MID TERM EVALUATION
Support to Effective and Responsive Institutions Project (SERIP)
Evaluation Terms of Reference

1. Background

The UNDP Country Programme (CPD 2018-2022) support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals within the framework of addressing the challenges of multiple transitions in Myanmar. The current Country Programme is built on the achievements of the previous programme but represents a shift towards more integrated programming at the national and sub-national levels and support to United Nations-wide initiatives to better address the interlinkages between peacebuilding and social cohesion, governance, environment and natural resources management, resilience, urbanization and balanced and inclusive growth. This integrated approach is designed to break silos and strengthen horizontal linkages across state and non-state actors as well as vertical linkages across administrations at district, township, state and union level through area based programmes.

The UNDP Country Programme is firmly aligned with the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) and it focuses on delivery of the following two outcomes:

(i) **Peace and Governance:** People in Myanmar live in a more peaceful and inclusive society, governed by more democratic and accountable institutions, and benefit from strengthened human rights and rule of law protection; and

(ii) **Planet and Prosperity:** Myanmar becomes more resilient to climate and disaster risk with efficient environmental governance and sustainable use of natural resources.

Under outcome Peace and Governance, the Support to Effective and Responsive Institutions Project (SERIP) one of the flagship project which has been designed to address the limited effectiveness of the Myanmar machinery of government in developing, implementing and evaluating evidence-based and demand-driven public policies and expenditure plans which has consequences on Myanmar's capacities to meet its poverty alleviation, social equity and environmental resilience goals. The Project is based on the assessment that, in many ways, dividends expected from the momentous triple transition set in motion in 2010 are still elusive for large swathes of the population, and in particular those made vulnerable by social marginalization, conflict and/or recurrent natural hazards.

SERIP is a 5-year initiative that aims to strengthen the effectiveness of state executive and legislative institutions in understanding the needs and aspirations of the Myanmar people, in all their diversity and in formulating, implementing and evaluating policies as well as in appropriating public resources in a way that provides effective, timely and equitable responses to these aspirations. The centerpiece of the Project's approach is to provide dovetailed support to: (i) core government functions that are essential building blocks of the machinery of government, i.e. the chain of decisions and actions that are needed to make policies deliver concrete results for people's lives; and (ii) parliamentary processes as Parliaments approve laws and budgets that organize a country's public sector management system and are meant to make government more responsible and accountable.

The Project is organized into 4 key intervention areas: (1) Data for Development; (2) Policy Management; (3) Parliamentary Law-making; (4) Subnational Governance, and will ensure throughout all activities, in line with principles of the Agenda 2030, the imperative of leaving-no-one-behind by introducing and supporting innovative and effective approaches to mainstreaming

gender equality, environmental resilience and conflict-sensitivity and, more broadly, to fighting vulnerabilities. Also, with SERIP, UNDP seeks to assist government authorities shift gradually to a more decentralization system of public sector management.

The Project adopts a multi-level approach, from the Union to Township level and is area-based, as it will land its different workstreams across 4 States & Regions: Bago, Mon, Rakhine, Kachin and others where possible, In these States and Regions UNDP has a solid track-record of achievements and is a trusted partner of subnational counterparts.

The key intended outputs of SERIP are:

1. Governance institutions have access to accurate, comprehensive and harmonized data needed for decision-making and monitoring.
2. Policy formulation, implementation and monitoring at Union and S/R level is guided by strategic priorities, better coordinated and more inclusive.
3. Parliaments are equipped to pass robust and people-centered legislation resulting from effective policy-making and legislative proposals.
4. Subnational institutions have gained autonomy and skills for demand-driven and decentralized public-sector management, with emphasis on improving equitable access to services, building resilience and fostering social cohesion.

