

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Location	Home-based with one travel to Bangkok, Thailand
Application deadline	10 February 2017
Type of Contract	Individual Contractor
Post Level	Senior Evaluation Expert (International) Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities for Evaluating Progress Towards the Sustainable Development Goals – Country Case Studies
Languages required:	English
Duration of Initial Contract:	20 days intermittently between 15 February and 30 June 2017

BACKGROUND

In September 2015, governments across the world adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This global “plan of action for people, planet and prosperity” is anchored on a group of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the agenda’s monitoring framework that captures universal aspirations across three dimensions of sustainable development: economic development, social development, and environmental protection.

Initial country-level efforts have focused on putting in place the building blocks necessary to support SDG implementation. Many countries are developing institutional arrangements to promote coordination across sectors and government level (e.g., SDG taskforces, inter-agency coordination groups, etc.), analyzing the alignment of development plans and budgets with SDG targets, and assessing the availability of data and capacities of data systems to monitor and evaluate progress. In this initial phase considerable focus has been on formulating the goals and indicators as well as setting up systems for measuring progress against the SDGs but efforts need to “go beyond measurement, to consider whether progress is equitable, relevant and sustainable. Such evidence will help demonstrate public sector accountability and accelerate change by focusing attention on enhancing learning and innovation”.¹ And as importantly, to learn what works best where, how, for whom, under which contexts and why to ensure value for money, enhanced efficiency and effectiveness.

While the MDGs mainly focused on monitoring, the 2030 Agenda has put Evaluation at the center stating that: *“Follow-up and review processes at all levels will be guided by the following principles: [...] They will be rigorous and based on evidence, informed by country-led evaluations and data which is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts. They will require enhanced capacity-building support for developing countries, including the strengthening of national data systems and evaluation frameworks. [...]”*²

National M&E systems which are currently being adjusted or set up will therefore need to truly include

¹ Briefing ‘Evaluation: a crucial ingredient for SDG success’, iied/EvalSDGs/Evalpartners, April 2016 available under <http://pubs.iied.org/17357IIED>

² The UNGA resolution A/RES/69/237 on capacity building for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, shows that member states recognize that evaluation is a core component of development processes, and recognize evaluation as a country level tool that can help strengthen and support development results.

equity concerns as well as proper data and data management systems and evaluation frameworks. In this context developing and strengthening national capacities for evaluation will be crucial. Such capacity development will need to be addressed as an integral part of the overall mainstreaming and implementation of the 2030 Agenda process.

To contribute to this process and to further develop national evaluation capacities in the region, several UN and government initiatives have recently been conducted or are still ongoing. These include:

- The [18 NEC commitments](#) from the Third International Conference on National Evaluation Capacities, organized by UNDP in 2013 in São Paulo;
- The [NEC Bangkok declaration](#) from the Fourth International Conference on National Evaluation Capacities, organized by UNDP and the Government of Thailand in 2015;
- The Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluations in Bangkok (2015), Kathmandu (2016) and Hanoi (2016) organized by EvalPartners in partnership with UN agencies;
- The Global Evaluation Agenda, developed by EvalPartners and other UN agencies in 2016;
- The first Asian Evaluation Week³, co-sponsored by the People's Republic of China, Ministry of Finance Asia-Pacific Finance and Development Institute and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) Independent Evaluation Department;
- Ongoing World Bank and ADB as well as UN agencies technical assistance to reinforce monitoring and evaluation systems in the region;
- *Regional Training Workshop- Developing National Evaluation Capacities to Support the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda* UNDP/ UNITAR with support from EVALSDGs and UNICEF; and
- The Asian Pacific Evaluation Association inaugural conference, "SDGs making a difference through SDGs".

