**DM&E for Statement of Work (SoW)/Terms of Reference (TOR)**

**Evaluation of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Phase 1 project portfolio in Madagascar**

Madagascar became eligible for PBF funding in 2015, following the 2014 presidential elections amidst continued political tensions. Since then, PBF has engaged in the country, within the framework of a Peacebuilding Priority Plan with a financial envelope of $11.5 million from 2015 to 2019.

This evaluation exercise focuses on the period 2015-2020 and builds on the evaluability assessment undertaken in 2018. It aims to examine accomplishments and overall Fund performance under the three portfolio level outcomes of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan, during the period 2015-2020 and summarize achievements specific to the individual projects implemented

1. **Background**

***National Context***

Following independence in 1960, Madagascar experienced a series of crises, notably in 1972, 1991, 1996, 2002 and 2009, which had a negative impact in the economy, weakened the sociocultural and institutional fabric and led to extreme poverty. The latest of such crises was triggered in December 2008 following the overthrow of the former President by the then Mayor of Antananarivo, backed by some elements in the army. After several failed rounds of negotiations, a SADC-brokered roadmap was signed in September 2011 with the international community’s support. Presidential and parliamentarian elections were held in October-December 2013. The elections were held peacefully and were judged as credible and transparent by all international observers. The new President, H.E. Hery Rajaonarimampianina, took office on 25 January 2014, marking a milestone in the country’s exit from crisis.

Although democratically elected institutions were established, weak governance at all levels remained a challenge. The fragility of national and local institutions is rooted in the excessive centralization of power and weak accountability, among other challenges. This also translates in huge disparities between Antananarivo and the interior of the country, particularly the South with high poverty levels and an increase in criminal activities. Furthermore, persistent collusion between business and politics, the prominent role played by the army in state affairs, and ineffective oversight and control mechanisms were and are major challenges that continue to affect the country.

So far, the conflict in Madagascar has not erupted into violent confrontation; however, the underlying causes of conflict continue to constitute a major threat to security and stability. Chronic interference and interventionism of the military into politics is symptomatic of the persistence of systemic and structural weaknesses in the organization and functioning of the Malagasy security sector. The weakness of accountability and democratic oversight mechanisms erodes government’s ability to address serious security threats and prevent military interferences.

The Malagasy authorities, particularly the President and the Prime Minister, have made public calls for peace and national reconciliation and have stated that such issues lie at the core of their actions. The UN has a strong presence in Madagascar and is strengthening its capacities to support peacebuilding efforts in Madagascar.

***Madagascar and PBF engagement***

In 2015, the Secretary-General declared Madagascar eligible for PBF funding. As a result of an inclusive and participatory process, in November 2015, the country presented a Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP). This initial phase of funding focused on confidence building and support to Madagascar’s key accountability and anti-corruption institutions as well as to most marginalized areas in the Deep South in order to mitigate the risk of escalating violence through social implosion and of further political instability. This was to be achieved by supporting three strategic objectives developed on the basis of a conflict analysis and assessment of critical needs, funding gaps and catalytic potential. These priorities were identified in consultation with the Government, civil society and development partners. The strategic objectives included: (i) strengthening the rule of law and good governance, focusing on the fight against corruption and transparency (IDIRC project), (ii) contributing to Security Sector Reform and bringing security closer to the people (ARSSAM project), and (iii) providing holistic support for the stabilization and demarginalization of southern Madagascar (AME and RAES project). This package of support, which formally ended in June 2020, was scheduled to be evaluated in 2020, but was postponed due to travel restrictions related to the COVID-19 global pandemic. In addition to the thematic priorities noted above, the PPP included specific strategic actions to help advance Madagascar’s yet-to-be-approved National Action Plan, in accordance with the objectives of Security Council Resolution 1325.

Furthermore, the intervention in southern Madagascar was developed based on a deep understanding of the conflict and anthropological dynamics. Partners on the ground identified the Andriry mountain region (Betroka) as a critical zone to address insecurity and strengthen stabilization and the social fabric.

Through PBF’s Phase 1, the Fund invested $11.5 million through a series of five Peacebuilding Recovery Financing Mechanism (PRF) projects. Additionally, the Fund approved a GYPI (Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative) project in 2018 and an “IRF surge” project in 2015.

