



NAÇÕES UNIDAS
SÃO TOMÉ E PRÍNCIPE



Terms of Reference for

Independent Evaluation of the Joint Programme on Integrated Social Policy funded by the Joint SDG Fund

***“Reaching the furthest behind first: A catalytic approach to
supporting the social protection in Sao Tome & Principe”***

March 2023

United Nations Office of the Resident Coordinator in São Tomé and Príncipe

1. INTRODUCTION

The Joint Programme, funded by the Joint SDG Fund in Sao Tome and Principe supported the Ministry of Labor, Solidarity, Family and Professional qualification (MLSFPQ) to fully implement a unique Social Registry (SR) to enable its use by several targeted social programmes. Despite it builds on the current support given by the World Bank to the MLSFQ to update the cash transfer beneficiary database, the SR has the aim to be linked with different monitoring information systems beyond social protection, including areas such as health and education. Hence, the SR is expected to be effectively linked to a set of interventions aimed at improving the access of vulnerable families not only to cash transfer schemes, but also to social services in the whole country. The main objective of the JP is to accelerate some key SDG targets by fostering synergies through cross-sectoral coordination while expanding social protection coverage. In achieving so, the JP supported the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and the MLSFPQ to link sector interventions to the SR, including: 1) parental education programme; 2) youth engagement in the social sector; 3) access to a health services package, including an individual health monitoring and case management (possible thanks to the interoperability of the Social Registry and the District Health Information Software - DHIS2 individual tracker module).

It was expected that by 2022 the Social Registry would be fully implemented at the national level, with an adequate legal and normative framework and ready to be scaled out and scaled up and that all families benefiting from the Vulnerable Family Programme (cash transfers targeting children) and identified as vulnerable in the social registry had access to parental education, access to basic health and access of vulnerable children to education (particularly pre-schooling). The Joint Programme was also expected to mitigate the negative effects of COVID-19 on the vulnerable and extreme poor household by fostering the development of an infrastructure capable of responding to negative shocks in a timely manner through adequate social protection mechanisms linked to priority access to social services.

As the implementation has been concluded, the UN in STP intends to document what worked well and what not from the Joint Programme, to inform the development of future JPs, to strengthen accountability of UN to national stakeholders, for results and recommendations on the way forward for possible new joint programmes on social protection. In doing so, UNICEF, ILO, UNDP and WHO are looking for an independent institution/organization with strong technical expertise and experience on programme evaluation to perform the ‘Final Evaluation for the Joint Programme on Social Protection’. The final independent evaluation is expected to be conducted from 15 April to 20 June 2023 with the aim of informing UN and government on the achievements of the program against the designated main transformative results, outcome, and output indicators. The evaluation shall consider the coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the JP. It shall also provide evidence on the JP contribution to the acceleration of the achievement of SDGs and its contribution to UN reform.

2. JOINT PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHTS

The Joint Programme had as its main outcome the following: *“Disparities and inequalities are reduced at all levels through the full participation of vulnerable and prioritized groups, and the development and use by these groups, of social protection services and basic social services”*. The JP aimed at accelerating the achievement of SDGs through the integration and coordination of different interventions in place (or planned to take place) as part of the implementation of STP Social Protection Policy and Strategy and of specific sectoral policies in a standalone manner. The main tool to enable

the integration and coordination process is a common database, the SR, that will help identify vulnerable families that will have priority access to both social protection programmes, particularly cash transfers, and social services. In the absence of coordination and integrating tools such as the SR, the DHIS2 with individual trackers and the MIS of different programme as well as trained personnel to operate referral mechanisms, the programmes would fail to create the synergies necessary to accelerate the SDGs. The main expected results were:

- Result 1: 2,570 vulnerable families are covered by social protection programmes.
- Result 2: 60% the vulnerable families registered in the Social Registry are covered by essential health services, in the three pilot districts.
- Result 3: 60% of children among children from vulnerable families registered in the Social Registry in the three districts are enrolled in pre-primary education.
- Result 4: By 2022, new and unique social registry in place that will unblock access to social protection and other social services for the furthest left behind (12% of the population) in 3 out of 6 districts. This data system will be utilized as a unique registry, for non-contributory social protection data, which will inter-operate with the health data gathered through the DHIS2 individual tracker.

