara, Bhojpur, Dailekh, Darchula, Dhading, Dhankuta, Dhanusha, Dolakha, Doti, Gorkha, Gulmi, Humla, Ilam, Jajarkot, Jhapa, Jumla, Kalikot, Kapilvastu, Kaski, Kavrepalanchok, Khotang, Lalitpur,Lamjung, Makwanpur, Manang, Morang, Mugu, Myagdi, Nuwakot, Okhaldhunga, Panchthar, Parbat, Parsa, Pyuthan, Ramechhap, Rasuwa, Rolpa, Rukum, Salyan, Sankhuwasabha, Saptari, Sarlahi, Sindhuli, Sindhupalchok, Siraha, Solukhumbu, Surkhet, Tanahun, Taplejung , Terhathum, Udayapur, Udayapur |
| RELRP | 7 | Dolakha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Ramecchap, Rasuwa, Sindhuli, Sindhupalchok |
| MEDEP | 38 | Baglung, Baitadi, Banke, Bardiya, Dadeldhura, Dailekh, Dang, Darchula, Dhanusha, Dolakha, Jhapa, Jumla, Kailali, Kalikot, Kapilvastu, Kavrepalanchok, Mohattari, Morang, Myagdi, Nawalparasi, Nuwakot, Parbat, Pyuthan, Ramechhap, Rasuwa, Rautahat, Rolpa, Rukum, Salyan, Saptari, Sarlahi, Sindhuli, Sindhupalchok, Siraha, Sunsari, Surkhet, Terhathum, Udayapur |
| LRP | 3 | Mohattari, Rautahat, Sarlahi,  |
| CILRP | 5 | Sindhupalchok, Dolakha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Rasuwa |
| CSUWN | 2 | Kailali, Sunsari |
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**Annex 4b: Contents of Final Evaluation Report**

The final report is expected to cover findings; judgments made following the evaluation criteria and questions based on a good analysis of qualitative and quantitative evidence, as applicable; lessons learned; and forward-looking, realistic, and actionable recommendations. The report will include the following contents1:

**Table of Contents for Final Outcome Report**

**Title page**

**Table of Contents**

**Acknowledgements**

• Identify those who contributed to the evaluation

**List of abbreviations and acronyms**

**Executive summary**

• Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose of the evaluation and methods applied, the major findings and conclusions, and recommendations in priority order

**Introduction**

• Summarize the purpose of the outcome evaluation, the key issues addressed and the methodology employed to conduct the evaluation

• Describe the aims and strategies of the programme/ project/intervention

* + - Describe how the information contained in the report.

**Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

* + - Evaluation Scope
		- Objectives
		- Evaluation Criteria
		- Questions

**Evaluation Methods and Data Analysis Tools**

* + - Data Sources
		- Sample and sampling frame
		- Data collection procedures
		- Major limitation of the methodology
		- Procedure of data analysis
		- Data gaps.

**Findings and conclusions**

• State findings clearly based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Provide critical assessment of performance (including factors affecting performance), and the results achieved;

• List facilitating and constraining factors for UNDP;

• In the conclusions, include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraining and enabling factors;

* Include specific lessons learnt on promoting gender equality and inclusion;

• Explain suggested changes to Outcome/CPAP and annex to the report the details of these suggested changes in the Outcome/CPAP.

**Lessons learned**

• Based on the evaluation findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)’ overall experience in other contexts, provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.

**Recommendations and way forward**

* Base recommendations on the conclusions and lessons learned, and discuss their anticipated implications;
* List proposals for action to be taken (short‐ and long‐term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for Follow‐up in priority order;
* Provide specific recommends on steps to be taken for the remaining time and future direction for upcoming UNDAF;
* Provide suggested time lines and cost estimates (where relevant) for implementation.

***Annexes***

* + - TOR;
		- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted;
		- List of supporting document reviewed;
		- Result Framework;
		- Short biographies of the evaluators and team composition;
		- Code of conduct signed by evaluators;
		- Evaluation criteria;
1. As a minimum, it is essential to include the elements with an asterisk in the inception port. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)