On the basis of an updated conflict analysis, PBF approved a second phase of support in late 2019, totaling $16.4 million over three projects (including a PBF secretariat extension and projects approved PBF GYPI initiative in 2020)[[1]](#footnote-2). The focus of the second phase continues to be on prevention of social and political instability by restoring confidence between communities and the state, greater empowerment and greater security to the most marginalized zones, and addressing new sources of social tensions which risk to spill over into general violence if unaddressed (especially around climate change effects in the south and vanilla production tensions in the north). This second phase of support underwent an evaluability assessment in 2020 and is not within the scope of the current evaluative exercise.

1. **Purpose of the evaluation**

PBF seeks an independent evaluation of PBF’s investments in Madagascar over the 2015-2019 period. This exercise will assess the PBF’s achievements and overall added value to peacebuilding in Madagascar during the Peacebuilding Priority Plan (2015-2019). It will also contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of the PBF’s strategic decision-making, its alignment with national frameworks and international processes, implementation modalities and partnerships, and finally whether the PBF has successfully leveraged its role as a catalytic, innovative and risk-taking actor in Madagascar. In addition, given that the PBF has supported peacebuilding initiatives in the country since 2015, this evaluation benefits from a longer time horizon of engagement, which may offer opportunities for evaluators to observe successes or challenges to cumulative achievement or greater effects over time.

This evaluation, moreover, coincides with the elaboration of a new United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), and a PBF eligibility package that includes the update of the country conflict analysis.These parallel exercises aim to i) identify current factors, actors and dynamics of conflict in Madagascar through inclusive, participatory analysis ; ii) facilitate a consultation process with local communities, Government, civil society, the UN and other international partners to contribute to a common understanding of key conflict dynamics and; iii) offer recommendations to the Joint Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Government and the UN, on strategic thematic and geographical priorities for potential PBF engagement in the future. It is anticipated that some data collection and analysis undertaken for the conflict analysis could also be utilized for this evaluative exercise.

The evaluation, together with the SDCF and the PBF eligibility package, together ultimately will inform any future PBF engagement strategy and prioritization in Madagascar.

Hence, the purpose of this evaluation is to:

* assess to what extent PBF’s support from 2015 to 2020 has achieved real and sustained positive results in terms of consolidating peace in Madagascar, either through direct action or through catalytic effects;
* asses how relevant, efficient, effective, coherent and sustainable the PBF support to Madagascar has been;
* assess how relevant, efficient, effective and catalytic the priority plan (2015-2019) and the PBF’s engagement thereafter has been, with particular attention to whether the strategic framework of the PPP made a difference in the management and strategic direction of the Fund’s investments;
* assess achievements specific to the four individual PRF projects implemented under the 2015-2019 PPP;
* assess to what degree the PBF portfolio was implemented in a conflict sensitive and gender-responsive manner;
* assess to what degree the PBF portfolio and extensions thereafter, was implemented based on the promotion and protection of human rights;
* assess to what extent the lessons learnt from the evaluability exercise helped improve effectiveness/ efficiency of Phase 1 implementation, and
* inform the preparation of an eventual new eligibility, reorganization of the Steering Committee and the overall future portfolio governance

There are two main clients for the evaluation, to whom the recommendations will be addressed: (i) the leadership and management team of the PBF portfolio in Madagascar, including the RC, the Madagascar PBF Secretariat team, relevant UNCT members, and the Joint Steering Committee; and (ii) the Peacebuilding Support Office and its Financing for Peacebuilding Branch.

1. **Scope of the evaluation**

The evaluation will consider the overall performance of the Phase 1 of PBF’s portfolio in Madagascar from 2015 to 2019, including, where appropriate, consideration of the cumulative effects of PBF-funded initiatives over time and collectively within a given priority area. Additionally, this evaluation will analyze the evidence of peacebuilding results that have been achieved by individual projects over the period 2015 to 2019.

The evaluation will be framed against the evaluation criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards (including criteria related to gender mainstreaming), which have been adapted to the context.While examples of questions are provided below, the evaluation team should further adapt and elaborate on these in the Inception Report, noting where relevant the relative evaluability of each criteria. Questions of evaluability, and proposed revisions to the evaluation approach, will be critical given the largely remote nature of the evaluation process.

Relevance:

* Were the PPP and its underlying projects informed by an adequate, up-to-date conflict analysis?
* What was the relevance of the proposed (or inferred) theory of change for the PBF Madagascar portfolio and the different sector interventions under the priority plan for 2015-2019?
* To what extent did the PBF respond to urgent funding needs and/or peace-relevant gaps?
* To what extent did PBF projects complement each other and have a strategically coherent approach?