These forums, conferences and workshops brought together parliamentarians, government representatives from national planning agencies and ministries of finance as well as line ministries, civil society organizations, national evaluation communities, ADB, the World Bank and UN agencies. Following these meetings there is a global and regional interest in learning from emerging experience in the Asia Pacific region on key enablers for national development strategies and for the review, follow-up and evaluation processes of the 2030 Agenda.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Scope of Work

To identify emerging practices UNDP and UNICEF have agreed to jointly conduct a series of country case studies. Based on emerging practices in the region presented in international forums, the initial phase will include three country case studies – tentatively the Philippines and Nepal and a third country - with further country case studies to be initiated over the course of 2017. A regional synthesis report on emerging good practices will be developed based on the country case studies. This will serve to showcase existing national evaluation champions and emerging country practices in the region, distil key success factors, trends, lessons learnt and identify areas other countries in the region should prioritize. The methodology for the case studies would be designed and refined throughout the process, with the view to being replicable across other countries. It will also foster peer to peer learning among

³ <https://www.adb.org/news/events/asian-evaluation-week-2016>

key stakeholders in the region, trigger interest on a regional State of Evaluation report and inform global and national evaluation capacity guidance.⁴ The country case studies and the synthesis report would complement national reports which would be useful for reporting at the HLPF.

A peer review group of senior evaluation experts will provide overall guidance to the country case studies and the regional synthesis report. There will also be a small national peer review group for each of the country case studies.

The country case studies will be informed by and build on EVALSDGs 'Spotlights', a tool to exchange and share the learnings and experiences accumulated and generated in the evaluation processes of the SDGs. A 'Spotlight' intends to provide a platform for learning on lessons learnt, challenges, opportunities and best practices, etc. on the evaluation of the SDGs of actual national experiences of selected countries.

Each country case study will include a review and analysis of country practices in terms of:

- generating and implementing evaluation policies;
- setting up functional and operating M&E systems;
- allocating and utilizing resources for evaluation as well as introducing other incentives;
- increasing evaluation use by identifying useful evaluations;
- fostering an evaluation culture;
- 2030 Agenda and related review and follow-up structure and oversight within the country and how the evaluation function is connected within Government;
- how the national government partners relate to the supply side of evaluation i.e. VOPEs;
- opportunities and processes for evaluation capacity development;
- identifying any emerging sector-specific focus or arrangements for evaluation and the SDGs; and
- processes for developing national and sub-national ownership and champions for localization of the SDGs and associated evaluation functions.

In each of these areas the country case study should identify key successes as well as areas for improvement. To do this, among other issues the following should be considered:

- Focus on the extent to which the country's legislation requires evaluation across the national government;
- Identify how national evaluation policies or other instruments have been developed;
- Identify what mechanisms contribute to the mainstreaming of evaluation at national level and (where relevant) sub-national level;
- Outline the extent to which evaluation is embedded in the government and results-oriented management practices (if used);
- Understand what contributes to/ drives change in resource allocations for evaluation;
- Map how evaluations are being used, and factors that influence or affect their utility;
- Identify what mechanisms contribute to align the collection of data and monitoring with the evaluation function; and
- Map the supply side (evaluation practitioners/ professionals) and identify mechanisms to engage with partners/ stakeholders (VOPEs/ practitioners, among others).

⁴ National Evaluation Capacity Development: Practical tips on how to strengthen National Evaluation Systems A Report for the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Task Force on National Evaluation Capacity Development (2012). UNDP's Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) is also currently developing an *Evaluation Diagnostic Guidance Note*.

The country case studies should be informed by the ‘critical success factors’ for developing a national evaluation system checklist (see Annex I) and provide a quick analysis and lessons learnt (covering issues of laws, policies and strategies, institutional arrangements and capacities and use) for each of the ‘success factors’ relevant to the country context. Where relevant, country case studies may identify additional ‘success factors’.

In addition to the above, the following issues should be considered to determine a country’s ‘readiness for evaluating the 2030 Agenda’:

- What is the government’s/ country’s evaluation strategy/ policy and guidance for the 2030 Agenda?
- What – if any - key steps is the country taking to adjust its M&E system to monitor, review and evaluate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda? This should include an analysis of:
 - What/ who is driving these changes? (This may require a brief political economy analysis)
 - To what extent are institutional arrangements being set up/ adjusted fit for purpose? (both horizontally (across sectors and departments) and vertically (subnational and local)
 - To what extent are other stakeholders involved in the M&E process?
- Through what mechanisms do evaluations inform/ will inform the adjustment/ revision of strategies, resource allocations and policies? How is this changing in light of the 2030 Agenda? This should also consider the vertical policy coherence issues.
- How are evaluation methods changing/ evolving to support adaptive governance and equity?
- What evaluation methods/ tools are the government and other stakeholders currently using to evaluate policy choices in particular in relation to integrated approaches (ensuring that the interlinkages between SDGs, trade-offs/synergies are adequately addressed and evaluated)?
- What equity-based evaluation methods/ tools are the government and other stakeholders currently using?
- Does the quality of the design of the national development strategy/ies allow for an evaluation of the SDGs?
- Is Government contribution to equity and gender equality and the SDGs verifiable based on the planned data collection systems?
- Would an evaluation of the SDGs be feasible, credible and useful?

