

## **Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme: Supporting Gender Equality and Women's Rights in Timor-Leste**

### **1. General Context: The MDG-F**

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples' life in 49 countries by accelerating progress towards the MDGs and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 49 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN Reform.

### **The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy is being implemented in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation strategy is based on the principles and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/ Development Assistance Committee (DAC) regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

- To support joint programmes to attain development results;
- To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives: MDGs, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one; and
- To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing a monitoring and evaluation system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

## 2. The Joint Programme: Supporting Gender Equality and Women's Rights in Timor-Leste

The MDG-F Joint Programme: Supporting Gender Equality and Women's Rights in Timor-Leste is supporting the Government of Timor-Leste in improving the conditions of women and girls through the protection of their rights and their empowerment. Five UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UN Women and IOM) are implementing the programme in collaboration with a number of Government partners and NGOs. The main Government partners include the State Secretariat for the Promotion of Equality, Ministry of Social Solidarity, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education and Ministry of Finance. The main NGOs include the Alola Foundation, JSMP, Fokupers, Rede Feto and PRADET. The District Administrations and Socu councils are involved in programme implementation at the district and suco levels. Also, citizen groups and community are involved in some programme activities.

The key beneficiaries of the programme are women and girls that are survivors of domestic violence and human trafficking as well as poor women (including those heading households). Secondary beneficiaries are institutional stakeholders, including policy makers, public servants, NGOs and service providers. The programme is being implemented at the national level and in five selected districts (Dili, Baucau, Bobonaro, Cova-Lima and Oecussi districts).

Timor-Leste is one of the poorest countries in the world with low level of socio economic situation. It faced internal crisis until 2008. A study conducted in 2005 indicated that 47% of the women in this country suffered physical, psychological or sexual violence by their partners. Recent study shows that 38% of the women experienced physical violence since the age of 18 years. 74% of the married women experienced it from their husbands or partners. Women's weak position in the society also makes them vulnerable to both domestic and international trafficking. Timor-Leste is also a destination country of sex trafficking of women from other Asian countries. However, the country is growing fast in recovering internal crisis and boosting economy. The country is one of the highest oil revenue earning countries in the world. The State Secretariat for the Promotion of Equality was created in 2008 and is leading gender equality activities in the country.

The expected programme results consist of the following three outcomes and eight outputs:

**Outcome 1: Improved protection of women and girls through the establishment of legal frameworks and mechanisms to uphold their rights.**

Output 1.1: Legislation passed and National Action Plans developed to prevent and combat domestic violence and human trafficking.

Output 1.2: Capacity building programme developed and implemented to upgrade the knowledge and skills of the Government officials, NGOs and CBOs involved in implementation of the action plans related to combating domestic violence and human trafficking at the national and local levels.

Output 1.3: Information, education and communication strategies developed and implemented on domestic violence and human trafficking at the national and local levels.

**Outcome 2: Reduced vulnerability of women and girls through improved outreach mechanisms and services and the establishment of a social protection scheme.**

Output 2.1: Technical supports provided for improving the design and implementation of on-going conditional cash transfer schemes of the Ministry of Social Solidarity.

Output 2.2: National and local referral mechanisms and services established and/or strengthened for the protection of victims of domestic violence and human trafficking.

**Outcome 3: Improved social and economic situation of women and girls through a fair allocation of resources using gender responsive budgeting.**

- Output 3.1: Tools on gender sensitive planning and gender responsive budgeting developed to increase the knowledge and skills of senior government officials, members of local assemblies and local council members
- Output 3.2: Civil society (NGOs, Women's groups, CBOs, academia) trained on gender sensitive planning and gender responsive budgeting to advocate for, scrutinize and monitor public expenditures.
- Output 3.3: Gender responsive budgets prepared and pilot tested in selected line Ministries and Suco councils.

The expected programme results are in line with the long term development plans and priorities of the Government of Timor-Leste and participating UN agencies. Promotion of gender equality is reflected in the National Development Plan 2002, the National Strategic Development Plan 2011-30 and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2009-13. The programme outcomes and outputs are broadly linked to the general thematic achievements of the MDG 2 (Achieve Universal Primary Education) and MDG 3 (Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women). The gender responsive budgeting component (programme outcome 3) is indirectly contributing to the MDGs 1, 2, 4 and 5. The programme contributes to realizing the UNDAF Outcome 1 (By 2013, stronger democratic institutions and mechanisms for social cohesion are consolidated) and UNDAF Outcome 3.3 (Vulnerable populations, especially children and women, benefit from quality social protection, particularly social welfare services, including in emergencies).

