

## TOR FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF THE INTER-AGENCY PROGRAMME FOR THE PROMOTION OF GENDER AND ETHNIC-RACIAL EQUALITY

### 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 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 Millennium Development Goals 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<sup>1</sup> that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

### *The MDG-F M&E Strategy*

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OECD/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:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results;
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the MDG-F objectives<sup>2</sup>, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Paris Declaration and Delivering as one<sup>3</sup>, and;
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to replicate and scale up successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E Strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E 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,

---

<sup>1</sup> The thematic windows are: 1) Environment & Climate Change; 2) Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment; 3) Youth, Employment & Migration; 4) Democratic Economic Governance; 5) Children, Food Security & Nutrition; 6) Conflict Prevention & Peacebuilding; 7) Culture & Development; 8) Development & the Private Sector.

<sup>2</sup> They are: Supporting policies and programmes that promise significant and measurable impact on select MDGs; Financing the testing and/or scaling-up of successful models; Catalyzing innovations in development practice; And adopting mechanisms that improve the quality of aid as foreseen in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

<sup>3</sup> In this specific case is worth to call the attention to the fact that Brazil is not a signatory of the Paris Declaration, neither is one of the countries where the "Delivering as One" model has been implemented.

Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

### ***The Inter-Agency Programme for the Promotion of Gender and Ethnic-Racial Equality***

The Inter-Agency Programme for the Promotion of Gender and Ethnic-Racial Equality is an initiative of the MDG-F and the Brazilian United Nations Country Team's Thematic Group on Gender and Race linked with the MDG-F Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment thematic window.

The Programme aims to provide technical cooperation to the Brazilian Government, especially for the Secretariat of Policies for Women (SPM) and the Secretariat of Policies to Promote Racial Equality (SEPPIR), and to civil society organization working on the themes of gender, race and ethnicity.

The Programme's Management Committee (PMC) is composed by six UN Agencies<sup>4</sup>, the SPM and the SEPPIR. The Programme has been implementing a set of actions aimed at contributing toward bringing about changes in the current unequal status of women, especially indigenous and black, in Brazilian society. Conditions are favorable in Brazil to work with this approach. Brazil has a consolidated institutional framework, a pioneer work on implementing gender and race organisms within the government, and a strong commitment on the part of the current and previous Federal Administration to facing up to challenges of inequality and iniquities based on gender, and ethnic-racial variables.

Innovatively, the Programme aims to address issues relating to gender, ethnicity and race simultaneously, and to promote intersectionality of gender and ethnic-racial issues. This approach stems from the finding that the status of women in Brazil has been characterized by an apparently paradoxical double standard. On the one hand, there have been advances in terms of participation of women in society, in education, participation on the job market, etc (with the caveat that these start from a very low baseline). On the other hand, as evidenced by statistical data, significant gender and ethnic-racial inequalities persist, keeping women at a disadvantage in practically all walks of social life. Obstacles to the progress of black or indigenous women are even more formidable, owing to cumulative and interrelated effects of ethnicity, race and gender discrimination throughout the entire lifecycle.

The Programme has four interdependent proposed outcomes: (1) Enhancement of crosscutting themes of gender and race in policies, programmes, and public services; (2) Capacity building at the sub-national level, to strengthen and integrate actions aimed at promoting gender and racial equality; (3) Egalitarian, plural and multi-racial expansion of participation of women in decision making areas; and (4) Increased support from the media for promotion of gender and racial equality.

The Programme has six proposed outputs, each one of them related to one of the specific outcomes previously cited: 1.1) Methodology for monitoring and evaluation of the National Plan of Policies for Women (PNPM) and the National Plan of Policies for the Promotion of Racial Equality (PLANAPIR) prepared; 1.2) Managers trained to propose and operate policies, programs, and budgetary measures, in consonance with governmental policies for overcoming gender and race inequalities; 1.3) Provision of public services (at schools, health facilities, police precincts, reference centers, and shelters) that are responsive to the needs of women, adolescents and girls from groups that suffer discrimination or in situations of vulnerability; 2.1) The structure of existing sub-national bodies for policies for women and for promotion of racial equality strengthened; and the creation of new bodies encouraged; 3.1) Policies and commitments for strengthening and expanding participation of women in decision-making bodies developed by organizations and institutions; and 4.1) Communication strategy drafted and implemented, with a view to stimulating greater support from society for promotion of gender and racial equality.