Basic project information can also be included in table format as follows:

Project Identifications		
Project Title:	Support to Effective & Responsive Institutions Project (SERIP)	
Project ID:	104456	
Output IDs:	***Output Name***	***Output Number***
	1 - Data for Policy making	106016
	2 - Policy Making Process	109093
	3 – Parliament Legislative Capacity	109307
	4 - Local Township Planning	109308
Linkages to Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP), UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and Strategic Plan (SP)		

MSDP Goal and Strategy:	MSDP Goal 1: Peace, National Reconciliation, Security and Good Governance
	• MSDP Strategy 1.4: Enhance good governance, institutional performance and improve the efficiency of administrative decision-making at all levels.
	  ○ MSDP Strategic Outcome: Increased transparency, predictability and accountability of government processes
	• MSDP Strategy 1.5: Increase the ability of all people to engage with government
	  ○ MSDP Strategic Outcome: More inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making	

	○ MSDP Strategic Outcome: Increased transparency, predictability and accountability of government processes Moreover, the project through its outputs contributes directly to the monitoring and evaluation of the MSDP. The project is also guided by recognized standards of international development practice, including the IPU's Common Principles of Support to Parliament.
UNDAF/CPD Outcome Statement:	People in Myanmar live in a more peaceful and inclusive society, governed by more democratic and accountable institutions, and benefit from strengthened human rights and rule of law protection.
Project Output Statements:	• **Output 1:** Governance institutions have access to accurate, comprehensive and harmonized data needed for decision-making and monitoring. • **Output 2:** Policy formulation, implementation and monitoring at Union and State/Region level is guided by strategic priorities, better coordinated and more inclusive. • **Output 3:** Parliaments are equipped to pass robust and people-centred legislation resulting from effective policymaking and legislative proposals. • **Output 4:** Subnational institutions have gained autonomy and skills for demand-driven and decentralized public-sector management, with emphasis on improving equitable access to services, building resilience and fostering social cohesion.
UNDP SP Outcome:	UNDP SP Outcome 1: Advance poverty eradication in all its form & dimensions
UNDP SP Output Statement:	UNDP SP Output 1.1.1: Capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other international agreements in development plans and budgets, and to analyse progress towards the SDGs, using innovative and data-driven solutions

Project Information		
Project Duration:	***Start Date:*** 1.1.2018	***End Date:*** 31.12.2022
Implementing Partner(s):	UNDP	
Responsible Party(s)	Rakhine state government	
Key Stakeholders:	Ministry of Planning, Finance and Industry, General Administration Department, Development Affairs Organizations, Ministry of the Office of the Union Government, Hluttaws, target townships (populations, civil society organizations, Ward/Village Tract Administrators, Township Administrations); Executive and legislative institutions at the Union, Region/State and Township levels and their staff, as well as local administrations.	
National Coverage (Yes/No):	Yes	
Name of Regions/States covered:	Bago Region, Mon State, Rakhine State (expanding to Kachin state), to a lesser degree all Region and State Hluttaws	

Project Budget	
Budget for Project Cycle:	US$ 36.043.728
UNDP Contribution:	US$ 3,315,073
Unfunded:	US$ 18,853,879
Other Contributions:	
Donor Contribution	
Government of Japan	US$ 6,428,034
Government of Sweden (SIDA)	US$ 3,257,225
Government of Australia (DFAT)	US$ 1,200,007
Government of Canada and German through MPTF-JP	US$ 2,989,546
Focal Point of the Project	
Project Manager:	Philipp Annawitt (OIC)
Chief Technical Advisors and technical specialists.	• Philipp Annawitt (Sub-national Parliament Specialist)– Output 3. Parliamentary Strengthening & Output 2 Policy Management • Si Sa Si Thu Htike San, Data for Development Specialist– Output 1. Data for Development and output 2. Policy Management • Vacant, Chief Technical Advisor – Output 4. Sub-national Governance

2. Current Context

As COVID-19 spreads globally, it is a massive health, humanitarian, and development crisis. Due to the pandemic, Myanmar, especially the border regions: Kachin State, Shan State and Kayin State have terrible negative impact. Due to porous border, Myanmar received the immediate return of large influx of migrant workers from China and Thailand where the largest hotspots of outbreaks exist. E.g. according to MOHS data, more than 23,000 people returned to Myanmar from Thailand via Myawaddy from March 19 to 28.