Effectiveness:

* To what extent did the projects supported by the PBF contribute to higher-level outcomes of the PPP?
* Specifically, to what extent did the PBF support contribute to : (i) strengthening the rule of law and good governance, including through the fight against corruption, (ii) contribute to the reform of the security sector, and (iii) provide holistic support to the stabilization of southern Madagascar?
* What were any other key overall effects or results of PBF support?

Efficiency:

* How fast and responsive were the PBF-funded initiatives in supporting peacebuilding priorities in Madagascar?
* How efficient was the implementation of the PBF support through the projects, and how significant were the transaction costs?  What was the implementation capacity of the individual their implementing partners?
* To what extent were the resources programmed in an efficient and strategic manner, including the selection of implementing partners?
* Overall, did the PBF investments provide value for money through the projects? How well did the program and project M&E mechanisms function? To what extent was it possible to increase efficiency in the implementation of the project portfolio based on the lessons learned, good practices and recommendations of the evaluation of the first phase?
* To what extent did the Secretariat contribute to the effectiveness of the PBF project portfolio?
* How well did different implementing partners work together towards common strategic objectives?
* How did the PBF programme adapt to unforeseen circumstances such as the global pandemic and changing contexts?

Coherence:

* To what extent were PBF projects complementary with each other and / or with different stakeholders (government, CSOs and others) in order to achieve a common peacebuilding objective in a given geographic area or on a given theme from different angles?
* To what degree did the PPP priorities align with or fill important gaps within national frameworks and policies? Within the UN Development Assistance Framework?
* To what degree were each project’s design, implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with that of other projects’?

Sustainability/national ownership/catalytic effects:

* What concrete evidence is there of the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to sustain the results of PBF support and continue activities or initiatives?
* What, if any, catalytic effects did the PBF support in Madagascar have (financial and nonfinancial)?
* How effectively were national stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of projects?

Conflict-Sensitivity and Risk Management

* Did the PBF project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity?
* Were the implementing agencies and organizations internal capacities adequate to ensure an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?
* Did any unintended negative impacts result from PBF interventions?
* How adequate was the assessment, mitigation and ongoing monitoring of risk?
* Did the United Nations Country Team and PBF Secretariat teams adequately apply a context-adaptive approach? If yes, how responsive was PBF to requested programmatic changes?

Cross-cutting:

* To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the PBF support to Madagascar?
* Were commitments made within the project documents to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment realized throughout implementation?
* To what extent did the PBF portfolio contribute to key Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment objectives from a peacebuilding angle?
* To what extent did the PBF portfolio projects in Madagascar contribute to commitments in the promotion of youth?
* To what extent is the overall portfolio implemented using a Human Rights based approach?

Evaluation of management and oversight structures in Madagascar and PBSO

In addition to the OECD-DAC criteria above, the evaluation will examine the management of PBF’s support in order to determine the overall fitness of purpose of management arrangements, both in-country and between PBSO/PBF and the Country Team, and assess progress made against recommendations from the PBF portfolio evaluability exercise of 2018. As in the previous evaluability exercise, criteria to consider will include the funding, programming and decision-making arrangements among all relevant actors, and the quality and inclusivity of national ownership of the processes.

Regarding PBF’s In-Country Mechanisms:

* PBF Secretariat:
* How effective and efficient was the support to Fund Recipients in terms of higher-level monitoring, coordination and quality assurance of project implementation and reporting?
* Was the Secretariat appropriately resourced (in terms of human and financial resources as well as political support)?
* How effective was the Secretariat’s support to the JSC?
* Joint Steering Committee (JSC):
  + How transparent, effective and efficient was the JSC’s decision-making regarding PBF support?
  + How suitable was the JSC composition to its role and how did JSC evolve over time?
  + How strong was the government leadership/ ownership within the JSC?
  + How effective was the in-country **strategic oversight** of the projects by the Joint Steering Committee mechanism?
* Fund recipients (Implementing agencies and organizations):
  + Has the implementation capacity of the individual fund recipients, and their implementing partners improved since the 2018 evaluability assessment?
  + Did fund recipient UN Agencies improve their capacities to work together towards common strategic objectives in comparison to earlier periods?
  + What was the process for compiling half yearly and annual reviews and reports and what was the quality of those reports, particularly with regards to reporting higher-level project outcomes and collaboration among the various Fund Recipients?
  + How were the principles of Do No Harm integrated in day to day management and oversight?