---

<sup>4</sup> UN Women (leader agency), UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UN-HABITAT and ILO.

The proposed results and outputs are aligned with National Development Strategies as well as the MDG Fund goals. To achieve the proposed effects, the Programme works mainly with four strategic areas: capacity development, institutional strengthening, knowledge and evidence generation, advocacy and social mobilization. The Programme's coverage is national, most of the activities are located at Brasília (DF), where the two national counterparts of the Programme (SPM and SEPPIR) are located. There are, however, a set of activities developed at the local level, mainly on state's capitals or metropolitan regions.

The Programme main direct beneficiaries are the two national counterparts (SPM and SEPPIR), as well as several gender, race and ethnicity NGOs. Indirectly speaking, the overall beneficiary population are women, especially black women, and in a smaller scale women from ethnic background (indigenous, quilombolas, gypsies, etc).

The Programme implementation began on the second semester of 2009 and the end of the activities is expected to take place on June 2012. The Programme's team is composed by a Coordinator, an Assistant Coordinator, and a Communications Assistant, all of them located at UN Women, the Programme's leading agency. The Programme's budget of US\$ 4 million was distributed amongst the six participants UN Agencies accordingly to the agencies work plan and the proposal presented at the Programme's PRODOC.

The UN's Resident Coordinator Office (RCO), as the commissioner of the Programme's evaluation is seeking high-qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation of this joint programme, including analyzing the Programme's programmatic, administrative and governance aspects.

## 1. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the 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 Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals 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 proposed outputs and contributed to attained developmental outcomes on medium to long term 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 and international level (replicability and scaling up).

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.

## 2. 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 of four months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is 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.

### 3. 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 Millennium Development Goals.**
  - a) Did the programme designed intervention strategy was align with national priorities, policies and plans?
    1. The resulting PRODOC was jointly produced? It had robust internal and external logic frameworks in terms of the proposed activities, outputs, results and the development problems it originally targeted?
    2. How did the government participate in developing the PRODOC and in the negotiation that resulted in the programme implementation? How the UN agencies participated in this process?
  - b) How much and in what ways did the joint programme design had the potential to contribute to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
    1. Was the programme proposed scale able to optimize inputs, activities and results?
    2. Are there any flaws in design that could jeopardize the programme implementation and contributions towards planned results?
  - c) To what extent this programme was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (see MDG-F joint programme guidelines.)
    1. To what extent and how national counterparts were jointly involved in the implementation and M&E process?
    2. Are there any flaws in design that could jeopardize the realization of joint activities?
    3. How the joint programming principle was contemplated during the programme design?

- d) To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
  - 1. In this specific case what are the comparative advantages of joint programming?
  - 2. In this specific case what are the main obstacles and bottlenecks of joint programming?
- e) 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?
  - 1. How the added value of joint programming can be considered distinct of the added value of traditional technical cooperation programs and activities?
  - 2. Was the added value to solve development challenges contemplated on the PRODOC? How?
- f) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
  - 1. Are there any flaws in the M&E system design that could jeopardize the realization of joint M&E activities? Was the M&E strategy design contemplated at the programme's PRODOC?
- g) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?
  - 1. Are there any flaws in the C&A strategy design that could jeopardize the realization of joint C&A activities? Was the C&A strategy design contemplated at the programme's PRODOC?
- h) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed?
- i) Are there revisions on the Programme's PRODOC? If so, why these revisions were necessary?
- j) What can be learned from the designing and revision process that could facilitate the replication of similar initiatives in other settings?

#### Process level

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

- a) 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?
  - 1. What are the fast tracks and bottlenecks in terms of joint programming management model?
  - 2. Are there any comparative managerial advantages or obstacles to joint programming?
- b) 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?
  - 1. If so, or not, why that happened?
- c) 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?
  - 1. Did the governance model stimulate the sustainability of achieved results?
  - 2. Did these governance structures implemented as suggested by the PRODOC? Why?

- d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
  - 1. What are the bottlenecks and fast tracks of joint programming in terms of its internal and external processes?
- e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
  - 1. What can be learned from the joint programming work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices that could facilitate the replication of similar initiatives in other settings?
- f) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
  - 1. What can be learned from the joint programming work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices that could facilitate the replication of similar initiatives in other settings?
- g) 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?

