**INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE UN ‘DELIVERING AS ONE’ (DAO) PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY IN THE FOCUS STATES IN NIGERIA**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR) CONCEPT NOTE**

# INTRODUCTION

The Mid-Term Review of United Nations Development Assistance ‘UNDAF’ I (2002-2007) conducted in 2005 recommended that the UN in Nigeria institutionalizes a streamlined and effective machinery for common programme development and implementation, among other issues.

To foster collective work and apply the principle of collective responsibility, the strategic vision of UNDAF II (2009 – 2012) incorporated the lessons learnt from the global experience on the programmatic approach on 'Delivering as One' (DaO) to highlight the work undertaken as 'One UN' in selected focus States. The DaO programme implementation modality is an integrated package of clear and internally consistent guidance on programming, leadership, business operations, funding and communications for development operations that recognizes UN agencies' mandates, rules, and procedures. It is implemented in partnership with the government and other implementing partners, and it is anticipated to help avoid duplication, enhance coordination and synergy, mobilize resources effectively, and multiply the impact of UNDAF/UNSDPF programmes and projects results, as a contribution to the attainment of the development aspirations of the States, and by extension, Nigeria. It emphasizes the comparative advantages of the UN in policy, technical advice, capacity development and intermediation between partners to address pressing social, political, economic and humanitarian issues, as well as the commitment of the States to support the activities in the workplan to help achieve the outcomes and outputs set out in the UNDAF/UNSDPF.

The focus States are typically selected by the UN Country Team (UNCT) from States with the programmatic presence of two or more UN agencies, and usually include at least one state in each geopolitical zone, plus FCT. The DaO programmme implementation modality at the focus States has continued across subsequent UNDAF/Ps to further consolidate on the gains of delivering as One UN, improve coordination, coherence and ensure more efficient use of available resources.

Characteristically, DaO programme implementation modality should have a clear exit strategy that also ensures the sustainability of the changes brought about by the programmes in the DaO focus States. Thus, the focus states are typically replaced after an UNDAF/P cycle to accommodate other states or repeated for specific reasons. As shown in Table 1, Lagos and FCT have been selected as DaO focus states consistently for three UNDAF/P cycles for their strategic and economic peculiarities. Benue and Cross River States have also been repeated twice as DaO focus states to consolidate on the progress made in their initial cycles. The geographic focus/spread of the DaO focus States, and the respective lead UN agencies from UNDAF II (2009-2012) to the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF, 2018 - 2022) is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: DaO states from UNDAF II to date, the geographic focus, and the Lead UN Agencies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS** | **UNDAF II (2009 – 2012)** | | **UNDAF III (2014 – 2017)** | | **UNSDPF (2018-2022)** | |
| **STATE** | **LEAD UN AGENCY** | **STATE** | **LEAD UN AGENCY** | **STATE** | **LEAD UN AGENCY** |
| SOUTH-SOUTH | AKWA IBOM\* | UNDP | CROSS RIVER | UNFPA | CROSS RIVER | UNFPA |
| CROSS RIVER | UNICEF |
| SOUTH-EAST | IMO | UNIDO | ANAMBRA | UNICEF | **NIL** | **NIL** |
| SOUTH-WEST | LAGOS | WHO | LAGOS | UNIDO | LAGOS | UNIDO |
| OYO | UNIDO |
| EKITI | UNDP |
| NORTH-WEST | KADUNA | UNFPA | ZAMFARA\*\* | N/A | SOKOTO | UNICEF |
| NORTH-EAST | ADAMAWA | UNFPA | BORNO | UNICEF | BAUCHI | WHO |
| GOMBE\*\* | N/A |
| TARABA\*\* | N/A |
| NORTH-CENTRAL | BENUE | UNICEF | BENUE | UNICEF | **NIL** | **NIL** |
| NIGER | UNDP |
| KOGI | UNIDO |
| FCT | FCT | FAO | FCT | FAO | FCT | FAO |

\* Akwa Ibom was initially selected. Challenges prevented it from taking off. It was replaced with Cross River in same cycle.

\*\*Zamfara, Gombe and Taraba did not take off.