1. **Findings and recommendations**

The evaluation should provide a clear, triangulated, evidence-based assessment of its findings. On the basis of these evidence-based findings, the evaluation should clearly articulate actionable recommendations, tailored to relevant actors, including the PBSO, PBC, Joint Steering Committee, in-county PBF Secretariat, Resident Coordinator’s Office, UN Country Team and, where relevant, non-UN Fund Recipients.

Evaluation findings and recommendations should speak to:

* the main programming factors of success;
* the main programming factors of failure;
* the main implementation/ administration factors of success;
* the main implementation/ administration factors of failure;
* the main challenges and ways to address them.

The major lessons and recommendations should come out clearly in the evaluation Executive Summary.

1. **Evaluation Methodology and approach**

The evaluation will use, to the greatest extent possible, a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide/ verify the substance of the findings. It will build on the findings and lessons from the first evaluability exercise and explore how the achievements found at that time have carried through and how any lessons have been used in the next phase.

Currently, COVID-19 related restrictions within Madagascar limit mobility within the country, and access to Government, civil society and community interlocutors is relatively unimpeded. The country’s regional borders are closed, given the “Situation d’Urgence Sanitaire” currently in place. When preparing the evaluation exercise, the evaluation team should consider in detail the security, health and logistical restrictions that may affect their efforts to collect data and how they will mitigate the risks this may pose to the completion of the exercise.

*The methodology should include, but not be limited to:*

* Review of documentation supplied by PBSO, the PBF Secretariat in Madagascar, and the UN Country Team, including:
  + the 2015 Peacebuilding Priority Plan, including higher-level outcomes, theories of change and results frameworks
  + the 2018 Evaluability Assessment
  + 4 sets of Project Documents and complementary project documentation
  + results of a PBF perception survey completed in November 2019
  + Anthropological study completed in 2019
  + any preliminary results and data from the conflict analysis being undertaken by the UNCT and in the conflict analysis 2021 update exercises
  + The 2020 UNCT Common Country Analysis
  + additional research by the evaluation team of documentation on the Madagascar peace context, as necessary.
  + The 2021 diagnostic exercise that includes information on the sustainability of projects implemented in the southern region.
* Teleconferences with major stakeholders in New York, including PBSO, PBC, headquarters of UN agencies implementing PBF financed projects in Madagascar;
* Teleconference with key stakeholders based in Madagascar, including Government and civil society partners and beneficiaries, implementing agencies and non-UN entities, other international partners engaged in supporting peacebuilding and development in Madagascar.
* Launch of a survey through, if possible, an experimental design approach.
* Field visits (to the extent possible within the constraints of COVID-19 related or other travel restrictions) – The PBF coordination office for the South (Betroka) will facilitate its network with local beneficiaries and partners in this region.
* Review of monitoring data from the implementing partners and JSC and other sources.

This assignment will be carried out in the framework of the PBF-UNOPS Programme Support Team (PST) mechanism.  The evaluation team will be composed by two international consultants hired by the PST, a Team Leader and an in-country specialist. Given global travel restrictions as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is expected that members of the evaluation team based internationally will work remotely. The in-country team member based in Antananarivo, will also require conducting remote work given the current mobility restrictions in place. Through a separate recruitment process, however, the international evaluation team will be complimented with a locally hired national evaluator who will assist in the in-country data collection. The national evaluator will be fully managed by the international evaluation Team Leader, who will also participate in the development of the national evaluation specialist Terms of Reference. Day-to-day coordination of and logistics related to the work of the international team member in country and the national evaluator will be supported by the PBF Secretariat. The evaluation approach outlined by the international evaluation team, therefore, should include specific reference to how it will work together with the national evaluator in data collection and analysis, as well as the presentation of findings.

While he international team leader will be in charge of all the theoretical and methodological conceptualization of the evaluation. The in-country team member will be focusing on providing specific input regarding fieldwork logistics, the stakeholder landscape, and local social, political, and peacebuilding environments, while maintaining the independence of the evaluation. Besides assisting in the data recollection phase, the national consultant, potentially based in the southern region, will also add local language knowledge and insights regarding entry points to the evaluation. The final report will be coined and drafted by all team members.

