|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Reference | | | WBS/Funding Reference | | | | Activity Budget | | | | Type of engagement | | | | |
| *Output 8.1* | | | *2070/A0/05/880/004/003* | | | |  | | | | National Contractor/Consultant  International Contractor/Consultant | | | | |
| Grant: | | | | GL Account: | | | | | | | | Fund ID: | | | |
| *Non-Grant* | | | | *7000110* | | | | | | | | *GC* | | | |
| Purpose of Activity/Assignment (Link with **AWP/ MYWP** or IMEP)  The Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, UNICEF Indonesia Country Office, is seeking an individual national consultant to conduct a case study on national evaluation capacity in Indonesia as part of an Asia and Pacific joint UNICEF-UNDP regional Review of *National Evaluation Systems and Capacities for Evaluating Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*. The regional review is led by two Senior Evaluation Experts who are overseen by UNICEF and UNDP Bangkok, and who will provide technical oversight to this assignment. The regional review will include several countries and will lead to a regional synthesis report. (MYWP sub-activity 8.1.2.1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budget Year | Requesting Section/Issuing Office: | | | | | | | Reasons why tasks cannot be done by staff | | | | | | | |
| *2017* | *PM&E unit/ UNICEF Jakarta, Indonesia* | | | | | | | *The required time and work commitment is above and beyond the current capacity of the unit.* | | | | | | | |
| Consultant selection method | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Competitive  Selection roster | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New SSA  Extension/ Amendment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Workplace of Consultant (Duty Station):  *Home-based*  (Jakarta) | | Rate: Professional fee  Estimated local travel cost  *There is no travel required outside Jakarta for this assignment.* | | | | | | | Justification or Refer to NFR (Note for Record- for extension/ amendment)  *N/A* | | | | | | |
| Consultants will be selected from the existing roster | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultants will be selected in a competitive sourcing process (advertising in TMS & interview) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supervisor: | | | | | | Start Date: | | | | End Date | | | | Number of Days (working) | |
| *Chief of PM&E unit* | | | | | | *30/06/2017* | | | | *31/08/2017* | | | | *20 (part-time, two months)* | |
| Work Assignment Overview (SMART)\*  National evaluation capacity and system strengthening in Indonesia is led by the National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas), under the mandate and framework of relevant laws and regulations. Bappenas is also responsible for coordinating roll-out and implementation of the SDGs in Indonesia, under broad support from development partners, including UN agencies. This assignment is therefore not only in support of the regional (Asia and Pacific) review, but is also expected to lead directly to concrete recommendations and opportunities for increased collaboration on national evaluation capacity development (NECD) in Indonesia.  **Background:**  **2.1 Background to the Regional Review**  The regional Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities for Evaluating Progress Towards the SDGs aims to foster peer-to-peer learning among key stakeholders in the Asia and Pacific region in relation to evaluation and the SDGs, trigger interest in a regional State of Evaluation report, and inform global and national evaluation capacity guidance.  The proposed case study is one of six proposed (in addition to Malaysia, Philippines, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Thailand) that will serve as inputs to a regional synthesis report on emerging good practices. This will be accomplished by using the case studies and regional synthesis to showcase existing national evaluation champions and emerging country practices in the region, distil key success factors, trends, and lessons, and identify areas that other countries in the region should prioritize.  In addition, by taking a consultative approach that engages key stakeholders, the production of the case studies will be oriented to building interest and capacity in relation to evaluation and the 2030 Agenda amongst national evaluation stakeholders. The case studies and regional synthesis will also complement national reports for the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) on evaluation and the SDGs Follow-up and Review (FUR) Process.  **2.2 Background to the Case Study**  In 2016, Indonesia made significant progress in localizing the SDGs and planning for implementation. The Government has been a champion for the SDGs since before they were adopted, for example by co-chairing the 2012-2013 High Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Subsequently, many SDG targets were integrated in the current medium-term national development plan (RPJMN 2015-2019).  Under the umbrella of the UN Partnership for Development Framework (UNPDF) 2016-2020, UN agencies contribute policy advice, capacity building and knowledge sharing, and function as a catalyst to support the achievement of national priorities from the RPJMN and SDGs (amongst others).  