While concerns have been raised about Myanmar's capacity to manage the coronavirus given its poor healthcare infrastructure, the country's displaced populations face even greater risks. Most are trapped in dangerously overcrowded camps with severely substandard health care and inadequate access to clean water, sanitation, and other essential services. Many displaced people have underlying medical conditions and chronic diseases, putting them at high risk of suffering serious effects from the virus.

The impact of economic fluctuations related to the COVID-19 pandemic is likely to disproportionately harm poor and vulnerable households. With travel and border trade restrictions in place, the impact is in Myanmar's tourism-related services, agricultural exports to China, and in supply-chain disruptions to the manufacturing sector. Every day, people are losing jobs and income, with no way of knowing when normality will return. Myanmar's GDP growth is projected to slow to between 2 and 3 percent in the current fiscal year due to the COVID-19

pandemic, with the brunt of the outbreak's economic impact likely to be borne by poor and vulnerable households across the country according to recent world bank report.

UNDP SERIP project works with Ministry of Planning, Finance and Industry, General Administration Department, Hluttaws, target townships (populations, civil society organizations, Ward/Village Tract Administrators, Township Administrations); Executive and legislative institutions at the Union, Region/State and Township levels and their staff, as well as Union and Region/State parliamentarians, and local administrations etc. Because of the Covid-19 crisis, there is wide shift of their focus and priorities of these counterparts to the crisis response.

Given the current Covid-19 pandemic there is also an expectation that this will also impact and delays in UNDP programme and project implementation. However, UNDP Myanmar remains fully operational and is adapting the way it works and focused on COVID-19 response. UNDP is mobilizing all assets to respond to this unprecedented challenge. UNDP Myanmar have transitioned all critical operations to digital and virtual platforms, enabling teams to continue delivering effectively despite restrictions on movement and physical interaction. With the changing context, emerging needs and priorities UNDP Myanmar is also revisiting the Programme strategy and business processes to be more relevant to this crisis. UNDP Myanmar had conducted Programme and operational criticality exercise to review and identification of critical programme areas and activities that will continue and activities that will be postponed or canceled. Some activities are paused or downscaled and looking for opportunities to be redirected to new priorities.

UNDP globally has developed a COVID-19 response focused on three immediate priorities including health systems support, inclusive and integrated crises management and response, and social and economic impact needs assessments and response. The Myanmar Country Office is preparing its response plan building on these three priority areas and in line with the current requests and priorities of the Government of Myanmar, current Programme areas and in response to broader UN Country Team collaboration across a range of development areas. Rapid response funds are new core funds being made available by UNDP headquarters to respond to this crisis, while flexibility have also been provided to the county offices to repurpose existing core funds towards this response, if necessary. In this context, UNDP have also been advised by cost-sharing donor partners that funds can also be repurposed towards COVID response if required.

UNDP intends to fully leverage its existing programme, staff and technical capacities and most importantly partnerships at the union, state and regional levels and with the communities to roll out the response in terms of community engagement and awareness raising, strengthening local government's capacity plan, coordinate, budget and deliver essential services including to migrants and IDPs, and bolstering public health systems. With many of our partners, particularly in the local government, capacities are being enhanced to be able to work and manage remotely through online systems. UNDP is working closely with local partners that allows local solutions to COVID-19 humanitarian and development needs, to be designed together with local partners, and in coordination with the host government.

Some activities that have been identified include community and anti-stigmatization awareness, expansion of use of digital technologies, private sector engagement and corporate social responsibility, volunteerism and social cohesion, resilience and recovery, support to MSMEs as well as health systems support and socio-economic impact assessments at the sub-national levels.

UNDP Myanmar is also streamlining policies and procedures for greater agility, increasing our flexibility to receive and deliver private sector and other financing, and taking steps to initiate innovative approaches like next generation network of innovation and digital solutions across the country — a crucial institutional asset in responding to this complex, fast-moving crisis.

Accelerator Lab will be sensing on-the-ground changes and sourcing local solutions for this crisis response.

Midterm Evaluations is expected to assess UNDP project performance in areas that are critical to ensuring sustained contribution to development results and the context of emerging development issues and changing priorities at the national levels. To this end, this evaluation also needs to review project strategy, focus areas, partnerships, programmatic approaches, cooperation modalities, or business models considering current crisis scenario.

3. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will assess the progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document[1] and identify early signs of project success and areas for improvement that will guide the future direction of the project. The evaluation will be based on data available at the time of evaluation and discuss outputs delivered by the programme from the time of inception, January 2018, until March 2020. The primary audience for the evaluation will be the Government of Myanmar, development partners and UNDP. The secondary audience for the evaluation will be the other relevant stakeholders.

The specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation are to review and make recommendations related to SERIP contribution in;

- strengthening governance institutions to have access to accurate, comprehensive and harmonized data needed for decision-making and monitoring;
- policy formulation, implementation and monitoring at Union and State/Region level is guided by strategic priorities, better coordinated and more inclusive;
- strengthening parliament functions so that they are well equipped to pass robust and people-centered legislation resulting from effective policymaking and legislative proposals as well as better able to engage with and represent the rights and interests of the public;
- subnational institution participatory planning process at township level, with emphasis on improving equitable access to services, building resilience and fostering social cohesion;
- partnership arrangements with the Implementing Partners put in place by the project and their effectiveness;
- cross cutting issues have been well integrated in the project;
- the current organizational and institutional capacities (staffing, structure etc.) are appropriate to deliver the project results

[1] amended version

The first stage of the MTE will be to conduct a review of the current context, building on relevant context analysis and taking into account the latest socio-economic and political developments locally as well as relevant developments at a global level since the inception of the project in 2018.

The second stage is to assess the relevance of the project to the current context, by identifying challenges and ways to overcome or mitigate them, and to provide lessons learnt taking into account the emerging national and global development priorities. The final stage will be the provision of key recommendations including improvements in performance and results, proposed adjustments to the design of the project including programmatic focus (structurally and through a revised Results and Resourced Framework) and the development of elements that can be considered to inform the planning of the next phase of the project.

4. Evaluation Criteria and Key guiding questions

The MTE will be conducted in line with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used).

Project Mid- term evaluation questions

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities (MSDP), the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs? Did the project amendment make the project more relevant to the above priorities?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the country programme outcome?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country e.g. Covid crisis?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design and implementation?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design and implementation processes?
- Are the project's objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? If not, does it provide space for flexibility to be responsive to policy changes that would directly affect the achievement of project objectives?
- How did the project promote UNDP principles of gender equality, inclusiveness, human rights-based approach, and human development? How were these cross-cutting areas mainstreamed into the project?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, national development priorities (MSDP), the UNDP Strategic Plan and SDGs?

- To what extent were the project outputs and objectives achieved? Which of these outputs and objectives are being achieved, and where is the project facing challenges and which ones?
- Is the objective of the project clearly articulated in relevant documents and translated into operational practices?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- What have been the main limiting factors constraining the project's effectiveness? How were they mitigated by the project? How likely is it that these factors will remain or change until the end of the project (and what that means in terms of changing directions for the project)?
- How are different stakeholder views considered in project implementation? To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure (e.g. project boards) as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective (e.g. value for money)?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
- What are the key areas of learning in the first two years, are there robust learning/feedback loops, and how has the project adapted in response?
- Are the risks of the project clearly assessed – and accurate? Does the project have sufficient ability to adapt to changing context and mitigating risk?

Sustainability

- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues questions

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP?
- To what extend the beneficiaries (right holders) have participated in various stages of planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation of project activities?

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

Conflict Sensitivity/Do No Harm

- To what extent have conflict sensitivity considerations been integrated into project design, implementation and M&E to ensure project intervention do No Harm?
- Which government institutions are we working with and to what extent are they considered legitimate and trusted by all communities in all project locations?
- What is the impact of the project interventions on stakeholder (government, EAOs and communities) relationships?
- What measures has the project put in place to ensure that governance structures are not unintentionally reinforcing tensions, conflict, discrimination and exclusion but rather strengthening social cohesion through project activities?

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent do the activities of the project contribute to sustainable changes in the country (both at beneficiary level and national/policy level)?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?

5. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted primarily to assess the progress of the project against the project document in its original and amended versions to assess against the context to provide recommendations for any adjustments to the project design, management and implementation. This evaluation will include mixed method design. The MTE must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase. The evaluation design will include both the qualitative and quantitative methods involving primary and secondary data collection. The MTE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach

ensuring close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries. The overall MTE will be divided into three phases:

Phase I: Evaluation Planning Phase (Virtual)

With the Covid -19 crisis, ensuring the safety of evaluation teams, Phase 1 of the MTE will be to conducted virtually by the evaluator which include remote arrangements to conduct four key tasks (1) desk reviews of key documents (2) review of the current situation – context analysis (3) development and finalize inception report (4) design of evaluation tools and questionnaires.

1. **Desk review of all relevant documentation**. Following the introductory meetings and briefings, the evaluation team will undertake a desk review of all relevant reports and data. This should be supplied by the strategic management unit in a timely manner and all efforts made to access missing reports and data prior to the development of the inception report and the data-collection mission. This would include a review of:
    - MSDP, CPD and Project document
    - Theory of change and results framework, including monitoring system.
    - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
    - Annual workplans.
    - Activity designs.
    - Semiannual and annual progress reports.
    - Minutes of project board meetings.
    - Risk matrix and mitigation measures
    - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
    - Donor contribution agreements and Donor reports
    - Other documents

2. **Context Analysis**

- **Development and Operational Context (2 pager):** First part of context analysis will analyze the environment in which a project operates since the inception of the CPD in 2018. Context analysis mainly focuses on scanning both internal and external environment, analyzing operating environments like political, economic, social, technological developments and demographic trends related to project implementation. Context analysis will analyze how key departures due to contextual changes had impacted organization, team, strategy, project activities.

- **Evolving Context (2 pager):** Second part of context analysis will assess the relevance of the project to the current evolving context (e.g. Covid crisis, intercommunal conflicts, election etc.). This will support to identify challenges and ways to overcome or mitigate them, and to provide lessons learnt. This analysis will be useful for proposed adjustments to the design of the current country programme and the development of elements that can be considered to inform the planning of the next phase project cycle.

3. **Evaluation Inception report** (max 10 pages) to be developed. Evaluators will commence the evaluation process with a desk review and preliminary analysis of the available

information supplied by the implementing agency. Based on the TOR, initial meetings with the UNDP programme unit/evaluation manager and the desk review, evaluators should develop an inception report. The description of what is being evaluated illustrates the evaluators' understanding of the logic or theory of how the initiative is supposed to work, including strategies, activities, outputs and expected outcomes and their interrelationships. It will detail how each evaluation question will be answered by way of proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures taking into consideration the options available during COVID-19 restrictions. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.

The inception report provides an opportunity to clarify issues and understanding of the objective and scope of an evaluation, such as resource requirements and delivery schedules. Any identified issues or misunderstandings should be addressed at this stage and prior to any data-collection or field missions.

4. **Development of evaluation questions, remote interview questionnaire focus groups guidelines and online surveys**
    a. Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
    b. Surveys interview questionnaires focus group discussions guidelines and online survey tools to be designed and pretested.

Phase II: Validation Phase (virtually or on site/ face to face)

Option 1: Virtual validation

With travel and border trade restrictions in place, it is very likely that there may or may not be able to conduct field visits and /or lack of local evaluation team members data could be collected remotely.

- For validation, skype or telephone interviews, online/mobile questionnaires, online surveys, collaboration platforms (slack or yammer) and satellite imagery could be used to gather data.
    - Remote telephone interviews with key government counterparts, representatives of key civil society organizations and implementing partners is recommended.
    - Online survey tool or one to one Zoom meetings can be organized for donor community members and UN partners.
    - Programme specific group zoom meetings can be organized for thematic programmatic and operational areas.
- Use of Partners Survey contact information: UNDP Myanmar had already collected list of all the partners contact details during 2019 partners survey. These information's can be used for virtual interviews.
- Stakeholder engagement ensures the effective communication of an evaluation and its uptake, so it is very important to do a test run and factor in emergency settings and time zone differences.
- Stakeholders that are dealing with existing emergencies should be given advance notice and an adjustment of evaluation timelines can be expected.