1. **Management arrangements and quality assurance process**

The PBSO PBF DM&E unit will manage and oversee the evaluation process. Day-to-day work of the evaluation team and their logistics will be supported by the PBF, with assistance from the Madagascar PBF Secretariat. While the evaluation is fully independent, a PBF Secretariat staff may accompany the evaluation team during data collection for quality assurance.

An Evaluation Reference Group of key stakeholders will be created to provide the PBF with advice on key deliverables, including the Inception and Final Reports. The Evaluation Reference Group is likely to have members from relevant coordination mechanisms, key in-country stakeholders and the PBF (PBF Secretariat, key members from the Joint Steering Committee). The PBF will approve each of the deliverables by the evaluation team, following internal quality assurance and consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group. The evaluation team is expected to work responsively with the Evaluation Reference Group, while still maintaining independence.

The evaluation team will prepare an Inception Report to further refine the evaluation questions and detail its methodological approach, including data collection instruments. The Inception Report must be approved by the PBSO prior to commencement of the evaluation team’s in-country data collection process.

In addition, before leaving the field following in-country data collection, the evaluation team will schedule a presentation of preliminary findings with the UNCT and key Government stakeholders for their validation. A separate validation exercise may be scheduled with the PBSO and Evaluation Reference Group prior to the submission of the draft report.

The PBSO will retain the copyright over the evaluation. The final evaluation report will be made public following approval by the PBF and incorporating feedback from relevant stakeholders.

1. **Requirements for the national consultant**

The national consultant will support the in-country data gathering and analysis and add a local perspective on the evaluation. Given potential mobility restrictions posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, it is recommended that the national consultant is based in south Madagascar to amplify the evaluation’s geographic scope and reach, specifically in the portfolio concentration zone around the Andriy Mountain Chain.

The national consultant should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

* Formal advanced education in a relevant field, including social sciences, history, conflict studies, etc.;
* At least five years of relevant work experience, including experience working in Madagascar;
* Knowledge of southern Madagascar conflict dynamics
* Excellent knowledge of the country’s cultural, political and socio-economic context ;
* Knowledge of the country’s governance institutions and existing contacts in those institutions, facilitating team’s communication and analysis of the stakeholders/beneficiaries of the PBF portfolio;
* Experience in research and analysis of data;
* Strong teamwork skills;
* Strong written and oral communication skills; and
* Fluency in French and Malagasy required; knowledge of English is desirable.

**Accountability and reporting:**

The Consultant will report the International Evaluation Team Leader and its contract will be managed administratively by UNDP under the PBF Secretariat project.

All reports should be provided in electronic version in French language, with the detailed description of the fulfilled tasks, according to the present Terms of Reference, and the direct contribution of the expert. Analytical documents, reports and notes developed by the national consultant should be attached to the reports as annexes, which will serve as a justification for payment.

**Travel:**

Due to the COVID-19 national restrictions, limited travel is envisaged.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

1. **Key Evaluation Deliverables and Evaluation timeline**

Payments will be made in three tranches as set out below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Estimated level of effort** | **Fees payable** |
| Completion of Inception Report | 10 days | 20% of total contract value |
| Approval of draft Report by the PBF | 25 days | 50% of total contract value |
| Approval of final Report by the PBF | 15 days | Remaining 30% of contract |

The review is expected to take approximately 10 weeks with the schedule broken down as follows:

| **Task** | **Expected Start** | **Expected Finish** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Scoping: document review, teleconferences/meetings with New York stakeholders (e.g., PBSO, MPTFO, other United Nations agencies, etc.), and write-up of Inception Report for PBF approval | May 31, 2021 | June 7, 2021 |
| 1. Field mission, including preparation (1 week) plus travel and meetings (2 weeks) with key stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners, and site visits; plus, validation workshop | June 7, 2021 | June 12, 2021 |
| 1. Analysis and presentation of draft report for PBF approval | June 12, 2021 | July 26, 2021 |
| 1. Finalization of report | July 26, 2021 | **August 9, 2021** |

1. **Statement of ethics**

The Evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluators 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 evaluators 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. Stakeholder explicit informed consent must be given for use outside of the evaluation of information, knowledge and data gathered during the evaluation process.

Annex I – List of Portfolio projects





1. In addition to the 2019 PRF allocation, active PBF investments in Madagascar include the Secretariat IRF project, as well as three additional IRF projects funded through the GYPI 2019. Taken together, the total active amount in Madagascar is $11 million. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)