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

- a) 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?
  - 1. How does this analysis fits on the specific Brazilian context and the characteristics of the joint programme?
  - 2. What are the causes of the identified pattern of participation?
- b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?
  - 1. What was the role of ownership, or the lack of it, in guaranteeing the sustainability of the results to which the joint programme has made contributions?

**Results level**

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

- a) To what extent did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document?
  - 1. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
  - 2. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals set in the thematic window?
  - 3. 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?

4. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?
  5. What are the driven causes for the attainment, or not, of the contribution on expected results?
  6. Are there any identifiable indirect or unexpected results that were not foreseen on the joint programming design?
- b) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
1. How do these synergistic and coherent outputs and outcomes are distinct from synergistic and coherent outputs and outcomes produced through a single agency's intervention?
- c) To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted citizens life? To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted institutions development?
- d) Have any good practices, success stories, main failures, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
1. How these practices were identified?
  2. What kind of methodology or criteria the programme used in this process?
- e) What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?
- f) 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)
- g) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

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

- a) 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:

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

#### 4. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, mid-term evaluations and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. 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 evaluator 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.

#### 5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

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

I) **Inception Report** (to be submitted within 15 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluator)

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 Annex 1 and it will be discussed on the evaluation reference group.

II) **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 draft final report will be shared with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

III) **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 established in Annex 2 and it will be validated by all stakeholders involved in the evaluator exercise.

## 6. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

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

### 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 evaluator 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 evaluator

### 2. The **programme coordinator** as **evaluation manager** will have the following functions:

- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR
- Execute the selection and recruitment of the evaluator accordingly to necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluator
- Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group
- Provide the evaluator with administrative support and required data
- Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation
- Connect the evaluator 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 and validation group**, this group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint programme

- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards.
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference
- Facilitating 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

- Disseminating 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 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 evaluator** 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

## 7. EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	When
Design	Establish the evaluation reference group	CE*	4 months before the end of the programme.
Design	General final evaluation TOR adapted	ERG**	4 months before the end of the programme
Implementation	Procurement and hiring the evaluator	EM***	3 months before the end of the programme
Implementation	Provide the evaluator with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme	EM, ERG	7 days
Implementation	Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group	ET****	15 days
Implementation	Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team. Agenda drafted and agreed with evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days
Implementation	In country mission	ET, EM, CE, ERG	20 days
Implementation	Delivery of the draft report	ET	20 days
Implementation	Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team. Fact-checking revision by MDG-FS, to be done at the same time as the ERG (5 business days)	EM, CE, ERG - MDG-FS*****	15 days
Implementation	Delivery of the final report	EM, CE, ERG, MDG-FS, ^NSC	10 days
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation	EM, CE, ERG, NSC	10 days

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

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

## 8. 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.

## 9. 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 (UNEG).

- **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 MDGF. 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.

## 10. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT/TEAM OF CONSULTANTS

- **Academic:**
  - ✓ Postgraduate degree in economics, social sciences, development studies or equivalent;
  - ✓ Familiarity with basic evaluation standards and principles;
  - ✓ Familiarity with academic discussion related to program's attribution/contribution in terms of results.
  - ✓ Familiarity with results-based management concepts and the logical framework approach;
  - ✓ Knowledge of communication strategies and techniques;
  - ✓ Knowledge of academic concepts and main discussions related to gender and ethnic-racial issues.
- ✓ **PLUS**
  - Academic knowledge of demographics, or statistics, or econometrics.
  - Postgraduate degree on M&E.
  - Postgraduate degree on Gender or Race.
- **Experience:**
  - ✓ 1-5 years work experience in the development sector, preferably with the United Nations;
  - ✓ Experience in working on M&E issues;
  - ✓ Excellent proven drafting skills in Portuguese.
  - ✓ Working knowledge of Spanish and English languages.
  - ✓ 1-5 years work experience with applied research.
- ✓ **PLUS**
  - 1-2 years work experience on the implementation of gender or race or ethnicity policies or programs.
  - 1-2 years work experience on the monitoring and evaluation of gender or race or ethnicity policies or programs.

## **11. 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 (include also Glossary page)
3. Introduction
  - Background, goal and methodological approach
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Methodologies used in the evaluation
  - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
4. Description of the development interventions carried out
  - Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement 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**

#### **MDG-F Context**

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy

- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

**Specific Joint Programme Documents**

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)

**Other in-country documents or information**

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One