# RATIONALE/CONTEXT

The standard operating procedure (SOP) of the DaO programme implementation modality comprises of a **common budgetary framework** that covers all planned and costed programme activities**, one programme** reflectedthrough joint workplans and **one leader** for coordination. It **operates as one** for cost-effectiveness, **communicates as one** for coherence and optionally, uses **one fund.** It utilizes joint programmes as one of the modalities for working together. The programmes are delivered as a set of activities contained in a joint work plan that is established between two or more UN agencies and government partner(s) that are working towards common strategic results aligned with national priorities as reflected in the UNDAF/P. The work plan details the roles and responsibilities of partners in coordinating and managing the joint activities based on the comparative advantages of each partner, including the targeted recipients to ensure sufficient geographic coverage. It can also include civil society organizations and the private sector as implementing partners, depending on the rules of participating UN agencies. The programmes in the work plan can be financed directly by UN agencies or donors as **stand-alone** funding, financed through a **multi-donor trust fund**, or **co-funded by governments**, and the funding can be managed using **parallel**, **pooled** or **pass-through** fund management modalities. Other bilateral arrangements can also be considered for peculiar circumstances.

In terms of structure, the DaO implementation modality in the focus states in Nigeria follows the SOP, has one leader (lead agency), communicates as one and operates as one using implementation strategies like joint workplans, joint reviews, the DaO results reporting and evaluations. A UN agency serves as the lead agency in the state to coordinate the development of an Annual Work Plan (AWP) between UN agencies with a programmatic presence in the focus state and corresponding MDAs to define the modes of working together in partnership to deliver as one UN. This includes managing the project cycle, resource allocation and mobilization within a common Strategic Programme Framework (SPF) and the associated Strategic Fund (SF). Agencies can operate outside these focal DaO states, either individually or collaboratively, while staying within the programmatic parameters of the UNDAF/P.

The DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states was underscored in the just concluded UNSDPF evaluation as a good example of working together. The UNSDPF evaluation covered the period of 2018 – 2021 and assessed the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the UNSDPF, the management and coordination mechanisms to support the achievement of national development priorities and reviewed the status of UNSDPF budget. The uses of the evaluation findings are for accountability of the performance of the UNCT to the commitments made in the UNSDPF, to generate lessons and good practices, to inform the design of the next strategy and programmatic implementations, and support evidence-based decision-making. The report emphasized that “the Dao approach has helped to ensure the coherence of UNSDPF interventions, by bringing together UN entities as well as through broad-based partnerships with governments and civil society at state levels”. The evaluation report recommended that the UNCT commissions an evaluation of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states to “look at the continuum from planning to coordination and implementation phases as well as that of the reporting phase”. This document presents the ToR for evaluating the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states to highlight the successes as well as the shortfalls, to maximize the delivery as one UN and address the development aspirations of the state, as well as Nigeria.

# PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF WORK

1. **PURPOSE:** The Aim of United Nations to undertake the independent evaluation of DAO is to demonstrate the Quality and Value or the Merit of ONE UN/Delivery As One in targeted  states in making differences for states institutions, communities, families and children & women for the purpose of: i) Learning of successful innovative approaches to improve future operational joint UN program delivery and to influence States and National Policies and ii) for the Purpose of Accountability to Communities, States, Govt and Development Partners.
2. **OBJECTIVES:**
3. To assess the status and relevance of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus States, with an emphasis on how it addressed the strategic vision of the UNDAF/P, as well as the development aspirations of the states and Nigeria.
4. To evaluate the effectiveness of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus States in achieving expected results (outcomes and outputs) committed within the results frameworksof the joint annual work plans, and how they contribute to the outputs and outcomes of the UNDAF/P, including meeting the expectations of men, women, boys and girls and other vulnerable groups including people with disabilities (PWDs).
5. To assess the Value For Money – the efficiency of the budgeting and funding of the DaO States (financial and human resources including time and in-kind support), in relation to the envelope of the participating UN agencies, including its cost-effectiveness stemming from the complementary role of the UN, government and partners.
6. Provide an independent appraisal of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus States within the scope of work to highlight the coherence of the coordination and partnership mechanisms employed to deliver as one UN, against initial UN commitments and expected results as agreed within the DaO work plans and the outcomes (and outputs) of the UNDAF/P including joint UN Humanitarian Actions.
7. To evaluate and document the contribution of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus States to UN reform and its significant contribution to addressing the development aspirations of the states, and consequently, Nigeria;
8. To identify key success factors, good practices, innovative approaches and setbacks to draw lessons;
9. Propose strategic recommendations for evidence-based programing to support future DaO programme design, implementations and/or expansion to other states.
10. **SCOPE OF DAO EVALUATION:**

UN agencies have agreed on following three priorities thematic areas of major competencies of joint field work of UN to be considered (WHAT to Evaluate) for which sound evidence for learning/knowledge and accountability will be generated through this independent evaluation of DAO:

* 1. Comparative Advantage of Coordination, Joint Work Planning and effectiveness of UN DAO Pillars of One Leader, One Office, One Program, One Budget/Resources Mobilization, One Voice/Communication, systems strengthening and will consider the UN reform efforts for improving the DaO implementation.
  2. Effectiveness (Performance Evaluation) of UN Agencies Convergences, Joint UN multi sectors integrated interventions for Social Basic Services Delivery at community level;
  3. UN effectiveness in Humanitarian Actions for life saving, and protection.