In 2016, UNICEF’s support to the Government of Indonesia in rolling out the SDGs helped ensure that key SDG priorities for children are firmly captured in the Government’s planning documents, including in the areas of child protection, WASH, nutrition, health and education. UNICEF has been providing technical support to improve the availability and quality of data and monitoring related to child well-being and the SDGs, and published an analysis of priority SDG targets and indicators for children in Indonesia in early 2016. The upcoming action plans at national (RAN) and subnational (RAD) levels in 2017, which will lay out Government’s planned actions to achieve the SDGs, provide an important opportunity to include key monitoring and evaluation strategies for the SDGs.  Recently, Indonesia signed up to present its Voluntary National Review (VNR) of SDG progress at the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in 2017. Global guidance recommends that preparations for the national review include the development of a VNR report which will highlight whether and to what extent national and sub-national development plans, implementation frameworks, programme implementation plans and disaggregated indicators are either being prepared or modified to strengthen cross sectoral, integrated approaches to implementing and achieving the SDGs, including goals and targets related to children. Further, it is recommended that the report reflects how the government is engaging its citizenry in implementation of the goals and tracking feedback, including through strengthened participation.  In preparation for the upcoming VNR, the Government is committed to ensuring that high quality monitoring (data) systems on key SDG targets are available, to allow for consistent tracking of progress. National evaluation systems, furthermore, are in place through key laws and regulations. These include Law 24/2004 (on the national development planning system, which states that evaluations are to serve as the basis for development of new plans), Government Regulation 39/2006 (on control and evaluation procedures for development plans), Presidential Decree 20/2016 (on mandate for monitoring, evaluation and control of development plans, given to Bappenas), and Ministerial Regulation 1/2017 (on guidelines for conduct of national development evaluation). Together these laws and regulations form the basis of a “national evaluation policy”, upon which further capacity development and strengthening efforts are to advance. Given the current momentum that exists around preparation for the HLPF, this is an opportune moment to identify further gaps and strategies to ensure evaluability of the SDGs.  **Case studies:**  The country case studies will 1) comprehensively map and analyse key features of the national evaluation systems and related capacities; 2) describe and analyse national responses to the evaluation requirements of the 2030 Agenda; and 3) identify key successes, lessons, gaps, trends, or other notable experiences or issues at the intersection of national evaluation capacity and the 2030 Agenda, with a view to analysing the country’s readiness for evaluating progress in relation to the SDGs. The country case studies will also be informed by and build on EVALSDGs ‘Spotlights’ initiative. ‘Spotlights’ are intended to provide a platform for showcasing the national experiences of selected countries with SDGs evaluation on SDGs through the exchange and sharing of lessons learned, challenges, opportunities, and best practices.  To facilitate comparison across cases, a uniform methodology will be employed, with minor adjustments only as required by local context. Given the emphasis on peer-to-peer learning and capacity development, consultation and engagement with national evaluation system stakeholders for data gathering, definition of issues, and validation will be central to the case study research methodology.  A detailed methodology and any associated tool(s) for the case study will be developed by the Senior Evaluation Experts who have been contracted to support the case study process and produce the regional synthesis report. The methodology will be framed by the four evaluation capacity development dimensions of institutional capacity, individual capacity, enabling environment, and linkages among these three. The framework, illustrated below, draws from the Global Evaluation Agenda 2016-2020, which was developed through an extensive global consultative process. The framework encapsulates the important elements of a functioning evaluation system and will help to guide the study process.  Importantly, the Global Evaluation Agenda 2016-2020 affirms that evaluation is not a value-neutral management tool. It promotes and supports equitable and sustainable human development as articulated through the SDGs. Each of the four dimensions and all evaluation processes and criteria are grounded in values of equity, gender equality, and social justice and on shared principles of partnership, innovation, inclusivity, and human rights in line with the SDGs’ “no one left behind” principle, which translates into a call for equity-focused, gender-responsive (EFGR) evaluation.    *Source: Global Evaluation Agenda 2016-2020, pg 17 (adapted).*  The case studies will follow the framework as a guide to:   1. trace each element of the framework, with particular attention being paid to the four key dimensions; 2. focus on important features of the national and sub-national context and status; 3. assess evaluation supply and demand factors; 4. consider issues relevant to the SDG “no one left behind” principle, which translates into a call for EFGR evaluation; and 5. explore the mutually supportive and interconnected dimensions of evaluation systems.   