- UNDP Field office colleagues will assist national consultant in logistic arrangement of the virtual meetings with partners and beneficiaries.

Option 2: Onsite or face to face validation

- If situation permits, national consultant or international consultant will visit to selected field sites (if feasible)
- Undertake key informant interviews with beneficiaries, government officials, communities and other stakeholders who have been involved in implementing activities under the program and/or participated in various program activities.
- Focus Group Discussions to be held whenever appropriate (specially recommended for beneficiaries). All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity.

Ensuring the security of consultants, stakeholders and accompanying UNDP staff, particularly in crisis situations. The evaluation team members should have passed relevant United Nations security exams and be aware of and compliant with related security protocols, including passing the United Nations Department of Safety and Security training courses on basic security in field II and advanced security in the field.

Phase III: Analysis, Debriefing and Report Writing Phase (in country or virtually)

Following field missions or data validation phase, data review and analysis of evaluation questions, surveys and questionnaires. Evaluation teams are required to ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) through triangulation of the various data sources.

Prior to the drafting of the evaluation report, the evaluation team should debrief the UNDP project/programme and management teams with preliminary findings. Debriefings with key stakeholders and the evaluation reference group may also be organized virtually or face to face where possible. This gives an opportunity to discuss preliminary findings and address any factual errors or misunderstandings, prior to writing the evaluation report.

At a time of social distancing, social media can help bridge the gap. Social platforms like yammer, teams etc can be formed to enable connecting, networking and engaging with target audiences such as donors, partners, and decision makers. This will be valuable to drive discussions, increase accessibility and amplify reach to key evaluation stakeholders.
A quality evaluation report should:

- Have a concise executive summary (maximum four pages).
- Be well structured and complete.
- Describe what is being evaluated and why.
- Identify the evaluation questions of concern to users.
- Identify target groups covered by the evaluation and whether the needs of the target groups were addressed through the intervention, and if not, why.
- Explain the steps and the procedures used to answer those questions.
- Present findings supported by credible evidence in response to the questions.
- Acknowledge limitations and constraints in undertaking the evaluation.
- Draw conclusions about findings based on of the evidence.
- Propose concrete and usable recommendations derived from conclusions.
- Be written with the report users and how they will use the evaluation in mind.

6. Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing following Deliverables/Expected outputs. These products include:

Deliverables	Payments
Evaluation Inception report (max 10 pages). The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.	25 percent
Evaluation debriefings. Debriefing meetings should be held (i) after collecting primary data from the field focusing on the initial findings and observations and (ii) a formal briefing should be held at the end of the mission including a power point presentation with all major findings and recommendations.	
Draft Midterm evaluation report (within an agreed length).[2] Draft Mid-Term Evaluation report with all major findings and recommendations. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.	25 percent
Presentation of draft report to evaluation steering committee	
Final Draft Mid-Term Evaluation report incorporating comments received, and including a clear succinct Executive Summary	
Evaluation report audit trail. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.	
Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation steering committee	
Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.	
Final evaluation report. The final report should be accompanied by digital copies of the processed data files, transcripts and associated materials.	50 percent

7. Institutional Arrangements

7.1 Reporting line:

The Team Leader will report to the Chief of Unit, Governance and Sustainable Peace Program.

[2] A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.

7.2 Logistical arrangements:

For all international travel (if situation permits):

- ❑ Candidates are requested to include international travel costs from probable point of departure in the financial proposal and arrange the flight. The travel cost should be based on the most economical class fare, with most direct routes.
- ❑ UNDP will provide support for the visa process and reimburse the visa fee, based on the actual receipt.
- ❑ UNDP will provide terminal charges at the applicable UN rate.
- ❑ UNDP does not consider travel days as working days.

For all in-country travels (if situation permits):

- ❑ For in-country missions, UNDP will arrange, and cover costs related to all domestic travels – such as transportation(s) between the agreed in-county duty stations and living allowances - in accordance with UNDP's regulations and policies.
- ❑ UNDP will facilitate security clearances required to travel in-country (if applicable).

Other logistical matters:

- ❑ The Contractor is expected to use their own computer.

8. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The MTE team should consist of five members team.

1. Expert on Institutional strengthening, policy processes and SDGs (Team leader - International)
2. Expert on Parliamentary work (International)[3]
3. Expert on Gender equality and Women's empowerment (International)[4]
4. Expert on Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding (International)
5. National Expert [5]

Expert on Institutional strengthening, policy processes and SDGs (Team leader - International): The team leader should have:

- advanced degree (Master's or preferably Ph.D.) in political science, social science, development studies, public policy, public administration, international relations and/or related fields.
- a minimum of 10 years of demonstrated experience in leading Midterm reviews and/or evaluations of development projects and programs on democratic governance
- at least 7 years of experience in institutional strengthening, preferably related to policy processes, SDGs and data for development
- experience with UNDP programming preferred
- knowledge of the national/regional situation and context - work experience in South East Asia and in Myanmar would be an asset

[3] This is a shared position for the MTR evaluation of UNDP's SARL and SERIP projects to also cover linkages on parliamentary work.

[4] This is a common position for the MTR evaluation of UNDP's LEAP, SARL and SERIP projects

[5] This is a common position for the MTR evaluation of UNDP's LEAP, SARL and SERIP projects

- proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing
- excellent command of English in speaking and writings.

9. Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.[6] The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

10. Implementation Arrangements

Evaluation management structure five level structure

1. Evaluation Commissioners (EC): Senior management who owns the evaluation
2. Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC): Key project stakeholders as advisory
3. Evaluation Management Group (EMG): Selected members for day to day management
4. Evaluation Manager (EM): Programme specialist as Lead for evaluation management
5. Evaluators: Third party

Detail of roles and responsibility of evaluation management structure is mentioned below:

1. **Evaluation Commissioners (EC):** Country office senior management, who "own" the evaluation plan for their programme/project. The key role of the EC will be the following:
   - Lead and ensure the development of a comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation plan
   - Responsible for the timely implementation of the evaluation plan
   - Establish appropriate institutional arrangement to manage evaluation- appoint evaluation manager;
   - Safeguard the independence of the exercise and ensure quality of evaluation;
   - Ensure management response are prepared and implemented
   - Accountable for quality and approval of final TOR, Final evaluation report and mgt responses

2. **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC):** This is the primary decision-making entity for the evaluation as it consists of members of the evaluation commissioners and other key stakeholders. The key role of the Evaluation Steering Committee will be the following:
   - Perform advisory role throughout the evaluation process

[6] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

- Composition and level of engagement of ESC can be discussed and finalized with consensus during finalization of ToR
- Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation
- Ensure that evaluation standards, as provided by UNEG, are adhered to, including safeguarding of transparency and independence
- Provide advice on the evaluation's relevance, on the appropriateness of evaluation questions and methodology and on the extent to which conclusions and recommendations are both credible considering the evidence that is presented and are action-oriented
- Review the evaluation products, provide feedback and ensure final draft meets quality standards. Endorse the final evaluation report
- Endorse the communication plan for the dissemination of evaluation findings. Communication plan to be prepared by evaluation task manager
- Review and endorse management response to the evaluation
- Ensure participation of donors as observers in the selection of consultants/ consultancy firms to carry out the MTE

3. **Evaluation Management Group (EMG):** Programme unit head/Programme Specialist, M&E focal point of the project; Project Manager, QA and Reporting Specialist of Country offices. This group will support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day management of the evaluation process. More specifically, it will:

- Prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in consultation with ESC;
- Ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation in alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
- Support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation activities and management of the evaluation budget;
- Hire the team of external consultants;
- Ensure participation of relevant stakeholders;
- Review and provide substantive comments to the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, and evaluation matrix;
- Substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes, and to ensure that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable;
- Inform the Evaluation Steering Committee on progress;
- Prepare management response to the evaluation for ESC's review
- Contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

4. **Evaluation Manager (EM):** Program Officer from the country office. Evaluation manager will work as the Secretariat of the EMG.