The evaluation will however not assess any individual programme or activities of specific UN agencies but on the programmes in the annual joint workplan for the DaO states. Nevertheless, the evaluation may build on the available findings from programme and project evaluations conducted by individual agencies and the collective evaluation of the UNDAF/P in the UNCT.

1. **THEORY OF CHANGES AND RESULTS MATRIX**

The Overall Theory of Changes and the Results Matrix of the United Nations Sustainable Development Coperation Framework (UNSDCF 2018-2021) including Results Chain Indicators of Impacts, Outcomes and Outputs will be considered for this DAO Evaluation at State Level.

**GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF DAO EVALUATION:**

The evaluation will cover the implementation of the DaO modality in **six (6)** selected states; the five focus States in the UNSDPF (2018 – 2021) and one former DaO state in UNDAF III (2014 – 2017). That is, the evaluation would cover Lagos, Sokoto, Bauchi, Cross River and FCT from the UNSDPF and Anambra State from UNDAF III. This ensures effective geographic spread as it includes one state per geopolitical zone. It also includes a State that was formerly a DaO focus state in the previous UNDAF III but was dropped in the UNSDPF to enable the evaluation team to make valuable comparisons and draw insightful lessons on sustainability and impact, as well as highlight how the State has fared following the exit of the DaO programme implementation modality.

# EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

**4.1.DAO Evaluation Criteria**

This independent objective evaluation of DAO in Nigeria will be conducted based on six (6) universal evaluation Criteria of OECD/DAC plus 2 country specific adopted criteria defined by UN agencies:

* The six OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria are: i) Relevance, ii) Coherence, iii) Effectiveness, iv) Efficiency, v) Impact, and vi) Sustainability.
* Two following additional Evaluation Criteria derived from SDGs Principles and Joint UN Programming Principles are considered: vii) Resilience (resistance to chocks) and viii) Equity/Gender Equality/Leave No One Behind.

These 8 evaluation criteria will be used to assess systematically the three (3) main thematic Scope of the DAO evaluation indicated the DaO pillars in Nigeria including:

* One Programme: progress made in establishing and implementing joint programming and a single, common programme instead of a collection of individual agency-specific programmes.
* One Fund/Budget: the extent to which the administrative systems in place have been able to achieve a common financial management system
* One Leader: the extent to which the Resident Coordination office has enabled a more coherent UN approach to address national development challenges
* Operates as One/One Office: the extent to what common support services and shared business units have increased efficiency
* Communicates as One/One voice: the extent to what one communication strategy has supported a more effective role and contribution of the UN system in Nigeria.

**4.2.DAO Evaluations Questions**

The suggested evaluation questions and sub-questions are categorised as follows:

1. **RELEVANCE: Is the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states doing the right things?**

The relevance of DaO programme implementation modality in addressing the outputs and outcomes in the joint workplan, the UNDAF/P, the development aspirations of the state and Nigeria, as well as global goals (SDGs, Common agenda). Assesses any change in context to ascertain the extent to which the DaO programme implementation can be adapted to sustain or improve its relevance.

1. How relevant are the programmes, projects and activities implemented in the joint DaO annual workplans to addressing the strategic priorities of the UNADF/P and consistent with the development aspirations of the state and Nigeria?
   * Are the outputs and outcomes of the JWP consistent with the strategic priorities of the UNDAF/P and the attainment of its strategic priorities?
   * Did the design, implementation and adaptation of the programmes consider contextual factors (economic, environmental, equity, social, political economy, and capacity conditions) specific to each of the programme sites?
   * To what extent are the programmes, projects and activities in the DaO state JWP relevant to the most vulnerable or adapted to fully meet the needs of different groups, particularly women, girls and people with disability?
2. **COHERENCE: How well did the DaO programme implementation fit in the focus states?**

The compatibility and coherence of the programmes and activities in the DaO joint workplans with those of the UNDAF/P.