During its implementation phase (January 2020 – May 2022) and despite the devastating impact of COVID-19 pandemic, the JP accomplished major milestones which fostered cross-sectoral coordination and expanded coverage of social protection programmes in Sao Tome and Principe. The Social Registry (SR) was established and was providing reliable data on key vulnerability criteria of the most vulnerable population in each community. The SR provides a powerful tool for the government to select beneficiaries for social programmes as well as plan, budget, and design adequate social protection packages. In 2021, given the proven relevance of the SR to national planning process, it was upscaled to the national level (i.e., inclusion of 3 remaining districts and Principe) and used to select the beneficiaries for a new cash-transfer dedicated to COVID-19. To ensure that the SR would be adopted by the government as a national tool across sectors and its data is interlinked with the information management systems of health, education, and agriculture, it was to be supported by a legal and regulatory framework, aimed at fostering cross-sectoral coordination.

The JP also aimed at increasing the coverage of essential health services, with a focus on the identified vulnerable families in the SR. The JP implemented a pilot initiative on universal health coverage to gather evidence and data to inform strategic directions for the new national health policy, including the paradigm shift for health financing, which aims at better protecting the most vulnerable from catastrophic expenditure risks. The pilot aimed at fostering the collaboration and coordination among health sector and national social security, through the interlinkage of the Social Registry and the unique register for users installed in the DHIS2 tracker platform. Vulnerable families registered in SR, were to be able to access subsidized health services improving their access to essential health care. The DHIS2 tracker platform, was expected to monitor the 21,668 potential beneficiaries of essential health coverage in pilot districts. It was expected that by the end of the JP the DHIS2 and the Social Registry would be fully integrated, and the interoperability among the system would be automated and updated on regular basis, to ensure the structural conditions to implement a Universal Health Coverage mechanism in the long term.

In relation to the JP commitment to increase the enrolment rate in pre-primary education of children from vulnerable families registered in the Social Registry, the sensibilization sessions provided by the

Parental Education Programme (PEP) continued, reaching out 50% of the vulnerable families, benefiting from the national cash-transfer programme. Through PEP, front-line workers across social service platforms (education, health, justice, social protection) were capacitated and provided with adequate tools to deliver sensitization sessions on positive parenting practices, with a focus on early childhood development. PEP aims at increasing the access of vulnerable children (aged 0-5) to pre-primary school and to basic health care services through enhanced cross-sectorial coordination among front-line workers, improving a decentralized referral system in the country. The JP has carried out a baseline assessment of the conditions of the beneficiaries of the cash transfer, focusing on their children situation, which provides the basis to develop an impact assessment of the programme and its contribution to increase enrolment rates to pre-primary school. Youth and adolescents have been crucial to the implementation of PEP, as the traineeship programme, funded by the JP, engaged 50 young girls and boys to work in the social protection sector and in the communities during these two years.

3. THE EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

3.1 Purpose

The evaluation will assess overall contribution of the JP to the strengthening of the social protection system in the country, particularly in the context of coordination, capacity strengthening, and policy development. It will also serve to analyse to which extent the joint implementation has contributed to the success or failure of the JP (in terms of programme coherence and efficiency). The initial evaluability assessment will provide Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) and partners with evidence on the extent to which results can be demonstrated based on quantitative and qualitative data.

3.2 Objectives

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the joint programme from its inception to its completion, with focus on its ability to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable households and hence its contribution to the reduction of disparities and inequalities at all levels through the full participation of vulnerable and prioritized groups to social protection services and basic social services. To accomplish this, the evaluation will need to examine the following:

- **Accomplishment of the main expected results and its sustainability:** inform the achievement of the program against the designated main transformative results, outcome and output indicators as defined in its Overall Results Framework, and their sustainability in the medium/long-term.
- **Contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups** identified in the JP document (ProDoc) through the assessment of evidence from programme experiences and approaches that have proven effective in meeting the needs of vulnerable households.
- **Contribution to SDG acceleration** through the assessment of JP underlying Theory of Change (ToC) based on the integration and coordination of different interventions to jointly strengthen a common database (Social Registry, SR) of vulnerable families that will have priority access to social protection programmes and social services.
- **Contribution to UN reform** (UNCT coherence) through the review of the joint implementation of the programme, including its governance and monitoring and reporting arrangements, to gather lessons learned that can help better design joint initiatives.