The implementation period of the programme was initially three years and has been extended for six months. Actual implementation of the programme was started on 15 December 2008 and will be ending on 15 June 2012. There was no significant change or complication since the programme inception except a slight delay in the implementation of a few of the planned programme activities as well as in the approval of the Law against Domestic Violence. The latter was, however, adjusted through the speedy implementation of the subsequent planned programme activities, such as the development of the National Action Plan on Gender Based Violence. It is expected that all expected programme results will be achieved by the end of the programme period. The Joint Programme was approved with a total funding of USD 4,955,000 of which US\$ 3,461,304 (70%) had been disbursed as of 31 December 2011.

The final evaluation of this Joint Programme will be conducted by 15 June 2012 as outlined in the MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines. The lead UN agency (UN Women), as mandated by the Resident Coordinator Office as the Commissioner of the evaluation, will seek to recruit highly qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation.

The evaluation team will consist of two members. A highly qualified International Consultant will be assigned to lead the Evaluation Team. A National Consultant or another International Consultant with knowledge on Timor-Leste will be assigned to assist the Team Leader during his/her in country mission (field visit). Academic qualification and required experience of the evaluation consultants are as follows:

**Team Leader**

**Academic Qualification:** A master degree or equivalent in international development, public policy, social science, gender studies or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.

**Experience:** A combination of minimum 10 years of recognized expertise in:

- Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas; and
- Having thematic expertise in, gender and women's empowerment, international development programmes and/or assessing or evaluating gender and women's empowerment thematic area.

#### **Team Member**

**Academic Qualification:** A master degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, gender studies or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.

**Experience:** A combination of minimum 5 years of recognized expertise in:

- Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas; and
- Having thematic expertise in, gender and women's empowerment, international development programmes and/or assessing or evaluating gender and women's empowerment thematic area.

### **3. Overall Goal of the Evaluation**

One of the roles of the MDG-F Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Programme Implementation Guidelines under the MDG Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that **all joint programmes will commission and finance a final independent evaluation.**

Final evaluations are **summative** in nature and seek to:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results.
2. Generate substantive evidence based knowledge, on one or more of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

### **4. Scope of the Evaluation and Specific Objectives**

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in this terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period between four and six months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation of the joint programme**, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

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

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. To measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. To measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
5. To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

## 5. Evaluation Questions, Levels of Analysis and Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

### Design level:

**- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the MDGs.**

1. How much and in what ways did the joint programme contributed to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
2. To what extent this programme was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (Reference: MDG-F joint programme guidelines and final evaluation guidelines)
3. To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
4. To what extent the implementing partners participating in the joint programme had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
5. To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
6. To what extend did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?
7. If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed?
8. Was there any gender sensitive assessment carried out at the programme design stage?
9. To what extend the joint programme design considered the needs of women and men? Were the objectives/outputs/indicators of the joint programmes gender sensitive?
10. Was there any affirmative action planned in order to reduce inequalities?

### Process level:

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

1. To what extent did the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
2. To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
3. To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
4. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
5. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
6. What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
7. To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the joint programme? Was it useful? Did the joint programme implement the improvement plan?
8. Was the participation of women promoted in the implementation of the programme? Was the participation of women and men equal?

**- Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions**

1. To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?
2. To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?

**Result level:**

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

1. To what extent did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document?
  - (a) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
  - (b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals set in the thematic window?
  - (c) To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to improve the implementation of the principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action?
  - (d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?
2. To what extent were the joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? `What kinds of results were reached?
3. To what extent did the joint programme have an impact on the targeted citizens?

4. Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them
5. What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, gender, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?
6. To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc)
7. To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?
8. Is there any good practice in terms of gender equality?

**- Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**

1. To what extent the joint programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?

At local and national level:

- (a) To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
  - (b) Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
  - (c) Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
  - (d) Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
2. To what extent will the joint programme be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?
  3. To what extent did the joint programme align itself with the National Development Strategies and/or the UNDAF?

## 6. Methodological Approach

This final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the terms of reference and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to ensure gender sensitive analyze of the relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, mid-term evaluation and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgments. Consultants are also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool as a means to collect relevant data for the final evaluation. The evaluation team will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of targeted citizens/participants of the joint programme are taken into account.