1. The extent to which other interventions support or undermine the DaO implementation in the focus states. The comparative advantage of the collaboration between the UN, government and implementing partners in the DaO focus states over in terms of results delivery, harmonisation and coordination, and value-added while avoiding duplication of efforts.
2. To what extent are the programmes and activities in the JWP of the DaO states accelerating the achievements of the strategic vision and priority areas of UNDAF/P, ensuring gender and disability inclusion, including the most vulnerable in all aspects, leaving one behind?

* What are the comparative strengths of DaO state implementation in comparison to other joint workplans/programmes in non-DaO states?
* What are the comparative strengths of the coordination, partnerships and convening roles of the DaO modality in the states? To what extent did the DaO modality in the states contribute to enhancing UNCT coherence?

1. **EFFECTIVENESS: Is the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states achieving its objectives?**

The effectiveness of the DaO programmatic implementation modality in achieving its expected results (Outputs and Outcomes), including any unintended and differential results across the participating agencies. The extent to which the objectives of the DaO programmatic implementation in the focus states were achieved or are expected to be achieved:

1. To what extent were the objectives(expected results from Results Frameworks or Joint Annual Workplans) of the DaO programmatic implementation in the focus states achieved?

* To what extent has the DaO programmatic implementation in the focus states contributed to accelerating coordination, partnerships, and collective working together as one UN?
  + What are the key success factors influencing the achievement of its objectives as well as the challenges causing the non-achievement of the DaO objectives?
  + To what extend did the DaO modality achieve its set outputs and outcomes in the implementation states, including meeting the expectations of the men, women, boys, and girls and people with specific needs (e.g., older people, people living with disabilities or other vulnerabilities)?
  + Were there any innovations or unintended (negative or positive) consequences that arose because of the DaO programmatic implementation in the focus states?

1. Are the current selection criteria for the focus states adequate? Does it ensure sufficient coverage/ geographic spread and trigger transformative change via the focus states to Nigeria?
2. **EFFICIENCY: How well are resources being used?**

The extent at which the intervention delivers or is likely to deliver results in an economic and timely manner.The economic conversion of the inputs into outputs, outcomes, and impacts. The efficiency of DaO outputs – both qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs provided:

1. How efficiently have the inputs to the DaO states been managed, given the human and financial resources available? What are the costs (including funds, expertise, natural resources, time and in-kind support), as well as the DaO focus state’s efficiency in reducing transaction costs?

* Have the DaO focus states been managed in an effective and efficient way, in terms of partnerships, human and financial resources compared to other alternatives?
* How have envelopes of participating UN agencies affected the overall budgeting process the DaO focus states and their ability to respond to emerging issues?
* Is the current organisational set-up, collaboration and contribution of concerned ministries and other partners working effectively to ensure accountability and operational efficiency? Have the State counterpart contributions been released in a timely manner and is it adequate to support implementation priorities?
* To what extent has the DaO modality led to improved efficiency of operational initiatives for development in the country and in the states?
* To what extent did key stakeholders in the DaO play their expected roles and provide complementary resources as required to develop the JWP and deliver on its implementation?

1. How efficiently has the DaO programmatic implementation in the focus states adapted the DaO pillars; one programme, one budget, one leader one voice and optionally one office?
   * To what extent are the lead agencies in the focus states exercising authority, responsibility and accountability to ensure coherence and efficiency gains from the harmonization of programmes, communication, fund and services? What further actions are needed, if any?
2. **IMPACT: What difference does the intervention make?**

The extent to which the implementation of the DaO focus states have generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative impact, intended or unintended. To what extent has the DaO states contributed to catalytic or transformational institutional and social changes in line with the strategic vision of the UNDAF/UNSDPF, the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement. To what extent do the expected Impacts Indicators of the DaO have been achieved in the focus States and impacted positively or negatively on vulnerable population including women and girls, and people living with disabilities in the view of Healthy Life, Learning outcomes and changes in socio-economic status, reduction of harmful practices against women, HIV/AIDS, etc. ?

1. To what extent has the DaO states contributed specifically to fast-tracking the UN’s commitments to catalytic and transformative change, national priorities and broader Impacts and outcomes across the SDGs, the 2030 agenda and the Paris Agreement? Accelerating the SDGs, change in the SDGs
2. To what extent has the DaO states contributed to ensuring more meaningful and measurable involvement of civil society and vulnerable populations, especially women and girls, as well as people living with disabilities in line with LNOB principle?
3. **SUSTAINABILITY: Will the benefits last?**

The extent to which the benefits of the implementation of DaO states continue or is likely to continue. An assessment of the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional capacities of the DaO states to sustain net benefits over specified time, medium and long term. Analyses the resilience of the capacities, coordination and implementation systems of the DaO states, as well as the risks and potential trade-offs underlying the continuation of the benefits.