- **Lessons learned, good practices and innovations** to better inform the sustainability of the joint program for its upscale.
- **To provide a set of forward-looking and actionable recommendations** to strengthen programmatic strategies in the design of the next JP taking into account national priorities and the national 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the country
- **JP focus on disability** to assess to what extent the joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation) and has effectively contributed to their socio-economic inclusion by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs across the life cycle.

3.3 Scope of the work

The summative evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the joint programme, and it will be forward-looking by reinforcing good practices, identifying areas for improvement, and providing conclusions and recommendations. It will be conducted to assess progress made and provide recommendation for future programmes.

The evaluation will attempt to assess the approach taken by UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and ILO, on whether the assumptions made in the ToC are appropriate, whether activities and interventions are indeed contributing to progress within the framework of the ToC, whether the proposed approach is scalable and to determine why or why not progress is occurring. Of course, where the evaluation does yield evidence in relation to impact and outcomes, these will be reflected upon in the evaluation report.

The evaluation will cover:

- **Temporal Scope:** January 2020 to May 2022
- **Geographic Scope:** national (excluding Principe)
- **Programmatic Scope:** Theory of Change and Results framework – The evaluation will focus on the 4 transformative results stated in the Project Document
- **Cross-cutting themes Scope:** disability focus and leave no one behind principle
- **Strategic Scope:** Contribution to UNDAF, agencies comparative advantage and value added, and contribution to SDG acceleration
- **Operational Scope:** use of resources for impact (more efficient together or alone?), complexity in terms of management (more efficient alone or together?) as well as evidence generation for JP performance measurement

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Summative evaluation evidence will be judged using modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as well as equity, gender equality and human rights considerations. Key evaluation questions might include the following:

Impact of JP: strengthening the social protection system form a cross-sectorial coordination and capacity strengthening:

- Are the activities and outputs of consistent with the national priority and the attainment of its objective?
- Did the interventions contributed to develop the foundation to make the social protection system more inclusive and sustainable?
- To what extent is the Social Registry and its interoperability with DHIS2 relevant to reach out to the most vulnerable households?
- Have the capacities of front-line workers been enhanced to improve service delivery to meet the needs of vulnerable households through the Parental Education Programme?
- Have the capacities of youth to work for social sectors and social entrepreneurship been enhanced to prepare them to be fully integrated into the job market and act as change agents within their communities?
- Are the activities and outputs of the joint programme consistent with the intended plan?

Coherence: The evaluation will assess the coherence of the programme with the SDGs acceleration and UN Country Team in contribution to UN Reform and contribution and how it improves the situation of vulnerable groups.

- How coherent is the Joint Programme with respect to meeting the needs of vulnerable groups exposed to unexpected shocks, and what are the major influencing factors affecting the programme's capacity to meet those needs?
- Has the JP leveraged (or has the potential to leverage) financing and investments, to ensure the scale of impact necessary for attaining the 2030 Agenda?
- To what extent have the programme objectives been jointly achieved? Did they contribute to the achievement of UNDAF results?
- What have been the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the programme objectives.
- To what extent is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to human rights, equity and gender equality objectives well-articulated and implemented in the programme?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent have the activities implemented helped achieve the objectives set out in the joint programme in the areas of partnerships and coordination, policy and strategy, technical and operational capacity, and learning?
- Has the JP implementation and its strategies have been one-agency nature or joint UN nature?

Efficiency of the Joint Programme outputs – both qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs provided:

- How efficiently has the Joint Programme been managed, given the human and financial resources available? What have been the costs, including both funds and in-kind support?
- Are activities low in cost and affordable (yet, of adequate quality to improve the situation of vulnerable households)?
- Is the current organisational set-up, coordination and collaboration among UN agencies, and collaboration and contribution of the concerned ministries and others working effectively to

help ensure quality outputs and accountability? What more might be done to improve efficiency?