- Participate in all stages of the evaluation process: (a) evaluability assessment; (b) preparation; (c) implementation and management; and (d) use of the evaluation
- Lead the development of the evaluation terms of reference

- Participate in the selection/ recruitment of evaluators and safeguard the independence
- Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data/documentation
- Connect the evaluators with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach
- Review inception reports including evaluation questions and methodologies
- Review and comment on draft evaluation reports, circulate draft and final evaluation reports Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report
- Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP. Facilitate, monitor and report on a quarterly basis implementation of management responses and key actions
- Ensure evaluation terms of reference, final evaluation reports, management responses, lessons learned, and other relevant information are publicly available through the ERC
- Facilitate knowledge-sharing and use of findings in programming and decision-making

5. **Evaluation team:** This team has to be a third-party firm/group/individuals who have never been involved directly or as implementing partners in any part of the project/program design, advisory role and/or implementation of any component of the project. Their tasks will be as per the ToR and contractual agreement:

- Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate;
- Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix, in line with the terms of reference;
- Keep to standards and ethical principles in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
- Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, programme/project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations;
- Finalize the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail;
- Deliver the products agreed to the right standard and quality;
- Account for what the team has done (and spent).

11. Time frame for the evaluation process 40 Days over a period a 90 Days (30 June – 30 September)**

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	PLACE
Phase One: Evaluation Planning Phase	**20 days**	
Briefing with UNDP (Senior Managers, SMU, Programme units and project teams)	2 days	Home based
Desk review of all relevant documentation	5 days	
Context analysis: Development context and evolving context	4 days	
Drafting of inception report	4 days	Home- based
Development and testing of evaluation tools	3 days	
Comments and approval of inception report *Note: Within one week of submission of the inception report*	2 days	Home based
Phase Two: Validation Phase	**10-15 days**	
Option 1: Virtual validation. Use of skype or telephone interviews for government counterparts and local implementing partners; online surveys/Zoom meetings/telephone interview with donor partners, UN counterparts and programme teams	10 days	Home- based
Option 2: Face to face or virtually - Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	15 days	With field visits
Phase Three: Analysis, Debriefing and Report Writing Phase	**10 days**	
Preliminarily debriefing (via zoom meetings if travel restrictions exists)	1 day	
Preparation of draft report including executive summary	6 days	Home- based
Draft report submission		
Feedback from UNDP *Note: Within two weeks of submission of the draft report*	-	
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating comments	2 days	Home- based
Presentation of final report (vis zoom meeting (via zoom meetings if travel restrictions exists)	1 days	Home- based
Estimated total days for the evaluation	**40 Days**	

*** This flexibility is being built in given the current COVID crisis and the uncertainties around travel etc.*

Duty Stations: Home based, Yangon and Project Field Sites if there is a possibility to travel to Myanmar

12. Application submission process and criteria for selection

The application submission process -both financial and technical is included in the RFP.

Criteria for selecting the best offer

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified Consultancy Firm/consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly, the firm/consultant will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following conditions:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable as per the Instruction to Bidders (ITB) of the Standard Bid Document (SBD), and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
    a. Technical Criteria weight is 70%
    b. Financial Criteria weight is 30%

Recommended presentation of technical proposal

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a Service Provider advised to use a proposed Table of Contents.

Confidentiality and proprietary interests

The consultants shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy or the Government without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of the UNDP. This assignment will be administrated by UNDP hence UNDP rules, policies and procedures will apply.

Proposed standard technical proposal evaluation criteria

Team Leader:

Technical Proposal Evaluation: Proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan	
To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?	4
Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	4
Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	4
Is the methodology well explained and meets the ToR requirements?	4
Is the presentation clear? Is the sequence of actions and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient delivery of the task?	4
Sub total	**20**
Technical Proposal Evaluation: Education and qualifications	

advanced degree (Master's or preferably Ph.D.) in political science, social science, development studies, public policy, public administration, international relations and/or related fields.	10
a minimum of 10 years of demonstrated experience in leading Midterm reviews and/or evaluations of development projects and programs on democratic governance	15
at least 7 years of experience in institutional strengthening, preferably related to policy processes, SDGs and data for development;	10
proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing	10
excellent command of English in speaking and writings.	5
Sub total	**50**
Total	**70**