1. To what extent has the DaO states enhanced long-term buy-in, leadership and ownership of development programmes by Government and other relevant stakeholders?
2. Is the state government leading and working closely with the UN to implement the DaO programmes in the focus states? To what extent has the state government funded DaO activities in the states and the likelihood of post DaO implementation continuity in the state?
   * To what extent has the one programme been integrated into government systems to ensure ownership and sustainability of capacities developed/strengthened or results achieved?
   * What are the lessons learned from the implementation of DaO states over the years?
   * To what extent are the benefits of the DaO states, especially those fostering positive change towards the SDGs likely to continue? How likely will the results and positive benefits be sustained beyond the DaO states through Government action and action from other stakeholders?
   * In what ways should the future DaO state implementation be revised or modified to improve sustainability?
3. **RESILIENCE: Did Joint UN DaO field operational programing demonstrated capability to resist and overcome chock and threat and provide adequate timely humanitarian responses to emergency situation?**
4. To what extent was the Joint UN Delivery As One in the focus states was able to enhance the continuation of service provision and access, despite the internal and external shocks ( COVID-19 pandemic, Conflicts, etc.)?
5. To what extent Joint UN DAO in the focus states responded effectively to Emergency situations, risks and threats?
6. **EQUITY, GENDER EQUALITY AND LEAVE NO ONE BEHIND: Did Joint UN DAO field operational programing demonstrated capability to resist and overcome chock and threat and provide adequate timely humanitarian responses to emergency?**
7. To what extent did the Joint UN DAO at state level has demonstrated evidence of results in addressing inequalities and promoting gender equality to ensure the universal global agenda of Leave No One Behind?

# EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEG norms and standards and on the basis of OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines, to ensure full compliance with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

A detailed Methodological Inception Report will be developed by the contracted Consultant Team including adequate Quasi Experiment Design (State Comparison Group), adequate Sampling and methods of data collection and analysis to generate sound evidence related to the Evaluation Criteria of IMPACT (including the appropriate statistical measurement of Difference in Difference of key priorities Social Impact indicators or PSM calculation) following participatory discussions during the inception phase.

The evaluation process will commence with athe careful selection of an evaluation team with the right skills and experience. The evaluation will commence with the careful selection of an evaluation team with the right skills and experience. The conceptual framework will be based on three overarching questions from the ‘right things, right ways, right results’ framework to comprehensively address the objectives and formulate the recommendations. The questions are:

1. Is the DaO modality at the focus states covering the ‘right things’?
2. Is the DaO modality at the focus states doing things in the ‘right ways’?
3. Is the DaO at the focus states delivering the ‘right results’?

Proposals submitted by prospective consultants should outline a strong mix of methodological approaches for data collection and analysis, highlighting the role of each approach to addressing individual evaluation questions and how the various forms of evidence will be employed to ensure validity and reliability of findings and conclusions in alignment with the following:

**A. SAMPLE SELECTION**

The evaluation will adopt the non-probability purposive sampling method to identify and define the sample size, locations, and sample population, including the stakeholders for key informant interviews and focus group discussions. The sample selection criteria, the process and the final stakeholder mapping will be detailed in the inception report, including any potential bias and limitations. The sampling should ensure that the selection adequately reflects the diversity of stakeholders of the DaO states and pay special cognizance to the inclusion, participation, and non-discrimination of the most vulnerable stakeholders especially women, girls and people living with disability. Failing to do so may affect the credibility and technical adequacy of the information gathered.

To ensure credible comparison, one state that is not a part of the current DaO programme implementation modality in the current UNSDPF but have similar characteristics and context to the focus states would be sampled as a control group. A former DaO focus state from UNDAF III was selected as the control group to provide insights on sustainability and impact. The selected sample states, the DaO focus states in the UNSDPF/experimental group as well as the control group would be assessed using pre-defined parameters that would be defined in the inception phase.