- Have the integrated social protection services been implemented in an effective and efficient way, both in terms of human and financial resources to other alternatives?

Sustainability of the benefits of the integrated social protection services provided:

- To what extent have the strategies adopted by the joint programme contributed to sustainability of results?
- To what extent is the joint programme supporting long-term buy-in and ownership by duty bearers and rights holders?
- What is the likelihood of the Joint Programme objectives to be sustained beyond the duration of the joint programme?
- What are the lessons learned about the JP implementation strategies?
- To what extent are the benefits of the joint programme likely to continue?
- What have been the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the joint programme?

Focus on disabilities - In line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, even programs that do not directly target persons with disabilities should ensure that persons with disabilities within targeted population can access the program without discrimination.

- To what extent did the program target persons with disabilities?
- To what extent did the design and implementation of activities of the joint program supported include disability-related accessibility and non-discrimination requirement?
- To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?
- To what extent did support to data collection and analysis, registries, and information system feature disability?
- To which extent did the program contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities either via: i) ensuring basic income security; ii) coverage of health care costs, including rehabilitation and assistive devices; iii) coverage of disability-related costs, including community support services; iv) facilitate access to inclusive early childhood development, education, and work/livelihood.

5. METHODOLOGY

As per the Project Agreements, after the completion of the joint programmes, a final, independent and gender-responsive evaluation will be organized by the Resident Coordinator. The evaluation will be managed jointly by PUNOs as per established process for independent evaluations, including the use of a **joint evaluation steering group (JESG)** and **dedicated evaluation manager** not involved in the implementation of the joint programme. The evaluations will follow the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, using the guidance on Joint Evaluation and relevant UNDG guidance on evaluations. The management and implementation of the joint evaluation will have due regard to the evaluation policies of the PUNOs to ensure the requirements of those policies are met; and with use of appropriate guidance from PUNOs on joint evaluation. The

evaluation process will be participative and will involve all relevant programme's stakeholders and partners. Evaluation results will be disseminated amongst governments, donors, academic institutions, and stakeholders of civil society (including workers' and employers' organizations) and a joint management response will be produced upon completion of the evaluation process to be made publicly available on the evaluation platforms or similar of the PUNOs.

The summative evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the joint programme, and it will be forward-looking by reinforcing good practices, identifying areas for improvement, and providing conclusions and recommendations. It will be conducted to assess progress made and provide recommendation for the sustainability of the program. The evaluation will attempt to assess the approach taken by UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and ILO, on whether the assumptions made in the ToC are appropriate, whether activities and interventions are indeed contributing to progress within the framework of the ToC, whether the proposed approach is scalable and to determine why or why not progress is occurring. Of course, where the evaluation does yield evidence in relation to impact and outcomes, these will be reflected upon in the evaluation report.

The composition of the **joint evaluation steering group** is as follows:

- **Chair:** Resident Coordinator (RC); **Co-Chair:** Ministry of Labor
- **Other members:** Chief of Agencies of UNICEF; UNDP; WHO and ILO.

5.1 Overall methodology

Referring to the objectives of the evaluation, this section indicates a possible design, approach, methods, and processes for the evaluation. Methodological rigor will be given significant consideration in the assessment of proposals. Hence bidders are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the ToR and improve on it or propose an approach they consider more appropriate. In their proposal, the bidder should refer to triangulation, sampling plan and methodological limitations and mitigation measures. Bidders must also demonstrate methodological expertise and considerable experience in evaluating social protection programmes.

The evaluation will employ:

- a) **theory-based approach-** which depicts how the interventions supported by the UN STP are expected to contribute to a series of results and identifies the causal links between the results, as well as critical assumptions and contextual factors that support or hinder the achievement of desired changes
- b) **iterative approach** (using a developmental approach in alignment with SDGs and UNDAF drawing on key background documents and the internal M&E system. The background documents include:
 - Program Document (with focus on the baseline and end line as indicated on the results framework)
 - The annual (2020 and 2021) narrative consolidated reports
 - Quarter reports on progress and quarter updates on financial delivery
 - Consolidated activity reports including study report, survey, consultancy report, Government guidelines, policies
 - A compilation of communication products i.e. monthly newsletter, Human Interest Story.