Within this framework, the mapping and analysis of the national evaluation system will provide an analysis of progress, challenges, and lessons learned for each of the ‘success factors’ relevant to the country context. Where relevant, case studies may also identify additional ‘success factors’.  **Evaluation questions:**  In analysing the country’s readiness for evaluation in the context of the 2030 Agenda, questions such as the following will be considered:   * What is the government’s evaluation strategy or policy and guidance for the 2030 Agenda? * What is the status of the current national system for monitoring, including national statistics and programme/project monitoring? * What – if any – key steps are being taken to adapt the national M&E systems and processes to monitor, review, and evaluate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda? This should include an analysis of:   + What/who is driving these changes?   + To what extent are institutional arrangements being set up or adjusted fit for purpose, both horizontally (across sectors and departments) and vertically (subnational and local)?   + To what extent are other stakeholders involved in M&E processes related to the SDGs?   + Through what mechanisms do (or will) evaluations inform the adjustment or revision of strategies, resource allocations, and policies? How is this changing in light of the 2030 Agenda? This should consider vertical policy coherence issues.   + How are evaluation methods changing or evolving to support adaptive governance and equity?   + What evaluation methods and tools are government and other stakeholders currently using to evaluate policy choices, especially in relation to integrated approaches (ensuring that the interlinkages between SDGs, trade-offs/synergies are adequately addressed and evaluated)? * What EFGR evaluation methods and tools are government and other stakeholders currently using? * Do existing data collection and statistical systems address national evaluation needs in relation to the 2030 Agenda, including with respect to equity and gender equality?   **Scope of Work:**    **1. Data collection**  Based on the methodology and tools prepared by the Senior Evaluation Experts, conduct data collection and literature review under the scope of case studies. This will include:  ***a)*** ***Document review.*** This will include material common across all case studies, as well as material specific to the national context, such as:   * Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system-related legislation, policies, regulations, standards, procedures and guides, institutional frameworks, studies, and reports; * Standard evaluation tools in use by key stakeholders in the M&E system, including template log frames, Performance Monitoring Framework (PMFs), reporting forms, etc.; * Evaluation reports and responses; * Policy research or academic materials providing prescriptive, comparative, or evaluative input related to evaluation in the national context.     ***b) Key stakeholder interviews****.* The consultant will conduct approximately 20 interviews, guided by semi-structured interview protocols tailored to the national context and categories of stakeholders. The interview sample will be representative in terms of role (e.g. evaluation commissioners and users, as well as those involved in conducting evaluations), level of influence and involvement, and sector (i.e. looking at whole-of government as well as departmental, ministerial, or subnational levels; and seeking stakeholders from government, civil society, and the private sector, as well as from international organizations and other development partners). It is expected that the interview sample will include the following categories:   * Civil service officials with roles in oversight, management, and implementation of M&E systems, with an emphasis on evaluation and SDG-related accountability roles; * Individuals with sectoral expertise and national experience related to key SDGs and evaluation issues such as social inclusion, gender equality, data, and localization; * Selected political stakeholders, such as elected representatives, government or political leaders, or civil society representatives who have been involved in political oversight, commentary, or advocacy related to national evaluation or M&E; * Private or non-profit sector individuals with particular interest and/or expertise related to evaluation and/or M&E-relevant aspects of SDGs (e.g. academics, consultants, or non-profit sector researchers working in this area; representatives of voluntary organizations for professional evaluation - VOPEs; professional evaluators); and * Representatives from international organizations, such as bilateral and multilateral donor organizations, INGOs, or NGOs with roles or experience relevant to the national M&E system.     ***c) Stakeholder roundtables/national workshop.*** The consultant will facilitate the discussion of a limited selection of questions related to NECD and the 2030 Agenda at a national workshop/roundtable. These opportunities will   * Promote sharing of perspectives amongst stakeholders and peer-to-peer learning and networking; * Facilitate triangulation and validation of emerging case study findings; and * Depending on timing in the process, serve to initiate discussion among national stakeholders of next steps, or a national "road map" for developing national evaluation capacity in the context of the SDGs.     ***d) Survey*.