**B. DATA COLLECTION**

The evaluation will adopt a mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches to allow for the triangulation of a range of sources to produce comprehensive and evidence-based findings. The data sources will include literature review, statistics at state, national and local levels, review of surveys and monitoring data, semi-structured and structured key-informant interviews, direct observation, focus group discussions and workshops. The data collection methodologies shall be assessed based on their relevance to the evaluation questions and objectives, as well as the appropriateness in engaging with key stakeholders.

**C. QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The data collected should be subjected to rigorous quality assurance to ensure the validity of the results and preserve data integrity during the data collection process using a variety of tools including triangulation of information sources.

**D. EVALUATION MATRIX**

The evaluation team will use the template of the evaluation matrix provided by the evaluation management team/evaluation steering committee (ESC) derived from the UNSDCF 2018-2022 Results Matrix and joint Annual Work Plans to systematically structure and consolidate the data collected for each of the evaluation questions and to provide sound evidence to measure changes that happened around Indicators of Impact, Outcomes and Outputs when comparing Base Line Data with Expected Target and the Current status of statistics.

This Evaluation Matrix will allow them, among other things, to identify the missing data and fill the gaps before the end of the collection. This matrix will also help to ensure the validity of the data collected.

**E. PARTICIPATION AND INCLUSION**

This evaluation should be conducted using a participatory and inclusive approach, involving a wide range of partners and stakeholders, including vulnerable population to LNOB.

**F. FINALIZATION OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

The evaluation team will finalize the evaluation questions after consultations with the *ESC.* The final evaluation questions should be a reasonable number, not exceeding 10, reflecting the evaluation criteria and the preliminary evaluation questions listed in this ToR.

# EVALUATION PROCESSES

**A. PREPARATION PHASE**

The ToR developed by the RCO for the evaluation will be shared with the PMT for review andapproval. The quality assurance of theToR will be provided by the M & E working group that serves as the ESC and Evaluation Reference Group. The ESC and RCO will oversee the implementation of the evaluation, including the logistics. See Table 2 for details*.* The team will collate all necessary documents and stakeholders’s list to share with the evaluation team. Once the ToR is approved by the PMT, it will be used for the recruitment of the evaluation team.

**B. DESIGN PHASE**

The evaluation team recruited in the preparatory phase will conduct the evaluation. The activities in the design phase include:

1. Preliminary desk review: The evaluation team will conduct a desk review of the DaO programme implementation modality in the focus states from documentation provided by the ESC. The ToR will include the Bibliography. The evaluation team will also be encouraged to search for information from other available sources to produce a comprehensive desk review.
2. Consultations with agencies in the DaO states and Evaluation Steering Committee: The consultants will discuss with UN agencies in the DaO states and the ESC to

* understand the peculiarities of the evaluation questions and refine them.
* understand relevant contextual factors and fine-tune the methodology accordingly.

1. Preparation of the inception report: The evaluation team will be required to submit an inception report based on an agreed template, and in line with UNEG Norms and Standards. The report will include a methodological note, the evaluation matrix, a stakeholder mapping of key informants and an outline of the data collection protocols. The report will be subjected to quality assurance by the UN M&E group, ESC, and an ethical review. This is to ensure it is robust enough to generate sound evidence to answer the evaluation questions and address objectives. The approval of the inception report will mark the completion of the inception phase.

**C.** [**FIELD PHASE**](#_Toc38364466)

Upon completing the inception phase, the evaluation team will proceed to the selected DaO states to collect qualitative and quantitative data from key stakeholders, implementing partners, government, and beneficiaries. The field phase will also include the verification of information from secondary sources. The analysis and presentation of findings would cover issues relating to gender equality, women empowerment, diversity inclusion and non-discrimination, human rights, and environmental sustainability.At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will present its observations and preliminary evaluation findings to the ESC, as well as the PMT and the UNCT.

**D.** [**REPORTING PHASE**](#_Toc38364467)

The evaluation team will produce a draft report after the completion of the data collection and analysis phases and submit the report to the ESC and PMT via the RCO. The ESC and the PMT (UNCT) would provide comments and observations which will be addressed by the team when preparing the final evaluation report. The final evaluation report is expected to be between 40-60 pages excluding the annexes.

**E.** [**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE (DISSEMINATION AND USE) PHASE**](#_Toc38364468)

On receipt of the final evaluation report the PMT (UNCT) will review and provide the management response to the final evaluation report and determine the actions to be taken to address and operationalize the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

# EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

**A. INCEPTION REPORT**

This document should present the plans and methods the evaluation team would employ to conduct the evaluation. It details their understanding of the evaluation purpose, objectives, questions, and scope and should be a 15-20-page document. The report should also further refine the overall evaluation scope, approach, design, and timeframe, and provide a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology which is to be delivered 10 days after the start of the assignment.

