

TERMS OF REFERENCE

National Terminal Evaluator for the Paving the Roads to SDGs through Good Local Governance (Roads2SDGs) Project

Project ID	106047
Project Name	Paving the Roads to SDG through Good Local Governance
Project Location	Philippines – 78 Provinces in 16 Regions (CAR, I, II, III, IVA, IVB, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, Caraga, and BARMM)
Implementation Period	December 2017 – March 2021
Project Completion Date	31 March 2021
Project Budget	USD 7,366,832.97
Project expenditure at the time of the evaluation¹	USD 6,593,297.51
Funding Source	Government of the Philippines thru the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG)
Implementing party	UNDP

I. Background and context

Launched in December 2017, “Paving the Roads to SDGs through Good Local Governance” (or the Roads2SDGs Project) aims to provide support in implementing the Conditional Matching Grant to Provinces (CMGP) Program of the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), particularly in road planning and design, quality assurance and strengthening citizen participation in local road governance.

Efficient, resilient, and well-planned road networks ensure that no one is left behind in the drive for inclusive growth. Therefore, roads are considered as an important foundation for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and a prerequisite for bringing communities together. In 2016, only 24.6% of all provincial roads in the Philippines are of acceptable quality. Of the 12,726km of provincial core roads, 57.2% are unpaved and in need of upgrading, while 20.2% are in poor condition and in need of rehabilitation. The situation is similarly dire for the 19,098 km of non-core roads, with 67% needing upgrading and 7% in need of rehabilitation.

To address this situation, DILG and DBM jointly launched the CMGP. By providing the provinces with financial investment for capital outlay, the Programme addresses the under-investment of local roads, to improve national local road connectivity, increase economic activity and improve public access to facilities and services in the provinces. Moreover, the Program also supports governance reforms, quality assurance and the strengthening of governance processes, specifically on Local Road Management (LRM) and Public Financial Management (PFM), among others.

In partnership with DILG, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has launched the Project “Paving the Roads to SDGs through Good Local Governance” (Roads2SDGs) to provide support on the quality assurance, governance reform components of CMGP, and citizen engagement in road governance through the “Roads to SDGs” framework.

The Roads2SDGs Framework is anchored on two complementing foundational precepts – (1) SDGs are potent to inform and enhance road governance; and, (2) good roads governance positively ushers in the attainment of the SDGs. This informs and enhances the prioritization, planning, design, implementation, and maintenance of road infrastructure projects to the achievement of SDGs, incorporating the elements of partnership building, climate

¹ As of June 2020, including commitments.

change, disaster risk reduction, gender mainstreaming, and citizen participation for transparency and accountability, among others. In this manner, the SDGs provide a framework to strengthen the governance of road projects, which in turn, will positively impact the achievement of the SDGs.

The Philippines is one of the most affected countries in the Southeast Asian region by the COVID-19 pandemic. By the end of July 2020, the total number of cases in the country is at 93,354. There have been 2,023 deaths and 65,178 recoveries so far. In response, the government launched a multi-sectoral response to the COVID-19 pandemic through its Interagency Task Force (IATF) and since March 2020, the government has implemented various quarantine measures in major cities and provinces. As a result, the project incurred delays due to the suspension and cancellation of activities. Thus, DILG and UNDP agreed to extend the partnership/project up to March 2021.

As the project is about to end, a terminal evaluation will be conducted to assess the project's accomplishments and the quality of implementation and analyze overall added value to local road governance reforms. In addition, lessons learned, and best practices will be identified and analyzed to inform future programming.

II. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

2.1. Purpose

Evaluations are critical for UNDP to progress towards advancing human development. Through the generation of evidence and objective information, evaluations enable UNDP to make informed decisions and plan strategically.

This project terminal evaluation is intended to demonstrate the level of change in the project outputs and the project's contribution to outcome level results, which are demonstrated as changes in the performance and behavior of institutions. It must also consider whether resources have been properly utilized towards implementation and delivery of outputs and the extent to which these outputs contributed to observed results achieved. The evaluation must also identify any operational issues that may be improved to facilitate better project implementation and delivery for similar projects in the future.

The evaluation will be used by all main parties (UNDP and DILG) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions and to generate knowledge for wider use.