** In order to gather data from a larger pool of respondents beyond those interviewed, a survey will be developed and administered. The main part of the survey will be standardized for application across the case studies for comparability; however, it may include sections tailored to each country and – if relevant – specific sectors. The survey will:   * Complement the interviews and expand the case study evidence base; * Emphasize issues of individual and institutional evaluation awareness and capacity; * Target the same categories of respondents as the interviews; * Be administered with the assistance of relevant contacts within government and VOPEs, as identified and facilitated by the UNICEF and UNDP focal points.     **2. Data analysis.** This will be based on the common study framework that will be supplied to the consultant.    **3. Report writing and presentation of findings in National Consultative Meeting.** The consultant will be responsible for:   * Preparing the first draft case study report (in English, 15 – 20 pages, exclusive of executive summary and annexes) to be submitted in draft form to the Senior Evaluation Experts for feedback, with copy to UNICEF. Feedback will be provided within one week of receipt of draft. * Preparing the second draft case study report and presenting it to a national consultative workshop to collect inputs and feedback. * Preparing the final case study report incorporating inputs from all parties as mentioned above, including any necessary annexes, a two to three page executive summary, in addition to a PowerPoint presentation (approximately 20 slides).   Deliverables should adhere to the formats, guidelines, and requirements of the UNICEF Style Guide and UNICEF Brand Toolkit and other government standards. They are expected to be of high quality and factually correct, employing truthful and relevant data and providing the list of references and data used in preparing the required analysis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tasks/Milestone: | | | | | Deliverables/Outputs: | | | | | | | | Date | | Amount  (final amount to be agreed by HR) |
| *Preparing the first draft case study report (in English, 15 – 20 pages, exclusive of executive summary and annexes) to be submitted in draft form to the Senior Evaluation Experts for feedback, with copy to UNICEF. Feedback will be provided within one week of receipt of draft.* | | | | | *First draft case study report* | | | | | | | | 31/07/2017 | | 10 days |
| *Preparing the second draft case study report and presenting it to a national consultative workshop to collect inputs and feedback.* | | | | | *Second draft case study report* | | | | | | | | 15/08/2017 | | 05 days |
| *Preparing the final case study report incorporating inputs from all parties as mentioned above, including any necessary annexes, a two to three page executive summary, in addition to a PowerPoint presentation (approximately 20 slides).* | | | | | *Final case study report* | | | | | | | | 31/08/2017 | | 05 days |

\*) Ref CF.AI.2013-001 Amend 2, work assignment should be: measurable, attainable, results-based and time-bound (“SMART”) and include:

(a) tangible and measurable outputs, objectives and targets of the work assignment, as well as specific activities to achieve these;

(b) specific delivery dates and details as to how the work must be delivered (e.g. electronic submission, hard copy), subdivided into “milestones” where appropriate;

(c) indicators for evaluation of outputs (including timeliness, achievement of goals, and quality of work)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Minimum Qualifications required: | | Knowledge/Expertise/Skills required | | |
| Bachelors  Masters  PhD  Other - *please describe*   * Indonesian National; * At least a Master’s degree in social development, public policy, or related field relevant to sustainable development and evaluation; or a Bachelor’s degree with additional relevant professional experience. * Excellent knowledge of English (oral and in writing) as well as fluency in written and spoken Bahasa Indonesia. | | * Minimum of 8 years of experience in evaluation-related work; * Experience in assessing and developing national planning and evaluation systems; * Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis; * Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills. | | |
| Additional information or attachments: | Prepared By: | | Request Authorised By: | |
| *Please provide any additional info.* |  | |  | |
| *Endorsed by HR: Name:*  *HR Remarks:*  *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*  *Approval of Deputy Representative(for all programme clusters)/Chief of Operations (for Operations and PFP)*  *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*    *\*Approval from Deputy Representative is required should the Consultancy is not in the SSA (Supply) Plan* | | | | |
| **Checklist for Individual SSA:**  Request as per SSA Plan  Evidence of Competitive selection process & matrix (minimum 3 CVs)  CRC approval for fee of US$ 50,000 and more  CV & P11 of candidates valid for 12 months  Completed Health Statement form  Proof of Health Insurance  Written Clearance from Government if consultant is government staff  Relevant approving body’s approval if consultant is former staff member or retiree (DHR/RO or CO)  Consultant Declaration for Retiree  MAIP form  Accidental Death & Dismemberment and Accident Medical Coverage UNICEF insurance form for IP consultant  Consultant has not exceeded the maximum duration of service i.e. 11.5 months in any 12 months period, up to a maximum cumulative duration of 46 months in any 48-month period | | | |