**B. PROGRESS REPORT/ PRESENTATION**

A presentation of the preliminary findings to ESC/RCO/PMT and agencies in the DaO states after the completion of the field phase (the briefing periodicity to be determined in the Inception Report)

**C. COMPREHENSIVE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

This should be a 40-60page document without annexes and the Executive Summary of the report should not exceed four pages. The template of the report to be provided by ESC, in line with UNEG standards.

**D. FINAL PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSIONS**

The evaluation team will make a final presentation of the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the PMT/ESC/RCO for dissemination and debriefing purposes. The submission of the Inception Report, Final Evaluation Report and Management Report should be in electronic copy. Reports should be of high quality, presented in Times New Roman Text, font size 12 and have the following attributes:

* Concision: Report should cover the required material without being irrelevant and unwieldy.
* Readability: Report should be written in English, jargon-free, simple, clear and reader-friendly.

# WORKPLAN – INDICATIVE TIMEFRAME

A tentative work-plan has been developed with the assumption that the evaluation will be conducted by a team of consultants for 45 days. The workplan matrix that highlights the major actions and deliverables expected throughout the evaluation process with an estimated timeline for each activity have been prepared and presented in Annex I. However, the evaluation team can propose alternative actions and timelines to ensure comprehensiveness, time and cost-effectiveness. A final workplan will be approved by the ESC/RCO/PMT before the commencement of the evaluation.

# MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION

* Evaluation Management Stakeholders

In accordance with UNEG norms and standards the evaluation would involve inclusive and stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of the evaluation to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of the findings. The roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Evaluation Management Stakeholders

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Stakeholders/Actors** | **Roles and Responsibilities** |
| UNCT | * Ensure decisions are made on time. * Approve the concept note, TORs, the final report, and the evaluation management response. * Set up/approve the evaluation management group/the evaluation reference group, and ensure they are consulted at different stages of the evaluation. |
| PMT | * Submit and recommend the concept note, TORs and final report for approval * Approve the shortlist of consultants for contracting. * Develop a follow-up plan and management response for the evaluation to the UNCT for consideration. * Ensure the implementation of committed actions. |
| ESC  (Comprises of the M & E Working Group. Also serves as the evaluation management and reference group.  Led by the Evaluation Manager for the UNSDPF, alongside the RCO) | * Review and contribute to the preparation of the concept note and TOR for the evaluation as well as those of the evaluation consultants. * Rate and shortlist CVs of different candidates and propose the evaluation team to be selected * Guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and reporting stages. * Provide technical advice and monitor the progress of the evaluation and report progress to PMT and UNCT. Clarify questions raised during the evaluation. * Participate in the review and validation of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the evaluation team. * Review the inception report and provide comments to the evaluation team. Contribute to the final selection and validation of evaluation questions. * Conduct an in-depth review of the quality of the data collection, analysis of findings and reports submitted, both at the inception and final stages. * Support the evaluation team to identify and gain access to government, other stakeholders as well as access information sources (documents and interviewees) to support data collection. * Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations. * Conduct Periodic Review of Evaluation Team' s Progress Report. Conduct checks to ensure that the views and inputs harvested at the stakeholders' validation workshop are reflected in the final report. * Clear the evaluation report for PMT and UNCT for approval. * Support the PMT and UNCT ln the development of a management response. * Facilitate access of the evaluation team to information sources (documents and interviewees) to support data collection. * Provide logistics support during evaluation field work and supervise the field work. |
| RCO | * Lead the preparation of TORs * Facilitate solicitation, selection and recruitment of the evaluation team members. * Ensure close communication with the evaluation team during the whole evaluation process. * Facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the ESC stakeholders * Help coordinate the travel to the project site and other logistic. * Consolidate the feedback on the evaluation reports and send it to the Team Leader within agreed timeframe. * Facilitate dissemination of evaluation reports to stakeholders. * Convenes the meetings of the ESC. * Co-lead the ESC with the Evaluation Manager. |

**The Evaluation Team**

1. **Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team**

The evaluation team will be made up of two National Consultants: one team leader and one technical expert. The team leader will be responsible for the overall delivery of the evaluation and the management of the evaluation team. S/he will have primary responsibility of designing the methodology, preparing the inception report and submitting the draft and final evaluation reports in line with the ToRs.