- c) **inclusive, transparent, and participatory approach** involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels. An initial stakeholder map will be developed to identify stakeholders who have been involved in the preparation and implementation of the JP and those partners who do not work directly with UN yet play a key role in a relevant outcome or thematic area in the national context. These stakeholders include government representatives, civil society organizations, implementing partners, the private sector, academia, other United Nations organizations, donors and, most importantly, rights-holders (notably women, adolescents and youth). Particular attention will be paid to ensuring participation of women, adolescent girls and young people, especially those from vulnerable and marginalized groups (e.g. young people and women with disabilities).

5.2 Methodological design of the evaluation

The methodology that the evaluation consultant/team will develop builds the foundation for providing valid and evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions and for offering a robust and credible assessment. The methodological design of the evaluation shall include the following key stages:

Finalization of the evaluation questions and related assumptions: Based on the preliminary questions presented in the present terms of reference and the theory of change underlying the JP, the evaluators are required to refine the evaluation questions. In their final form, the questions should reflect the evaluation criteria and clearly define the key areas of inquiry of the JP. The final evaluation questions and shall be presented in the inception report.

Sampling strategy: An initial overview of the interventions supported by JP, the locations where these interventions have taken place, and the stakeholders involved in these interventions. As part of this process, the stakeholder map will be prepared to identify the range of stakeholders that are directly or indirectly involved in the implementation or affected by the implementation of the JP. From this stakeholder map, the evaluation team will select a sample of stakeholders who will be consulted through interviews and/or group discussions during the data collection phase. These stakeholders must be selected through clearly defined criteria and the sampling approach outlined in the design/inception report.

Data collection: The evaluation will consider primary and secondary sources of information.

- Primary data will be collected through semi-structured interviews with Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with the following stakeholders: ILO, UNICEF, UNDP, WHO, Resident Coordinator's Office (cover both the technical working group and Heads of Agencies), Ministry of Labor, Solidarity, Family and Professional qualification (MLSFPQ), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Youth and Sport, World Bank. The evaluator also needs to interview the implementing partner such the Youth institute, Directorate of Social Protection, National Social Security Institute, Directorate of Entrepreneurship, etc. Surveys and questionnaires including beneficiaries, and/or focus group discussions (FGDs) with relevant stakeholders at the national and in-depth interviews/surveys with beneficiaries.
- Secondary data will be collected through desk review, primarily focusing on annual work plans, work plan progress reports, monitoring data and results reports, evaluations and research studies (incl. previous evaluations, research by international NGOs and other United Nations

organizations, etc.), surveys, data repositories and its implementing partners. The evaluation consultant/team will ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex, age, location and other relevant dimensions, such as disability status, to the extent possible.

Adherence to a code of ethics and a human right based and gender sensitive approach in the gathering, treatment and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report. Perspective from both rights holders and duty bearers shall be collected.

Analysis: Data analysis will be undertaken largely through the following techniques: descriptive, content and comparative analysis. Debriefs will be held regularly to compare and discuss data collected and analyse emerging findings. To this end, data will be triangulated across data sets (quantitative and qualitative) and data sources (documents, site visits, people) to enhance data reliability and validity. In the analysis phase, the evaluation consultant/team should highlight data gaps and other data constraints.

Validation mechanisms: All findings of the evaluation need to be firmly grounded in evidence. The evaluation consultant/team will use a variety of mechanisms to ensure the validity of collected data and information including systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection methods. Data validation is a continuous process throughout the different evaluation phases. The evaluators should check the validity of the collected data and information and verify the robustness of findings at each stage of the evaluation, so they can determine whether they should further pursue specific hypotheses (related to the evaluation questions) or disregard them when there are indications that these are weak (contradictory findings or lack of evidence, etc.). The validation mechanisms will be presented in the design/inception report.

6. EVALUATION PROCESS

6.1 Pre-preparation phase

- Lead agency recruits the evaluation consultant/team (with validation from the RCO)
- RCO nominates the Evaluator Manager (not involved with the JP implementation).

