Outcome Evaluation

Terms of Reference

CPAP Outcome 1: Government of Iraq and civil society have strengthened participatory mechanisms in place for electoral processes, national dialogue and reconciliation

A. BACKGROUND

UNDP’s corporate policy is to evaluate its development cooperation with the host government on a regular basis in order to assess whether and how UNDP-funded interventions contribute to the achievement of agreed outcomes, i.e. changes in the development situation and ultimately in people’s lives. Under the results-based management (RBM) framework - UNDP’s core management philosophy- there has been a shift from traditional project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to results-oriented M&E, in particular outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and partnership strategies intended to achieve a higher level outcome. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in a given country context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development.

Outcome to be evaluated

In the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP 2011-2014) of UNDP Iraq there are five development outcomes to which UNDP is expected to contribute; One of these outcomes is: Government of Iraq and civil society have strengthened participatory mechanisms in place for electoral processes, national dialogue and reconciliation

It will take stock of UNDP’s efforts in achieving the development outcome so far and propose measures in order to increase the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNDP cooperation in the outcome areas. A results framework for the selected outcome for evaluation is summarized in Table 1 below.

Brief national context related to the Country Programme outcomes

Iraq has witnessed wide-spread violence and political instability at national and sub-national levels over the last few years and remains susceptible to further insecurity until the fundamental causes of vulnerability to conflict are holistically addressed. Although the country is blessed with significant natural resources, it remains challenged in harnessing its human and natural resources to accelerate much needed reconstruction and recovery efforts.
Since 2005, three parliamentary and provincial elections have been held in Iraq. Successive governments initiated reforms to better perform core state functions but due to general insecurity and institutional capacity needs these efforts have had limited impact. The Government, therefore, still faces major challenges in ensuring adequate basic services including electricity, water supplies and health services. Inadequate security continues to disproportionately affect the most vulnerable groups, in particular women, children and persons with disabilities. Iraq ranks low in human development indicators. There is high income poverty (23 per cent of Iraqi families live below the national poverty line), growing illiteracy (women in particular), and high unemployment (+18 per cent) especially among women and youth. Gender based violence has emerged as an issue of concern.

Iraq is facing a myriad of political, security, humanitarian and developmental challenges. Despite the successful electoral process of April and the formation of an inclusive Government in September 2014, enormous mistrust among the country’s Shiite, Sunni and Kurdish components continues to linger and minorities such as Yazidis, Turkmen, Christians and Assyrians feel marginalized. Also, ISIL’s genocidal attacks against these minorities have almost completely uprooted them from their ancestral homes and destroyed their places of worship.

The KRI has been relatively stable for over two decades and had managed to score significant development gains. However, the influx of IDPs since last year has put the region’s hard-won development gains under serious threats of reversal. In addition to 2 million IDPs, KRI also hosts about 250,000 Syrian refugees. Today, an estimated 30% of the region’s inhabitants are IDPs and refugees. In August 2014, The Emergency Relief Coordinator designated Iraq as a Level 3 Emergency. With the engagement of the air campaign of the coalition forces, the Iraqi defense forces and the Kurdish Peshmerga, some areas were liberated at the end of 2014. Based on the security situation and other factors, the mandate of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) was extended until July 31, 2015 through Security Council resolution 2169 (2014).

The GoI still faces challenges in its efforts to enhance the role of all stakeholders, including women, in the democratic process, and in building a solid social contract. As indicated in the Government programme 3014-2018, the Government is committed to reform the public sector and addressing corruption, including more inclusive institution-building and modernization of the state at the national and sub-national levels.