2.2. Scope

Under the overall guidance of the Evaluation Reference Group, and reporting to the UNDP Evaluation Manager, the Evaluation Consultant, shall assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Roads2SDGs Project by reviewing progress towards project results based on the project document and annual work plans. The evaluation will review the project's theory of change vis-à-vis the project's achievements and risks and assess the project's effects on the target beneficiary groups. It will likewise highlight strengths, weaknesses, gaps, good practices, and provide recommendations for the design and implementation of future government financing projects and determine opportunities to continue the DILG-UNDP partnership.

2.3. Objective

The terminal evaluation seeks to assess the overall performance of the Project vis-à-vis its objectives and its value and contribution to road governance reforms at the provincial level, including unintended positive and negative results. The evaluation will also assess the strengths and weaknesses of the project design, implementation, monitoring, management and sustainability measures, including project exit strategy. The evaluation will collate and analyze lessons learned and best practices in relation to strategies employed and implementation arrangements, which can inform future programming.

Specifically the terminal evaluation will assess:

- The relevance of the project;
- The effectiveness of the achievement of project objectives/results;
- The level of efficiency in the use of project resources;
- The usefulness and sustainability of results for the project beneficiaries;
- Application of rights-based approach and mainstreaming gender in project interventions;
- UNDP's performance as a development partner; and
- UNDP's added value to the expected results.

III. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Relevance

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, empowerment of women and to the human rights-based approach?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent the project outputs were achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outcomes and outputs, and project outputs
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and realization of human rights?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- Were the selected implementation modalities (i.e., direct implementation, engagement of implementing partners) the most efficient way to implement the Project?
- How effective were the project coordination and responsiveness mechanisms including between the implementing agencies, with the Project Board, with the Government and with other project stakeholders/beneficiaries?
- How well did the project complement any other initiatives existing in the same area and what efforts did the project make to identify such initiatives and strengthen synergies?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have the project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- How effective were the project's monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?
- How well did the project measure and respond to risk during design and implementation?

Sustainability

- How likely are the outputs and results of the Project to be sustained?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent do mechanism, procedures, and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on governance reforms, gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

IV. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation process is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, Project Team and other relevant stakeholders. The evaluation plan should outline a mixed method approach to data collection and analysis. The methodologies for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

1. Desk review of documentation provided by the Project, which shall include the following: project document, annual work plans, activity designs, Project Board minutes and other pertinent documents produced by the implementing units.
2. Systematic review of monitoring data from project (i.e., quarterly and annual reports, documentation of activities, and monitoring reports) and other key sources of data.
3. Semi-structured interviews. Key informant and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with all major stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries including the implementing agencies, provincial government units, partner civil society organizations (CSOs) Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), citizen volunteers/monitors and community/individual beneficiaries. When applicable, beneficiaries should represent diverse groups, including women and youth from different ethnic groups and social-economic statuses. Proposals should clearly indicate how KII and FGD data will be captured, coded and analyzed.
4. Survey of key stakeholders, including those who are involved in the project within UNDP and the government.
5. Validation workshop of the key findings, conclusion and recommendation with key stakeholders.

Travel to the country and within the country has been restricted since the implementation of community quarantine due to COVID-19. If travel to or within the country is not possible for the evaluation then the Evaluation Consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and should resort to the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for the stakeholders' availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet and computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online platform (skype, zoom etc.). Health and safety of stakeholders, evaluation consultants and UNDP staff must be the key priority. A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

V. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The Evaluation Consultant is expected to deliver the following:

1. **Evaluation Inception Report (10-15 pages).** To be submitted within two (2) weeks from the official start of engagement, outlining the framework of analysis, schedule of activities, budget, milestones and deliverables. The Inception Report will include an Evaluation Matrix (see table below) that outlines how the Evaluation Consultant will collect and analyze data to answer all evaluation questions.

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Assumptions to be Assessed	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

2. **Evaluation debriefings.** Presentation of initial findings to UNDP and Project Management after the end of evaluation field work and shall also highlight the actual coverage of the mission, additional requirements, if any and next steps.
3. **Draft Evaluation Report.** The draft report will be circulated to project stakeholders for review and comments within an agreed period of time. The Evaluation Consultant shall be required to provide an **Audit Trail**, detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the Final Terminal Evaluation Report. The table below is an example of Audit Trail Template.