6.2 Design/Inception Phase:

In the design phase, the activities will be carried out by the recruited evaluation consultant/team, in close consultation with the evaluation manager, RCO and the lead agency. This phase includes:

- Evaluation kick-off meeting between the evaluation manager/RCO and the lead agency and the PUNOs.
- Desk review of background information and documentation on the JP, as well as other relevant documentation.
- Formulation of a final set of evaluation questions.
- Development of a stakeholder map and a sampling strategy to select sites to be visited and stakeholders to be consulted through interviews and group discussions.
- Development of a data collection and analysis strategy, as well as a concrete and feasible evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase.
- Development of data collection methods and tools, assessment of limitations to data collection and development of mitigation measures.

At the end of the design phase, the **evaluation consultant/team will develop a design/inception report** that presents a robust, practical, and feasible evaluation approach, detailed methodology and work plan. The report will include, among other elements: **i)** evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives of the evaluation; **ii)** evaluation criteria and questions; evaluation methodology (i.e., sampling criteria), a description of data collection methods and data sources (incl. a rationale for their selection), draft data collection instruments, for example questionnaires, with a data collection toolkit; **iii) availability of data sources and information gap analysis** **iv)** proposed structure of the final report; **v) evaluation work plan and timeline;** **vi)** annexes (i.e., organizing matrix for evaluation questions, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework, the field visit approach). The inception report will be 8-10 pages in length (excluding annexes).

6.3 Field Phase

The evaluation consultant/team will collect the data (primary and secondary) and information required to answer the evaluation questions in the field phase. Towards the end of the field phase, the evaluation consultant/team will conduct a preliminary analysis of the data to identify emerging findings that will be presented to the UNCT. The field phase includes:

- Meeting with the PUNOs to launch the data collection.
- Data collection at national and sub-national level
- Regular meetings with Evaluation Manager and RCO

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation consultant/team will hold a **debriefing meeting** to present the emerging findings from the data collection. The meeting will serve as a mechanism for the validation of collected data and information and the exchange of views between the evaluators and important stakeholders and will enable the evaluation consultant/team to refine the findings, formulate conclusions and develop credible and relevant recommendations.

6.4 Reporting phase

In the reporting phase, the evaluation consultant/team will continue the analytical work (initiated during the field phase) and prepare a **draft evaluation report**, considering the comments and feedback provided at the debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase. The draft report will be circulated to the **joint evaluation steering group** for review. If the quality of the draft report is unsatisfactory, the evaluation consultant/team will be required to revise the report and produce a second draft. Based on the comments, the evaluation consultant/team should make appropriate amendments, prepare the **final evaluation report**, and submit it to the evaluation manager. The final report should clearly account for the strength of evidence on which findings rest to support the reliability and validity of the evaluation. Conclusions and recommendations need to clearly build on the findings of the evaluation.

Each conclusion shall make reference to the evaluation question(s) upon which it is based, while each forward-looking and actionable recommendation shall indicate the conclusion(s) from which it logically stems.

Evaluation report will not exceed 30 pages excluding the executive summary and annexes. The structure of the report will be agreed with PUNOs and other stakeholders at the beginning of the assignment. The evaluation report is considered final once it is formally approved by the RCO. The final report should be compliant with UNEG quality checklist of evaluation reports.

6.5 Dissemination and Facilitation of Use Phase

In the dissemination and facilitation of use phase, the evaluation consultant/team will develop a **PowerPoint presentation** of the evaluation results that summarizes the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation in an easily understandable and user-friendly way. Also, an **evaluation brief** (a concise note) will be developed on the key results achieved and recommendations of the evaluation of the JP, thereby making them more accessible to a larger audience. The brief is distinct from the executive summary in the evaluation report, and it is intended for a broader and non-technical audience.

7. INDICATIVE TIMEFRAME, WORK PLAN AND DELIVERABLES

The table below indicates the key activities that will be undertaken throughout the evaluation process, as well as their duration or specific dates for the submission of corresponding deliverables.