Institutional challenges continue to pose major constraints on economic reforms and significantly affect the country’s efforts to diversify the economy and promote private sector investment. Multiple issues have caused over 20,000 private companies in Iraq to close. The Government allocated over US$ 1 billion for lending to facilitate private sector growth but this action did not generate the intended expansion with investors and emerging entrepreneurs. Issues impeding the private sector appear to be the absence of the financial and non-financial support services and legal frameworks.
Table 1: Results Framework for Outcome 1, UNDP Iraq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outcome (#1): Government of Iraq and civil society have strengthened participatory mechanisms in place for electoral processes, national dialogue and reconciliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicators (Baselines 2009 and Targets 2014):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. IHEC has a permanent voter registry with safeguards to prevent fraud, and mechanisms for inclusion of all Iraqis in elections (2009: no; 2014 yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CSO-led campaigns promoting universal participation in elections at all levels (2009: 0, 2014: 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** UNDP Iraq CPAP (2011-2014)

**UNDP Outcome areas of support**

The proposed outcome: Government of Iraq and civil society have strengthened participatory mechanisms in place for electoral processes, national dialogue and reconciliation, lay under the result area “Fostering Inclusive Participation and Reconciliation” of the CPAP (2011-2014). The outcome and related outputs are designed to support the efforts of Government to enhance the participation of all citizens in policy dialogues and legislative decision-making processes which take into account national and sub-national diversity. Specifically, UNDP will continue to support the Government and civil society in strengthening participatory mechanisms to improve the development of long-term electoral processes and electoral institutions, encourage national political dialogue and advance the process of reconciliation. Capacity development of the Independent High Electoral Commission to continue carrying-out fair and transparent elections will form one of the flagship activities in pursuit of this outcome. National public awareness campaigns explaining the electoral process, support for the promotion of an independent media, and the empowering of CSOs to participate in the democratic process will also form key components of the CPAP.

The Council of Representatives (CoR) will continue to receive support to strengthen its oversight, administrative and research capabilities, and to improve its representation and law-making skills and its role in national dialogue and reconciliation efforts. Political parties will also receive support to improve constituency representation for a more representative Parliament in Iraq. Initiatives that sought to strengthen regional and subregional mechanisms to support intergovernmental dialogue in a participatory manner will also be undertaken so that local councils and Governors’ Offices can address development issues and respond to the needs of vulnerable communities more effectively. In all these efforts, effective participation of women in decision-making roles in national and subnational political processes will be promoted.
The promotion of freedom of expression and information for an independent, pluralistic and professional media will be another central component affiliated to this outcome, and UNDP will give attention to strengthening the capacities of civil society media-related institutions and initiatives.

B. Objectives of the evaluation

The outcome evaluation shall assess the following:

- Outcome analysis – Evaluate the progress that has been made towards the achievement of the outcome in Iraq since 2009 (including contributing factors and constraints);
- Output analysis - Determine contributing factors and impediments and extent of the UNDP contribution to the achievement of the outcomes through related project outputs (including an analysis of both project activities and soft-assistance activities121);
- Output-outcome link - Assess the contribution UNDP has made/is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome; and
- Assess partnership strategy in relation to outcome.

The results of the outcome evaluation will be used to guide future programming. In this regard the evaluation will:

1. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the current Programme/Projects in respect of the stated outcome.
2. Extract lessons and best practices for future interventions
3. Propose better ways of coordinating donor interventions in the sector
4. Identify priority areas of focus for future programming

C. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Geographic Focus

The evaluation should cover the regional and governorate dimensions of the country.

Outcome analysis

- What is the current situation and possible trend in the near future with regard to the outcome?
- Whether sufficient progress has been achieved vis-à-vis the outcome as measured by the outcome indicators?
- To what degree UNDP’s projects have incorporated the cross-cutting themes i.e. gender?
- To what degree UNDP assistance has resulted in the development of national capacity,
- Including assessment of performance monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?
• What are the main factors (positive and negative) that affect the achievement of the outcome?
• Whether the outcome indicators chosen are sufficient to measure the outcome?
• To what extent are synergies in programming such as partnerships, including among various UNDP programmes, related to the relevant outcome?
• Relevance of the outcomes, taking into account the changes in environment and other situational (including policy) factors.