Author and Date of Submission	Comment Number	Paragraph Number/ Comment Location	Comment/feedback on the draft report	Evaluator response and actions taken

4. **Final Evaluation Report and Presentation to Key Stakeholder.** The outline of the report should be based on the guidelines and templates to be provided by UNDP.

VI. Institutional Arrangements

The Evaluation Consultant will be hired for an indicative of four (4) months, in accordance with the timetable set forth in Section VII of this TOR.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO-RBM Analyst and supported by the Institutions and Partnership (I&P) Team Lead, with whom all outputs shall be submitted and through whom all communications shall be coursed or copied. The UNDP CO-RBM Analyst and I&P Team Lead shall review and approve the outputs submitted by the Evaluation Consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).

The Project Management Unit (PMU) through the Project Manager and the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst will be responsible for coordinating and liaising with the Evaluation Team pertaining to required technical and financial documents, including coordination with stakeholders (DILG-CMGP PMO, DILG Regional and Provincial Offices, Provincial Local Government Units, community beneficiaries and other relevant government agencies),

setting up interviews, consultations and meetings. PMU shall likewise assist in distribution of draft reports to stakeholders for the review, consolidation of comments, and in organizing key stakeholders' meetings for presentation of the salient points of the draft/final reports.

The UNDP CO-RBM Analyst will brief the Evaluation Team on UNDP evaluation norms and standards, reviewing and quality assuring the inception/draft and final reports, and in publishing findings and management responses at the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center.

The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for implementing all evaluation-related activities – collecting and organizing project technical and financial documents and in producing evaluation products listed in Section V. While the PMU will provide the information required and support in coordinating with stakeholders, the Evaluation Consultant will have to manage its own schedule and logistical arrangements in the conduct of terminal evaluation.

VII. Duration of Work

The Evaluation Consultant is expected to deliver the outputs outlined in Section V, according to the following indicative schedule. The total duration of the evaluation will be 40 days spread over four (4) months.

Deliverables/Outputs	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Evaluation Inception Report (with attachments and annexes)	12-16 October 2020	To be reviewed by ERG & UNDP Evaluation Manager and/or I&P Team Lead
Revised Inception Report based on key inputs/comments of UNDP	19-23 October 2020	<i>Approval: UNDP Evaluation Manager and/or I&P Team Lead</i>
Data Collection, Interviews and Consolidation	26 October to 27 November 2020	UNDP Roads2SDGs Project M&E Officer to provide needed project documents
Evaluation Debriefings (Presentation of preliminary findings)	07-11 December 2020	To be presented to ERG for comments <i>Approval: UNDP Evaluation Manager and/or I&P Team Lead</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	11-15 January 2021	To be reviewed by ERG and UNDP Evaluation Manager <i>Approval: UNDP Evaluation Manager and/or I&P Team Lead</i>
Final Evaluation Report and Presentation to Key Stakeholders	08-12 February 2021	To be reviewed and approved by ERG and UNDP Evaluation Manager <i>Approval: UNDP Evaluation Manager and/or I&P Team Lead</i>

VIII. Duty Station

The Evaluation Consultant will be Philippines-based with mission(s) to project sites. Though the Evaluation Consultant will not be required to report regularly at the Country Office, he/she may be asked to report and meet virtually (during community quarantine/lockdown) and send emails or through calls to UNDP (as agreed during the inception report) to consult with stakeholders and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) and to report status and provide feedback on the outputs.

The Evaluation Consultant will travel to the Project sites, the COVID19 travel restrictions permitting. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic and declaration of State of Public Health Emergency in the Philippines, all work and travel of the Evaluation Consultant shall be done within the guidelines and protocols set by the local and national government. Field work, trainings, meetings, and coordination shall be done in compliance with community quarantine policies;

Any necessary mission travel must be approved in advance by the CO focal point and the BSAFE course must be completed before the commencement of travel. The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when traveling to certain parts of the country, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The Evaluation Consultant is also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>.

The UNDP CO will be responsible for making his/her site travel arrangements and will shoulder related expenses in line with UNDP travel policies.

IX. Competencies

The Project will engage the services of a National Evaluation Consultant as Individual Contractor (IC) to carry out the Project Terminal Evaluation. The IC may bring in technical and/or administrative support but will still have the overall responsibility during all phases of the evaluation, particularly in maintaining the high quality and ensuring timely completion of evaluation processes, methodologies, and outputs under this engagement.

