

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR HIRING CONSULTANT

A. Project Title – General Information

- Post Title: *International Consultant to conduct the evaluation of the SDGs Trust Fund Farm to Table Project with WIBDI*
- Location: *Apia, Samoa*
- Organizational Unit: *Governance Poverty Reduction Unit. UNDP MCO*
- Supervisor: *Head of Unit*
- Expected starting date: *End of January*
- Duration: *25 working days*

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learnt, and best practices of the MDG Fund and the MDG experience, while focusing on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships and gender and women's empowerment as cross-cutting priorities in all our areas of work. The SDG Fund aims to act as a bridge in the transition from MDGs to SDGs providing concrete experiences on how to achieve a sustainable and inclusive world as part of 'Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.'

As per the TORs, **all joint programmes will commission an independent final evaluation in the last three months of implementation.** The SDG Fund Secretariat shall assume the role of guidance and oversight in the final evaluations. For more information about the joint programmes see the generic TORs; for more information about M&E, please see the SDG Fund's M&E Strategy.

C. Scope of Work:

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase
2. To measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained the results originally foreseen in their project document, M&E frameworks, etc.
4. To measure the impact of the joint programme on the achievement of the SDGs
5. To identify and document substantive lessons learnt and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic areas and crosscutting issues: gender, sustainability and public private partnerships

The evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Specific evaluations may include but are not limited to the following:

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are

consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and achieving the SDGs

- a) How has the joint programme contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular with reference to the baseline situation?
- b) To what extent was the joint programme aligned with national development strategies and the UNDAF/UNDAP?
- c) To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges described in the programme document?
- d) To what extent are the objectives of the joint programme still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?
- e) To what extent have the implementing partners participating in the joint programme contributed added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?

Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

- a) To what extent did the joint programme attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the programme document?
- b) What good practices, success stories, lessons learnt and replicable experiences have been identified? Please describe and document them
- c) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
- d) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

- a) To what extent was the joint programme's management model (governance and decision-making structure, i.e. lead agency, Joint Programme Coordinator, Programme Management Committee and National Steering Committee, financial management and allocation of resources, i.e. one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- b) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to single-agency interventions? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
- c) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices did the implementing partners use to promote/improve efficiency?
- d) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?

Impact – Positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs

- a) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the SDGs?
- b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the targeted cross-cutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, public private partnerships (PPPs) and sustainability at the local and national levels?
- c) What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation and results of the joint programme?
- d) To what extent did the joint programme have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
- e) What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint programme have, if any?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term

- a) Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint programme to ensure results and impact, i.e. policy, policy coordination mechanisms, partnerships, networks?
- b) To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
- c) To what extent will the joint programme be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This final evaluation will make use of:

- **All relevant secondary information sources**, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, evaluations and
- **Primary information sources** including: interviews, surveys, etc. to ensure participatory approach and appropriate consultation and engagement of stakeholders
- **Triangulating of information** to allow for validation and discern discrepancies

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory approaches.

5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator will provide the following deliverables:

Inception Report

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme this report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation reference group. The report will follow this outline in Annex II:

Draft Final Report

The draft final report will follow the same format as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 30-40 pages in length. See Annex III for the template.

Final Evaluation Report

The final report will be 30-40 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than five pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will follow the template and follow the outline as given in Annex III.

6. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION – EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP

The main actors in the evaluation process are the SDG-F Secretariat, the management team of the joint programme, including the Joint Programme Coordinator, M&E Officer, in addition to the Programme Management Committee. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the **evaluation reference group**. Its role will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation
- Providing input on the evaluation planning
- Prepare **communication and dissemination plan**
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference
- Facilitating the Evaluator's access to all information and relevant documentation, as well as to key actors, stakeholders and informants
- Monitoring the quality of the process and deliverables generated
- Prepare **improvement/action plan** following the submission of the final evaluation report
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group

7. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

	Scheduled date	Main activities
	Desk study (Five days)	<p>Briefing with the Evaluator and sharing of all documents to be reviewed (Annex I)</p> <p>Submission of the inception report including the findings from the desk review and evaluation methodology (see Annex</p>

Phase B: Execution phase of the evaluation study		II) Preparation of mission itinerary by evaluation reference group
	Field visit (Five days)	Field visit conducted by Evaluator based on the planned agenda
	Final Report (15 days)	Submission of draft final report by Evaluator (Annex III) to the Secretariat Review of report by the evaluation reference group Review of report by Secretariat Finalization of the report by Evaluator and submission to the Secretariat

8. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation reference group and any other stakeholders relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete **communication and dissemination plan** to share the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim to advocate for sustainability, replicability, scaling up or to share good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

The **communication and dissemination plan** should at least aim to target all members of the NSC and PMC and other relevant stakeholders as necessary.

9. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality** - the evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality
- **Responsibility** - the report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Evaluator and the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted
- **Integrity** - the Evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention
- **Independence** - the Evaluator should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under

review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof

- **Incidents** - if problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the SDG Fund Secretariat. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat in these terms of reference
- **Validation of information** - the Evaluator will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report
- **Intellectual property** - in handling information sources, the Evaluator shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review
- **Delivery of reports** - if delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable

10. COMPETENCIES OF THE EVALUATOR(S)

In observing UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016),¹ the evaluation should be conducted by evaluator/s who are:

- Well-qualified, selected on the basis of competence, by means of a transparent process
- Impartial, i.e. not have been (and not expected to be) involved in the design or implementation of the joint programme
- Suitably experienced, possess methodological expertise and at least five years of recognized experience in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.

In the case of hiring more than one evaluator, one consultant should be experienced in the sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation, or have a sound knowledge of the subject to be evaluated. The other should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation.

D. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:

- Inception Report
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Final Evaluation Report

E. Institutional Arrangement:

The consultant will be working closely with UNDP and WIBDI during this assignment. He or she will conduct the work both home based & Samoa during the mission.

F. Duration of the Work:

¹ UNEG (2016) Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016:
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

The consultant will complete this assignment within 25 working days over a three months period.

G. Duty Station:

A. Apia , Samoa

H. Competencies:

- A. Creates effective advocacy strategies
- B. Provides information for linkages across programme activities to help identify critical points of integration
- C. Provides information and documentation on specific stages of projects/programme implementation
- D. Provides background information to identify opportunities for project development and helps drafting proposals
- E. Participates in the formulation of project proposals
- F. Seeks a broad range of perspectives in developing project proposals
- G. Identifies new approaches and promotes their use in other situations

I. Qualifications of the Successful Contractor:

- Degree in political science, development studies, economics, public administration or related field; 20%
- At least 10 years of relevant experience in inclusive growth work at senior; 25%
- Proven experience in undertaking evaluation projects; 20%
- Global experience in engaging with inclusive growth development is highly desirable; 20%
- Excellent interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills; and ability to meet tight deadlines; 10%
- Excellent English written and communication skills; 5%

J. Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments:

Deliverables/ Outputs	Target Due Dates	Amount in USD
Preparation and submission of the Inception Report	End January 2018	10%
Preparation of the Draft Evaluation Report	Mid-February 2018	60%
Preparation of the Final Evaluation Report	End of February 2018	30%



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

K. Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- A. Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)

CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **16th January 2018** electronically via procurement.ws@undp.org. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted.

Proposals must include:

- **P11** and what time you are available from – template provided
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work,
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate and whether per diem is included – template provided
- **Letter of interest and availability** summarises all details required – template provided

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to procurement.ws@undp.org.

II. ANNEXES

I. Check List: Documents to be Reviewed

The documents below should be provided by the evaluation reference group who will be responsible for compiling the complete list and collecting all the documents for timely submission to the Evaluator.

SDG-F Context

- [SDG Fund TORs and Guidance for Joint Programme Formulation](#)
- SDG Fund M&E strategy
- Communications and Advocacy Strategy
- Knowledge Management Strategy

Programme-Specific Documents

- Joint programme document and its annexes (annual work plan and budget, theory of change, integrated M&E research framework, performance monitoring framework, risk analysis matrix)
- Baseline and end line study (if any)
- Mid-term review report (if any)
- NSC and PMC minutes
- Exit strategy
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Financial information (MPTF)

Other in-country documents or information

- All assessments, reports and/or evaluations directly conducted/commissioned by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the SDGs at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country

II. Inception Report - Outline

0. Introduction
 1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
 2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
 3. Main substantive interventions of the joint programme
 4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information
 5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including field visit



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

III. Draft/Final Evaluation Report - Outline

1. Cover Page
2. Executive Summary – a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations.
3. Introduction
 - a. Background, goal and methodological approach
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation
 - c. Evaluation methodology
 - d. Constraints and limitations of the study conducted
4. Description of the development interventions carried out
 - a. Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
5. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)
6. Conclusions and Lessons Learnt
7. Recommendations
8. Annexes