Specifically:

* Thoroughly review and familiarize self with the documents on the DaO programmatic implementation modality within the scope of work including the DaO Work Plans, the Common Country Analysis, the UNSDPF, the Outcomes, the Results Matrix, the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and the Evaluation Concept Note/TORs;
* In close consultation with the RCO and ESC, manage the day to-day coordination of the detailed tasks of the Evaluation including communicating with the Evaluation focal points in the Agencies, sending, receiving and proper archiving of documents, organizing and facilitating consultative meetings etc;
* Participate actively and take initiative in meetings with PMT and the ESC on the Evaluation;
* Convene coordination meetings with and provide technical guidance to the technical expert/second member of the evaluation team and ensure their full understanding and application of the Evaluation principles and guidelines to both the processes and outputs.
* Review and analyze inputs from all UN agencies with programmatic presence in the DaO focal states as well as the stakeholders and ensure all Evaluation Questions are answered and the results collated into the draft Evaluation Report;
* Present the draft Evaluation Report as following the processes described above and incorporate comments or changes and produce the final draft of the report;
* In collaboration with the RCO, lead the planning for, and organization of Evaluation meetings, including preparation of the reports, the accompanying presentations and the meeting logistics;
* Attend Evaluation meetings and incorporate comments or changes and produce the final Evaluation report.

The technical expert/team members will work alongside the team lead and in close consultation with RCO, contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology, the preparation of the inception report and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports. S/he will in also contribute to the data collection and analysis processes. ·

1. **Composition of the evaluation team**

The evaluation team will comprise of two members as detailed above; two national consultants (one team leader and one technical expert/team member). Once contracted, the consultant/contract may propose an alternative team composition provided all requirements in the TORs are met and a convincing rationale for a different team composition is provided. The composition of the team will be gender sensitive as women will be encouraged to apply for the consultancy. At the end of the selection process, selected consultants need to prove that they have not been involved in the implementation of the DaO programmatic Implementation in the focus states with an of the UN Agencies in Nigeria.

1. **Qualifications and experience of the evaluation team members**

**Qualifications of the Team Leader**

The team leader should have advanced university degree (Masters or PhD) in public administration, development studies, public health, business management, economics, international relations/law or other relevant field, with at least 10 years of proven experience in leading development and humanitarian evaluations especially in the area of governance, human rights, economic growth, basic social services, health and WASH, peace and security. Having conducted positively rated evaluations against the UNEG Standards for any UN Agency or country will be considered an asset for the team leader. The team leader to be recruited should, furthermore, have a strong development background with a solid understanding of the humanitarian aspects and of the humanitarian development nexus. The team leader is also required to have sound expertise in UN strategic planning processes (UNSDPF) and the DaO programmatic implementation, including familiarity with key concepts/approaches such as Result Based Management (RBM), Huma Rights Based Approach (HRBA), gender equality, leave no one behind (LNOB) and UN reform process; S/he should have previous evaluation experience in Nigeria.

**Qualifications of technical expert/team member**

The technical expert/team member should have advanced university degree (Masters or PhD) in public health, social sciences, education, development studies, economics, business management, or other relevant fields. S/he should be sufficiently conversant with Nigeria's development and humanitarian context, especially the socio-political and institutional context, with at least 5 years' experience in conducting evaluations and analyzing quantitative data. S/he should demonstrate sound knowledge of UN's mandate and experience of partnering with the Government of Nigeria and show proven experience in governance processes, policy analysis and implementation in Nigeria. Having conducted evaluations with UN agencies adhering to the UN Evaluation Group is an asset. S/he should demonstrate the ability to effectively translate data collection tools and conduct interviews in local communities and in the local language of the geographic area if required. S/he should have proven experience in planning, managing risks, monitoring and evaluation processes based on RBM, HRBA, LNOB and gender mainstreaming. Candidates who served as implementing partners or are still implementing the UNSDPF programmes will be automatically excluded from the bidding process.

# EVALUATION ETHICS

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”[[1]](#footnote-2). The team will sign an undertaken that as members of the evaluation team they will not use the data for their own research purposes, nor license the data to others, without the written consent of UN Nigeria.

# EVALUATION BUDGET AND PAYMENTS

The Consultancy fee will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Payment Tranches** |
| At the signing of the Contract | 10% |
| At the submission and **approval of the inception report** | 20% |
| After the presentation of the preliminary finding | 40% |
| At the end of the Evaluation exercise | 30% |

1. *For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System* [*http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/*](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)