Core Values

- Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards;
- Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post requirements and is conscientious & efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Core competencies

- Results-Oriented: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;
- Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences;
- Teamwork: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team;
- Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners' needs and matching them to appropriate solutions.

X. Evaluation Ethics

The Evaluation Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

“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.”

XI. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The Consultant should send the financial proposal based on a lump-sum amount for the delivery of the outputs identified below. The total amount quoted shall be “all inclusive” (professional fees, communications, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor should be factored into the final amount submitted in the proposal. Travel, as deemed relevant by UNDP and compliant with government guidelines on community quarantine, will be arranged and paid for by UNDP and should not be included in the financial proposal.

Medical/health insurance must be purchased by the individual at his/her own expense, and upon award of contract, the Contractor must be ready to submit proof of insurance valid during contract duration.

The contract price will be fixed output-based price. Any deviations from the output and timeline will be agreed upon between the Contractor and the UNDP.

Payments will be done upon satisfactory completion of the delivery by target due dates. Outputs will be certified by the Evaluation Manager and I&P Team Lead in UNDP Philippines prior to release of payments.

Deliverables/Outputs	Due Date
1st Tranche: 30% Upon submission evaluation inception report and issuance of the certificate of acceptance	October 30, 2020
2nd Tranche: 30% Upon presentation of mission highlights and submission of draft evaluation report, and issuance of the certificate of acceptance	January 15, 2021
3rd Tranche: 40% Upon submission of final evaluation report, including a final presentation to key stakeholders, other related documents, and issuance of the certificate of acceptance	February 15, 2021

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

XII. Recommended Presentation of Offer

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications including the following:

1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template to be provided by UNDP;
2. **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;
3. **At least two final/published version of evaluation reports** will be required for submission to provide the Project an idea on how the prospective IC will package the reports [i.e., quantitative and qualitative presentation of findings and recommendations];
4. A brief **Plan of Approach and Methodology** which contains the same elements of the inception report as indicated in Section IV; and
5. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

XIII. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Offers will be evaluated based on the combined scoring method :

- Technical qualifications = 50%
- Plan of Approach and Methodology = 20%
- Financial Proposal = 30%

Qualifications	Obtainable Points
<i>Education</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advanced degree in social sciences, international development, research methods, evaluation and other related fields; additional courses/certifications on project management, monitoring and evaluation would be an advantage (14 points for master's, 20 points for doctorate, +3 points for additional degrees/certifications)	20
<i>Experience</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least five (5) years of progressive global experience in development research, evaluation of development projects, or management of donor-funded projects related to local road management, public financial management, and local governance in the Philippines preferred (21 points for 5 years, +1 point for additional year)	30
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least three (3) years of demonstrated experience in the application of various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, with specialization in either quantitative or qualitative research, or both. (21 points for 3 years, +1 point for additional year)	30
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A portfolio of at least two (2) published and unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research output from consultancy projects in the last two (2) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least one (1) of these should be an evaluation. (10 points for each project)	20
TOTAL	100

Assessment of best offer will be via Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications will be weighed a maximum of 70 percent and combined with the price offer which will be weighed a maximum of 30 percent. Criteria for technical part is shown above while financial criteria will be based on the financial proposal.

The technical criteria (education, experience, plan of approach/methodology) will be based on a maximum 100 points. Only those that have obtained a minimum of 70% (70 out of 100 points) from the review of education, experience and language will be deemed technically compliant and considered for financial evaluation.

Financial score (max 30 points) shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal of those technically qualified.

The financial proposal shall specify an all-inclusive lump sum fee. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of daily fees (including all foreseeable expenses to carry out the assignment). Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

XIV. Annexes to the TOR

- A. Project Document and Cost Sharing Agreement (including amendments)
- B. Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change
- C. DILG and DBM Joint Memorandum Circular No. 2017-2 – Guidelines for the Implementation of the Conditional Matching Grant to Provinces (CMGP) for Road Repair, Rehabilitation and Improvement

XV. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature:

Name and Designation:

Maria Luisa Isabel Lim-Jolongbayan, I&P Team Lead

Date of Signing:
