



TERMS OF REFERENCE

| | |
|---|--|
| Job title: | International consultant Democratic Governance Outcome Evaluation |
| Duty station: | Chisinau, Moldova |
| Reference to the project: | n/a |
| Contract type: | Individual Contract (IC) |
| Expected duration of the assignment: | 30 days within a 3 months assignment (10 in country, 20 home based) |
| Starting date: | End June, 2015 |

A. Brief National and Programme Context

Moldova declared its independence in 1991 with the European integration becoming a strategic priority 8 years after. Since its independence the country engaged into a multitude of reforms across all sectors, in parallel developing policies and legal and institutional frameworks aiming at achieving the Democratic Governance standards. The most important reform thought to contribute to the major transformation is the Central Public Administration Reform launched in 2005. It intended to improve transparency and accountability of the public administration, establish a modern civil service system and strengthen the public finance management. In 2012, the Decentralization Strategy aiming at consolidating the capacities of the local public administration authorities and at improving the management and the quality of public services provided to the citizens had been approved. The provisions of the Strategy have been correlated with the relevant policies documents, the Reform of the Central Public Administration, and other reforms representing an operational continuity of the actions of the National Development Strategy. In order to move towards a participative and inclusive process of policy development, the National Participation Council (NPC) representing the Civil Society organizations had been established. Representatives of the NPC participate in the Government meetings and are consulted on the policies developed. These developments had been noted at the global level, as the Republic of Moldova was among five winners of the 2013 UN Public Service Awards for the set of initiatives on increasing decisional transparency and fostering participation of civil society in this process.

The State Chancellery is the leading central public authority responsible for the implementation of the above reforms and for coordinating the policies developed by the Line Ministries. Within the Central Public Administration Reform process (CPAR) it provided methodological guidance in the elaboration of the Institutional Development plans by the Line Ministries and other central administration institutions which identified the needs and set the actions for strengthening the financial, human and institutional capacities of the central public administration bodies. However, the linkage between strategic planning and finance planning is still weak, while the ex-ante policy impact assessment piloted through the CPAR has not been legally enacted. The overall capacity of the public administration to develop, implement and monitor policies in a transparent and participative manner is not sufficient for achieving a steady progress in the reform process. The implementation of the Decentralization Strategy faced many delays, the territorial-administrative reform is postponed again for another four years, and the official approval of the next phase of PAR is pending.

Against this background United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) “Towards Unity in Action” and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2017 response is aimed at contributing to the establishment of a modernized public

administration system properly capacitated to effectively and efficiently develop, budget, implement and monitor evidence-based policies in support of the country's priorities and European integration objectives. Results achieved with the UNDP and UN Women's assistance will contribute to the achievement of UNPF/CPD Outcome 1 which refers to *increased transparency, accountability and efficiency of central and local public authorities*. The assistance is provided through UNDP programmes and projects, as well as through the joint projects implemented in cooperation with the UN Women with co-funding by Donor partners, such as EU and the Governments of Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Romania, and in collaboration with the national partners, such as the Parliament, the Central Elections Commission, the National Integrity Commission, State Chancellery, 15 other central Government institutions and the local authorities.

B. Purpose of the Evaluation

This mid-term evaluation exercise is commissioned according to the in the Republic of Moldova Evaluation Plan. The evaluation covers Outcome 1 of the UNPF/CPD 2013 – 2017. The evaluation will put the major focus on assessing the progress achieved within the Outcome 1 “Increased transparency, accountability and efficiency of central and local public authorities” and the impact produced so far under the area of intervention, as well as draw conclusions and recommendations for eventual adjustments, and, to extend possible, lessons learnt for further programming and implementation of programme. The evaluator shall also give importance to assessing efficiency and to a possible extent effectiveness of the UNPF/CPD Outcome 1, whether the size of resources, both financial and human, and partnership strategies continue to be cost-effective and may be applied in continuation and/or revised/changed.

The following Outputs falling under this Outcome, as stated in UNDP CPD 2013 – 2017, are to be part of this evaluation:

| CPD/UNPF Outcome | CPD/UNPF Outputs | UNDP and joint UNDP/UNW Programmes/Projects |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Increased transparency, accountability and efficiency of central and local public authorities</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i></p> <p>a. Confidence in public administration institutions <i>Baseline:</i> (May 2011): Government – 23%; Parliament – 19%; LPA – 47%;</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Government: 45%; Parliament: 40%; LPA:60%; Corruption Perception Index: Improvement of the Moldova index</p> <p>b. Hunter coefficient of vertical balance (the degree of fiscal dependency of local governments on resources transferred by central government)</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> Varies between 13% and 19% (2011)</p> <p><i>Target:</i> A Hunter Coefficient that is above 20% and not varying</p> <p>c. Public availability of equality data (disaggregated data on vulnerable groups)</p> | <p>1.1 - A modernized public administration system is capacitated to effectively and efficiently develop, budget, implement and monitor evidence-based policies in support of the country's national priorities and European integration objectives</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i></p> <p>a. Ex- ante policy analysis and results based management principles mandatory for public policy development, ensuring results oriented, rights based and gender response implementation and monitoring with clear linkages to program based budgeting</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (2011) The methodology for ex-ante policy analysis (including human rights and gender sensitive approach) is not a mandatory step for public policy development</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Ex-ante policy analysis, including human-rights based and gender responsive methodology, is mandatory for development, implementation and monitoring of all new public policies developed after 2013</p> <p>b. Public Expenditure Framework Assessment (PEFA) scoring on multi-year perspective in fiscal planning, expenditure policy and budgeting</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (2011) PEFA scoring B+</p> <p><i>Target:</i> PEFA scoring A</p> <p>c. EU-Moldova Association Agreement signed and implemented in line with the Action Plan</p> <p>EU-Moldova Association Agreement not signed</p> | <p>Building Institutional Capacity of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration (2012 – 2015)</p> <p>EU High Level Policy Advice Mission to the Republic of Moldova (2013 – 2015)</p> <p>Capacity Development of the National Integrity Commission of the Republic of Moldova's Office (2014 – 2015)</p> <p>Support to Parliamentary Development and Electoral Support in Moldova (2012 – 2015)</p> <p>Capacity Development of the Office of the President of the Republic of Moldova (2013 – 2014)</p> <p>Joint Integrated Local Development Programme/ Policy Framework Support for the Implementation of the Decentralization Strategy (2013-2015)</p> <p>Strengthening the National Statistical System (2012 – 2015)</p> |

United Nations Development Programme

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>to track progress towards MDGs and Moldova long-term development goals</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> Certain data available on gender and regional disparities but data missing on a number of key groups</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Improved data in key areas in particular on persons with disabilities, Roma, persons with stigmatized diseases, third country nationals and stateless persons</p> | <p><i>Target:</i> EU-Moldova Association Agreement signed and is being implemented in line with the Action Plan</p> <p>d. population census undertaken successfully, providing reliable and credible data for policy formulation</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> non-existent (last census in 2004)</p> <p><i>Target:</i> 2014 Population and Housing Census undertaken</p> <p>1.2 – The Parliament and the Central Electoral Commission are better able to exercise their functions including ensuring human rights and gender equality</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i></p> <p>a. Women representation in decision-making positions</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (2011) MPs: 22%; Members of the Government at Minister-level: 2 (10%)</p> <p><i>Target:</i> (2015) MPs: 30%; Members of the Government at Minister-level: 30%</p> <p>b. Public confidence in Parliament (sex-disaggregated)</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (spring 2012): – 25% confidence in Parliament (27% of men, 22% of women)</p> <p><i>Target:</i> (2017): 40% report confidence in Parliament (at least 40% of women)</p> <p>c. Human Rights and gender analysis of the draft laws in the Parliament</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> 0</p> <p><i>Target:</i> 100%</p> <p>d. ODIHR/OSCE overall assessment of the quality of the general elections</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> 2010 parliamentary election ‘met most standards’; 2011 local elections ‘largely met’ standards</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Steady improvement in meeting electoral standards as assessed by ODIHR’ (general elections 2014 and local elections 2015)</p> <p>1.3 – Local Public Authorities have increased capacity and resources to exercise their functions including in better planning, delivering and monitoring services in line with decentralization policies.</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i></p> <p>a. Increase in the share of local own revenues in the overall local budgets</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (2011) 10.6%</p> <p><i>Target:</i> 13%</p> <p>b. Degree of implementation of Decentralization Strategy Action Plan</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><i>Baseline:</i> Decentralization Strategy approved in 2012</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Decentralization Strategy Action Plan implemented in a timely manner at a rate of 70% of planned actions for the respective year</p> <p>c. Women representation in decision-making positions at the local level</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> (2011) Mayors -18%; Local councilors - 28,7%</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Mayors - 25%; Local councilors - 40%</p> | |
|--|--|--|

C. Objectives and scope of the Evaluation

This is a progress evaluation aiming to assess the extent to which programme and project activities implemented with partners during 2013 - 2014 have contributed to the progress under UNPF/CPD Outcome 1, as well as to achievement of the set of targets, whether existing partnership with partners proved to be successful and relevant and overall whether UNDP and relevant UN Women (further referred to as UNW) supported activities have contributed to strengthening transparency, accountability and efficiency of central and local public authorities in compliance with the country's EU integration agenda. The evaluation shall identify changes that happened during these two years as they relate to the development outcomes, the degree and level of these changes, i.e. enabling environment, organizational and/or individual levels. It shall also assess whether UN/DP's strategic positioning in this area can be improved.

The evaluator shall take into account and rank the following items:

- Status and degree of change in the Outcome, and factors influencing the Outcome
- Level of incurred changes: Enabling environment, Organizational and/or individual levels
- UN/DP's strategic positioning on achieving the Outcome
- Relevance of the Outcome and outputs
- Partnership strategy
- Sustainability: whether there is ownership and capacity to maintain and manage development in the Outcome

The International Consultant will work in a team with a national consultant that will provide necessary support, as per the TOR for the national consultant.

Main partners to be involved in the evaluation are: Parliament, CEC, State Chancellery, Line Ministries, NBS, Project Management Teams, NGOs and LPAs.

Worksheet on Outcome Evaluation: Categories of Analysis/Scope

| Category | Notes |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Progress to outcome realization | Review indicators to determine extent/degree of contribution in the outcome realization by assessing progresses made to-date vis-à-vis baseline. Focus on the how and why outputs and strategies contributed to achieving outcome. Focus on questions of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. |
| Factors affecting outcome | These are political, economic and social factors. As such, the evaluation scope shall be as broad as possible so as to take all factors into account |
| UN's contribution to outcome | Conduct quantitative and qualitative assessments of contributions from UNDP's own and joint interventions vis-a-vis outcome indicator baseline. Assessment should focus on determine the continued validity of the strategies applied to-date by UN/DP and so as to decide whether they should be revised and/or changed for the next programming cycle |
| Partnership strategy | Determine whether the best possible synergies have been established among partners and the steering role played by UN/DP within this context. Assess whether other stakeholders and/or sponsors should be |

United Nations Development Programme

| | |
|--|---|
| | included and/or excluded from the programme in continuation as well as referring to the next phase of CPD |
|--|---|

Specifically, the Outcome evaluation should address, but not limited to, the following **questions and issues**:

1. Outcome analysis

- Are the Outcome and associated projects/programmes relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and UN/DP's mandate?
- Where the actions to achieve the outputs and outcome effective and efficient?
- Where there multi-level interventions conducted (environment, organization, individual)? How many?
- Are the outputs and outcome leading to benefits beyond the life of the existing projects?
- Which findings may have relevance for eventual adjustments and/or future programming?
- Are the stated outcome, indicators and targets appropriate for the development situation in Moldova and UN/DP's programme of assistance in this field?
- What is the current status and prospects for achieving the outcome with the indicated inputs and within the indicated timeframe?
- What are the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UN/DP's interventions that affected or are affecting the achievement of the outcome? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards outcome?
- Were UN/DP's proposed contributions to the achievement of the outcome appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable?

2. Output analysis

- What are the key outputs that have been produced by UN/DP to contribute to the Outcome?
- Are the UN/DP outputs relevant to outcome?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the Outcome, or is there a need to improve these indicators?
- Is sufficient progress been made with regard to UN/DP outputs?

3. Resources, partnerships, and management analysis

- Was UN/DP's resource mobilization strategy in the field appropriate and effective in achieving the Outcome?
- Was UN/DP's partnership strategy in the field appropriate and effective in achieving the outcome?
- Are UN/DP's management structures and working methods appropriate and effective in achieving the Outcome/
- Overall, assess the scope, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of UN/DP's resource mobilization, partnership and management arrangements in achieving the Outcome.

4. Recommendations

- Based on the above analysis, recommendations should be provided as to how UN/DP should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures for an efficient and effective implementation of the current UNPF/CPD.

To the extent possible, answers to the above questions shall address the implications for women and men, their participation in design and implementation of the outcome and particular programmes and projects in the outcome area, whether the latter had addressed the issues of gender inclusion, equality and empowerment and contributed to strengthening the application of these principles to various development efforts in the country, and how gender issues had been mainstreamed across the outcome area by UN/DP. Evaluation shall also address the extent to which UN/DP had advocated for the principle of equality and inclusive development, and has contributed to empowering and addressing the needs of the disadvantaged and vulnerable population.

Evaluation methodology is provided in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results and the UNDP Guidance for Outcome Evaluators. Based on these guiding documents, and in consultation with the participating UN Agencies in Moldova, the evaluator should develop a suitable methodology for this Outcome evaluation.

During the Outcome evaluation, the evaluator is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- Desk review of relevant documents (project documents with amendments made, review reports – mid-term/final, donor specific, etc.);
- Discussions with the Senior management and programme staff of the participating UN Agencies;
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with the UN/DP and the Government, as well as with other donors and partners;
- Interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used); other donors, including European Commission, SIDA, SDC, ADA, WB, etc.
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions with project teams and project beneficiaries;
- Consultation meetings.

E. Deliverables

The key product expected is a comprehensive evaluation report that includes, but is not limited to the following components: (see UNDP Guidance for Outcome Evaluators for detailed information):

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the interventions
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and method
- Development context
- Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
- Recommendations and lessons learnt for the future (including viable project ideas and other recommendations)
- Annexes: TORs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The evaluator should provide a proposed report structure to participating UN Agencies prior to the start of fieldwork. The report should be prepared in English. It should take into account the opinion/voices of people from Moldova, government representatives, donors and NGOs. The evaluator will prepare a presentation of the preliminary findings to be discussed at a roundtable in Chisinau with participating UN Agencies and their partners. Consultation process, entirely or its parts, might be undertaken separately by participating UN Agencies.

An outline for the future UN/DP interventions in the respective area (if still deemed relevant) based on the recommendations of the mission is to be produced. The format of the outline will be agreed between participating UN Agencies and the evaluator prior to the start of the evaluation. The evaluator is required to discuss the full draft of the evaluation report prior to departure from Moldova. Both products shall be submitted in electronic form.

Evaluation ethics

The evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key information providers in the collection of data.

Dissemination mechanisms

The results shall be presented at a roundtable to all key stakeholders (representatives of Government, relevant Parliamentary Committees, projects and specialized NGOs) and shared through specialized local

United Nations Development Programme

and regional networks. The final evaluation report will be placed on the UN/DP website and distributed through regular Government channels to interested parties.

F. Requirements for experience and qualification

1. Academic Qualifications

- Advanced University degree in Public Administration, International development or related fields
- Trainings in project management and monitoring and evaluation is an advantage

2. Years of experience

- At least 7 years of work experience in the field of democratic governance, public administration, international development, including participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation
- At least 3 years of experience in conducting complex evaluations, especially in Democratic Governance field
- Working experience in Eastern Europe region and with international organizations

3. Competencies

- Good understanding of Democratic Governance issues, including gender and human rights aspects
- Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation)
- Proven knowledge of monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures of international financing agencies
- Familiarity with the political, economic and social situation in the Republic of Moldova
- Extensive research and analytical skills and report writing abilities
- Availability to work during the indicated /approved period
- Excellent communication skills
- Fluency in English. Knowledge of Romanian and/or Russian will be an asset

Timeframe

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and the length of the assignment will be discussed with the evaluator prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of the assignment is up to 30 working days within a three month period through June- September.

G. Implementation Arrangements

The International consultant will work in a team with a local consultant that will help with the analysis and research of the available relevant documentation, with setting up the meetings with the external actors and with the needed ad-hoc translations/ interpretation. To facilitate the Outcome evaluation process an Evaluation Focal Team (EFT) comprising of representatives of UNDP and UN Women will be set up. The EFT will assist in connecting the evaluation team with the senior management and key stakeholders. In addition, the EFT will assist in developing a detailed evaluation plan and conducting field visits. During the evaluation, EFT will help identify key partners for interviews. Otherwise, the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the Outcome evaluation.

Indicative Mission Schedule

| Activity | No of days | Place | Responsible party |
|--|------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan | 2 | On-line | EFT, Evaluation Team |
| Desk review | 4 | On-line | Evaluation Team |
| Interviews, consultation, 1st Draft Outline and presentation to the UN | 14 days | 10 days in Chisinau 4 days on-line | EFT, Evaluation Team |
| Preparation and submission of 1 st draft of the evaluation report | 3 days | On-line | Evaluation Team |

| | | | |
|--|--------|---------|-----------------|
| Feedback on draft report from partners and UN | 5 days | On-line | EFT |
| Finalization of evaluation report. Presentation to stakeholders | 2 days | On-line | Evaluation Team |

I. Financial arrangements:

Each candidate will be required to submit an aggregated financial offer (“aggregated financial offer” is the total sum of all financial claims of the candidate for accomplishment of the task), which includes proposed consultancy fee, travel costs, visa costs (if required), per diem (for accommodation, meals and local transport / communication). In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. The consultant will be provided with the necessary administrative and logistical support to enable them deliver on the expected outputs.

Payment will be disbursed in two installments upon submission and approval of deliverables and certification by the UNDP Programme Manager that the services have been satisfactorily performed.

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals:

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal: explaining why they are the most suitable for the work including past experience in similar evaluations (brief information on each of the required qualifications, item by item);
2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, per diems, travel costs, phone calls etc.);
3. Duly completed and signed P11 Form, and at least 3 contacts for references.

H. Documents for study by the evaluator:

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
2. UNDP Guidance for Outcome Evaluators
3. Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
4. UNDP Results-based management: Technical Note
5. Government of the Republic of Moldova Activity Programme (2015 – 2018)
6. National Development Strategy Moldova 2010
7. Development Partners’ Briefing Book for the Government of Moldova
8. Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports
9. UNDP Assessment of Development Results, 2012
10. United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) “Towards Unity in Action” (2013 – 2017)
11. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 - 2017