Output analysis

• Are the UNDP outputs still relevant to the outcome?
• Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs?
• What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
• Assess whether and how human development and human security concerns have been considered in the national development planning.
• Assess UNDP’s ability to advocate best practices and desired goals, including its role and participation in national debate and ability to influence national policies on promoting recovery and development.

Output-outcome link

• Whether UNDP’s outputs or other interventions can be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome (including the key outputs, projects and assistance soft and hard that contributed to the outcome);
• What are the key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome (e.g. piloting new technologies, developing pricing schemes, drafting energy efficiency standards)?
• What has been the role of UNDP soft-assistance activities in helping achieve the outcome?
• With the current planned interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, will UNDP be able to achieve the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed?
• Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. Has UNDP been able to bring together various partners across social, ethnic and sectoral lines to address human development and human security concerns in a holistic manner?
• Assess UNDP’s ability to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner (through exposure to best practices in other crisis-affected countries, south-south cooperation, holistic and participatory approaches). Has UNDP been able to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development?
• What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the two outcomes? Can it be ensured that the outcomes will be reached and maintained even after the UNDP interventions?

In addressing the above questions the evaluation team is also expected to examine the interventions in terms of the following:

• Project management and implementation issues:
- Whether the current project management structure and staffing is effective and efficient;
- To identify failures and successes in strategy and tactics in the planning and Implementation stages;
- Identification of possible obstacles to effective implementation in the future.

**Analysis of underlying factors:**

- Identification of factors beyond UNDP’s control that influence the environment and the outcome;
- Coordination between agencies;
- Risk analysis (short, medium and long term).

**UNDP contribution to development results:**

- Whether or not UNDP’s outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome (including the outputs, programmes, projects, and soft and hard assistance that contributed to the outcome).

**Partnership strategy:**

- Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective;
- The level of participation of stakeholders/partners in the achievement of the outcome, as well as the effectiveness of such participation.
- Sustainability and exit strategy.

**Key lessons:**

- The key lessons to emerge in terms of country ownership and state and/or district level cooperation in connection with the outcome.

**E. Methodology**

An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators. In addition, UNDP’s Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of outcome evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization. The evaluators should come up with a suitable methodology for this outcome evaluation based on the guidance given in these three documents.

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- Desk review of relevant documents and database sites(project documents with amendments made, progress reports review reports – mid-term, final, donor-specific, audit and financial);
- Discussions with Senior Management and relevant programme staff of UNDP Iraq;
F. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will comprise four consultants: two international consultants, specialized in reconciliation and elections (one of them will be Team Leader and the other Team Specialist) and two national consultants; it would be preferable to recruit international team leader who is English/Arabic speaker. The international consultants should have an advanced university degree and at least ten years of work experience with evaluation of development issues in crisis-affected countries.

The Team Leader is expected to be a professional ‘evaluator’ with substantive knowledge about results-based management (RBM) and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation. S/he will take the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the evaluation report to the UNDP Country Office.

Specifically, the Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the two outcomes;
- Decide the division of labour within the evaluation team;
- Conduct analyses of the outcomes, outputs and partnership strategies for the two outcomes;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The Team Specialist will provide substantive support to the Team Leader to achieve the above as well as assume a lead role in the evaluative analysis of at least one or more practice area covered by the evaluation.

The national consultants should be English/Arabic speaker, have advanced university degrees and at least eight years work experience; (s)he should have sound knowledge and understanding of electoral process in Iraq, Experience with CSO and national dialogue, and have experience in
conducting evaluation. The national consultant will be responsible of performing the following tasks respectively:

- Review documents;
- Act as ‘translator’ (Arabic to English and vice versa) for the international consultants, as necessary;
- Participate and contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Undertake field visits in UNDP Iraq project areas in the north, central and south of the country;
- Undertake observation and other evaluative activities as required by the agreed evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report under the guidance of Team Leader; and
- Assist Team Leader in finalizing the evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