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

## 7. Evaluation Deliverables

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

🔗 **Inception Report** (to be submitted within 15 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team).

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

🔗 **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 20 days after the completion of the field visit, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat).

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

🔗 **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat).

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the sections establish in Annex.

## 8. Key Roles and Responsibilities in the Evaluation Process

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluation:

1. The **Resident Coordinator Office** as **Commissioner** of the final evaluation will have the following functions:

- Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
- Convene the evaluation reference group;
- Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
- Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team;
- Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat);

- Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
  - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
  - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee;
  - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.
- 2. The Programme Coordinator as Evaluation Manager** will have the following functions:
- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation ToR
  - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group
  - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data
  - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of the evaluation
  - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
  - Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
  - Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation
- 3. The Programme Management Committee** that will function as the **Evaluation Reference Group**, this group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint programme:
- Review the draft evaluation report & ensure final draft meets the comments on draft report;
  - Facilitate the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
  - Identify information needs, define objectives & delimit the scope of the evaluation;
  - Provide input and participate in finalizing the evaluation ToR;
  - Facilitate the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
  - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products
  - Disseminate the results of the evaluation.
- 4. The MDG-F Secretariat** that will function as a **Quality Assurance Member** of the evaluation in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation.
- Review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.
- 5. The Evaluation Team** will conduct the evaluation study by:
- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the ToR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.

## 9. Evaluation Process: Timeline

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	When
Design	Establish the evaluation reference group	CE*	(By 5 Feb 2012)
Design	General final evaluation TOR adapted	ERG**	(By 10 Feb 2012)
Implementation	Procurement and hiring the evaluation team	EM***	(11 Feb-10 Mar 2012)
Implementation	Provide the evaluation team with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme	EM, ERG	7 days (11-17 Mar 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group	ET****	15 days (18 Mar-1 Apr 2012)
Implementation	Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days (2-11 Apr 2012)
Implementation	Agenda (field mission itinerary) drafted and agreed with evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days (12-21 Apr 2012)
Implementation	In country mission	ET, EM, CE, ERG	20 days (22 April -11 May 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of the draft report	ET	20 days (12-31 May 2012)
Implementation	Quality check of the evaluation draft evaluation report	CE, MDG-FS*****	5 days (1-5 Jun 2012)
Implementation	Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team	EM, CE, ERG	5 days (1-5 Jun 2012)
Implementation	Delivery of the final report	EM, CE, ERG, MDG-FS, ^NSC	10 days (6-15 Jun 2012)
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation	EM, CE, ERG, NSC	10 days (16-25 Jun 2012)

\*Commissioner of the evaluation (CE) \*\*Evaluation Reference group (ERG) \*\*\*Evaluation manager (EM)

\*\*\*\*Evaluation team (ET) \*\*\*\*\*MDG-F Secretariat (MDGF-S) ^National Steering Committee

## 10. Use and Utility of the Evaluation

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure to what extent development results were attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and the products goes far beyond what was said during the field visit by programme stakeholders or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc) it's the ideal opportunity to set an agenda on the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also excellent platforms to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scale up in the country as well as at international level.

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

## 11. Ethical Principles and Premises of the Evaluation

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

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDG-F. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

## 12. Annexes

### I. Outline of the inception report

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

### II. Outline of the draft and final evaluation reports

1. Cover Page
2. Executive Summary
3. Introduction
  - o Background, goal and methodological approach
  - o Purpose of the evaluation
  - o Methodologies used in the evaluation
  - o Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
4. Description of the development interventions carried out
  - o Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description & judgment on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
5. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)
6. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
7. Recommendations
8. Annexes

### III. Documents to be reviewed

#### 1. MDG-F Context

- o MDG-F Framework Document
- o Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- o General thematic indicators
- o M&E strategy
- o Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- o MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

#### 2. Joint Programme Documents

- o Joint Programme Document
- o Mission reports from the Secretariat
- o Quarterly reports
- o Biannual monitoring reports
- o Annual reports
- o Annual work plan
- o Financial information (MDTF)
- o Mid-term evaluation report

#### 3. Other in-country documents or information

- o Baseline survey report - 2009
- o Internal review report- Oct 2011
- o Demographic Health Survey Report-2010
- o National Development Plan 2002/Strategic Development Plan 2013-2030
- o UNDAF 2009-13