Each country case study will contain a clearly structured output presenting the case study findings (20 pages) and a summary policy note that captures the key lessons per case study (3-4 pages).

Expected Outputs and Deliverables

Inception Phase (February/ March 2017)

- Develop overall methodology to be applied to country case studies based on above outlined scope for country case studies, Annex I and any other relevant material;
- Help identify suitable national consultants to conduct country case studies in the Philippines, Nepal and one other country in Asia Pacific (to be identified);

Deliverables:

Mid March: draft country case study methodology (10 pages) to be shared with UNDP and UNICEF focal points and peer review group for review. UNDP, UNICEF and peer reviewers will provide feedback within one week of receipt of draft.

End March: final country case study methodology incorporating feedback received.

Support to Country Case Studies (April to end May 2017)

- Provide overall guidance to country case studies;
- Ensure that country case study reports meet relevant 2016 UNEG norms and standards.⁵
- Ensure that stakeholder feedback from national peer reviewers and national workshops is properly addressed and incorporated into final draft country case studies.

Deliverables:

End May 2017: 3 draft country case studies reviewed.

Synthesis of Country Case Studies (June 2017)

- Develop synthesis report of country case studies with recommendations for national governments and development partners; and
- Based on lessons learnt from country case studies, suggest revisions to methodology for country case studies.
- Present findings at a regional workshop in Bangkok (date to be determined).

Deliverables:

Mid June: Draft synthesis report (30 pages) to be shared with UNDP and UNICEF focal points and peer review group for review. UNDP, UNICEF and peer reviewers to provide feedback within one week of receiving draft report.

End June: Final draft

Institutional Arrangement

The Senior Evaluation Expert will report to the Regional Programme Advisor, Sustainable Development Goals, UNDP, Bangkok Regional Hub. The consultant is also expected to work closely with the Regional Advisor- Evaluation, UNICEF, East Asia and Pacific Regional Office.

Duration of the Work

The assignment is for a duration of 20 days intermittently between 15 February 2017 and 30 June 2017.

Duty Station

Home-based with one travel to Bangkok, Thailand for a maximum of 5 working days (tentatively in May 2017, date to be determined).

⁵ Available under following link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

COMPETENCIES

- Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities skills;
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
- Ability to plan, organize, implement and report on work;
- Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines;
- Proficiency in the use of office IT applications and internet in conducting research;

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Educational Qualifications

- Advanced university degree in economics, development studies, public policy, public finance or other fields relevant to sustainable development and evaluation.

Experience

- Minimum of 12 year experience in evaluation related work.
- Experience in national country planning and evaluation capacity systems.
- Experience in 2030 Agenda and national planning systems.
- Track record of publications (research or policy papers) in the field.
- Excellent interviewing and writing skills.

Language requirements

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Lump Sum Amount. Consultant shall quote an all-inclusive Daily Fee for the contract period. The term “all-inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, communications, consumables, etc.) that could be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment are already factored into the daily fee submitted in the proposal.

Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

- **30%** of total contract amount upon the submission of final country case study methodology.
- **70%** of total contract amount upon the submission of final synthesis report.
- Lump sum all-inclusive payment for one travel to Bangkok, Thailand for a maximum of 5 working days.

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 100 points)

- Criteria 1: Relevance of educational background – Max 10 points
- Criteria 2: Relevance of experience in area of specialization (e.g. evaluation, national evaluation capacity building) – Max 40 points
- Criteria 3: Relevance of experience in key areas (e.g. 2030 Agenda, national planning systems) – Max 20 points
- Criteria 4: Quality of writing sample and its relevance to the assignment – Max 30 points

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Documentation required

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II.
- **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Technical proposal**, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- **Writing samples** – two samples of writing preferably from peer reviewed journals and/or policy notes/ reports.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II. Note: Consultants must quote prices in US Dollar.

Incomplete proposals may not be considered.