Key Evaluation Phases and Activities	Dates/Duration	Responsible		
<i>Pre-preparation phase – 15 working days (27 March – 14 April)</i>				
Recruitment of the evaluation consultant/team (with validation from the RCO)	16 days	Lead Agency		
RC nominates the Evaluator Manager (not involved with the JP implementation).	2 days	RCO		
<i>Design Phase – 10 working days (17 April – 28 April)</i>			<i>1st deliverable (UNDP)</i>	
Evaluation kick-off meeting between the RCO, evaluation manager, JESG, and Lead Agency	1 day	RCO	20%	
Kick off meeting with Participated United Nations (PUNOs)				
Desk review of background information and documentation on JP (incl. bibliography and resources in the ToR)	7 days	Evaluation consultant/team		
Drafting of the inception report (incl. approach and methodology, theory of change, evaluation questions, final stakeholder map and sampling strategy, evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase, evaluation matrix)		Evaluation consultant/team		
Presentation of the draft inception report for comments and feedback		Evaluation consultant/team		
Revision of the draft design report and circulation of the final version to the evaluation manager for approval	2 days	Evaluation consultant/team		
<i>Field Phase - 17 working days (1 May – 23 May)</i>				<i>2nd Deliverable (ILO)</i>
Data collection (incl. interviews with key informants, site visits for direct observation, group discussions, desk review, etc.)	14 days	Evaluation consultant/team	35%	

Debriefing meeting to present emerging findings and preliminary conclusions after data collection	3 days	Evaluation consultant/team	
Reporting Phase - 10 working days (23 May – 6 June)			3rd Deliverable (UNICEF)
Drafting of the evaluation report and circulation to the evaluation manager	6 days	Evaluation consultant/team	30%
Review of the draft evaluation report by the RCO, JESG and HoAs	2 days	Evaluation Manager	
Drafting of the final evaluation report (incl. annexes) and circulation to the evaluation manager/EMG	2 days	Evaluation consultant/team	
Dissemination Phase – 7 working days (07 June – 15 June)			4th deliverable (WHO)
Development of the presentation on the evaluation results	3 days	Evaluation consultant/team	15%
Development of the evaluation brief		Evaluation consultant/team	
Publication of the final evaluation report, the evaluation brief	2 days	RCO	
Dissemination of the evaluation report and the evaluation brief to stakeholders	2 days	Lead Agency	

8. EVALUATION CONSULTANT/TEAM

The evaluation will be conducted by one (or a team) of independent, external evaluators, with extensive evaluation expertise with overall responsibility for carrying out the evaluation exercise. The selected consultant should present the following skills and qualifications:

- At least five years of proven relevant experience in development especially in the area of social protection, social registry, universal health, education, or related and preferably within non-profit organizations foundations, donor organizations and international organizations.
- Demonstrated experience in evaluation process on projects and programs, preferably with UN
- Strong substantial knowledge and experience in monitoring and evaluation with 5 or 10 years of proven progressive experience on program monitoring and evaluation.
- Demonstrated experience in analysing and managing quantitative and qualitative data.
- Familiarity with Santomean government program and policy is strongly an asset.
- Familiarity with the work and role of the United Nations is considered an added value.
- Strong attention to consistency, detail, and quality.
- Strong analytical, reporting, presentation and writing skills which demonstrate in the ability to write high quality, clear and concise report including to produced substantiated recommendations.

Language Proficiency

- Fluency in English (written & verbal) required

- Portuguese will be an asset

9. BUDGET AND PAYMENT MODALITIES

The consultant must submit a financial proposal at the time of application. The financial proposal is the lump sum including, fees, international travel and DSA, local transportation, etc. The payment will be based on the submission of deliverables, as follows:

1st Deliverable: Upon approval of the design report	20%
2nd Deliverable: Upon submission of a draft final evaluation report of satisfactory quality	35%
3rd Deliverable: Upon approval of the final evaluation report	30%
4th Deliverable: Upon approval of evaluation brief and the PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results	15%

Request Authorised by Section Head	Request Verified by HR: <i>Esaltina Almeida</i>
<i>Approval of Chief of Operations (if Operations):</i>	<i>Approval of Deputy Representative (if Programme)</i>
_____	_____
<i>Representative (in case of single sourcing/or if not listed in Annual Workplan)</i>	