G. Key Deliverables

1. An Inception report
2. Debriefing of UNDP and partners
3. Draft evaluation report
4. A comprehensive analytical report in English – the key product expected from this outcome evaluation includes the following contents:

   a. Executive summary (1-2 pages)
   b. Introduction (1 page)
   c. Description of the evaluation methodology (6 pages)
   d. An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs, and the partnership strategies (15-20 pages)
   e. Analysis of salient opportunities to provide guidance for future programming in relation to the outcome (8-10 pages)
   f. Key findings, including lessons learned and best practice (5-6 pages)
   g. Conclusions and recommendations (2-3 pages) and
   h. Annexes: ToR, charts, field visits, people consulted, documents reviewed, etc. The tentative page numbers serve only as a guide for the Evaluation Team. However, it is expected that the report will not exceed 80 pages, including annexes.
H. Timeframe & Delivery of Report

Evaluation Process Schedule (not chronological):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>working days</th>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inception report : Desk review, Evaluation design and work plan</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20-09-2015</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders</td>
<td>Baghdad (&amp; Erbil)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-10-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1st draft report</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-10-2015</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Debriefing stakeholders</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15-11-2015</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incorporating comments and finalization the report</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-11-2015</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total working days</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 65 working days are required for each of the two international consultants and the two national consultants.

The evaluation report should be finalized and submitted to UNDP Iraq by (30 November, 2015) for final review and approval by UNDP Iraq.

Evaluators will be paid in installments for their services and the final payment will be made only after the submission and approval of the evaluation report by UNDP Iraq.

I. Specific responsibilities

Country Office – to provide logistical support; facilitate meetings and interactions with relevant stakeholders; comment on the final draft report; approve final report and follow up on recommendations/management response.

Government counterpart – to participate in meetings/consultations and presentation of findings as per these terms of reference and mission schedule; provide needed information and document related to the outcome evaluation; and comment on the draft report.
Partners/Key stakeholders – to participate in meetings/consultations and presentation of findings as per these terms of reference and mission schedule; provide needed information and documents related to the outcome evaluation; and comment on the draft report.

J. Implementation Arrangements

To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, Partnership and Management Support Unit (PMSU) in UNDP Iraq will assist in connecting the evaluation team with the relevant UNDP programme units, senior management, and key stakeholders. It will provide both substantive and logistical support to the evaluation team and ensure a participatory evaluation process. The team will help identify the key partners for interviews/consultations by the evaluation team. It will also provide guidance to help the evaluation team to identify the most strategic areas to visit in Iraq by the evaluation team. However, the evaluation will retain its full integrity and flexibility to determine the best approach to collection and analyzing data for the evaluation.

K. Reporting

The consultants will be reporting directly to the PMSU.

L. Key documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

The evaluators will need to study the following documents in addition to project documents, project monitoring reports, project evaluation reports, programme evaluation reports, audit reports and annual work-plans etc.:

- UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
- UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
- UNDP Results-Based Management: Technical Note
- The National Development Plan (2010-2014)
- General Framework of the Governmental Program 2014 2018
- Other national policies, strategies and plans related to the outcome
- Project documents under this outcome
Annex 1: List of UNDP Programmes/Projects under outcome 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Original Budget $000,000</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to Elections</td>
<td>Institutional Development: Organizational and Capacity Development for IHEC</td>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Iraq Trust Fund</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Assistance to IHEC Phase II</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>UNDG ITF</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Development Support to the IHEC</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>UNDG ITF</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Council of</td>
<td>Support to the Council of Representatives</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>UNDP core funds UNDP DGTTF UNDP BCPR</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Civil Society</td>
<td>Empowering CSOs in Iraq</td>
<td>2012-2014</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>UNDAF fund</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Support to National Reconciliation</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>UNDAF Fund</td>
<td>Nineweh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for Rights of Minorities</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Government of the Netherlands</td>
<td>Nineweh and DIBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nineweh Minorities – Interfaith Dialogue Component</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Government of the Netherlands</td>
<td>Nineweh and DIBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and Development Analysis</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>UNDP core funds CPR TTF Conflict</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>