Draft Terms of Reference

Independent Midterm Evaluation

Shan State: Peace, reconciliation and development through community empowerment

as of 18 January2017

ILO Project Code	MMR/14/01/EEC
ILO IRIS Code	105117
Project dates	15 March 2015-14 March 2019
Administrative Unit in charge of the project	Liaison Office -Myanmar
Unit in charge of backstopping	DEVINVEST, FPRW, SKILLS, ENTERPRISES, DWT-BANGKOK
Timing of evaluation	midterm
Type of Evaluation	Independent
Donor	EEC
Budget	US$ 8,235,294
Evaluation mission dates	13-24 March 2017
TOR preparation date	January 2017
Evaluation Manager	Pamornrat Pringsulaka, ROAP

Table of Contents

I.   Introduction

This EU funded programme "Shan State – Peace, Reconciliation and Development through community empowerment" – A consortium of ILO-FLD/EPRD-SCI-ASG-MDCG is coming to its mid-point given its commencement in March 2015, the midterm evaluation is thus due as per ILO evaluation policy.

The objective of this midterm evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence of the interventions' actions undertaken under the programme. The main focus of the evaluation is to assess if the project design and its theory of change remains valid and whether there have been any changes in the context where the programme operates. The midterm evaluation shall also identify challenges and new opportunities.   It will provide lessons learnt, recommendations and possible adjustments if needed for further programme improvement during the remaining period.

The midterm evaluation will seek to test the programme's theory of change – that ceasefire's have made possible efforts in the empowerment of conflict-affected communities and that such empowerment can make a measurable contribution to peace, reconciliation and development at the local level – specifically identifying what changes occurred, how and why they happened, what contributed to them and which might be judged more relevant and useful for other peace actors?

The evaluation will be carried out from March to May 2017 (with field work and interviews ideally conducted in March). It will be conducted in compliance with the principles, norms and standards for project evaluation set forth in the *ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: principles, rationales, planning and managing for evaluations, 2nd edition* (July 2013). The midterm evaluation will be carried out in close consultation with the consortium members, target group stakeholders and the EU.

Responsibility for management of the evaluation is with the ILO's Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, based at the ILO Regional office- Bangkok who has no prior involvement in the programme with oversight provided ILO Evaluation Office. The evaluation will be carried out by an independent external evaluator. The evaluation will be funded by evaluation provision of the programme and it will comply with UN Norms and Standards[1].

II.   Background and description of the programme

The programme is being delivered by a Consortium of organisations comprised of Aids Support Group (ASG), the Foundation for Local Development/Ethnic Peace Resources Project (EPRP), the Maggin Development Consultancy Group (MDCG), Save the Children (SC) and the ILO.   The ILO is the coordinator of the consortium.

 The five partners has been working with a variety of stakeholders in different areas in Shan State, Myanmar. The programme supports up to 80 villages in Shan North, East and State-wide (based on proximity to Ceasefire Liaison Offices – CLOs), reaching an estimated of 74,976 people.   The programme focuses specifically its implementation in the townships: Tachileik in East Shan, Kutkai and Namkham in Northern Shan and including Mansi in Kachin (across border from Northern Shan) and in areas of Southern and central Shan State, including southern Mawk Mai Township, Laikha and Mongshu.

---

[1] United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms and Standards for Evaluation. June 2016.

The overall objective of this programme is to contribute to peace, reconciliation and development through the empowerment of conflict affected communities in Myanmar. The project has three specific objectives:

(1) To provide opportunities for communities and local actors, including women and children, to be engaged in the peace and reconciliation process, supporting inclusive peace processes

(2) To support all stakeholders to create a safe and protective environment that supports effective and sustainable reintegration of children affected by conflict, and

(3) To facilitate participatory development in conflict-affected communities based on community Empowerment.

Consortium Programme Advisory Committee has been established. The members meet quarterly.

ILO core team for this programme comprises of a Chief Technical Adviser / Programme Manager, a National Project Co-ordinator, an M&E Officer and trainer, an engineer, a finance and administration officer and a driver. The team has technical input from other ILO staff, including an infrastructure expert; the ILO Yangon Liaison Office Programme Officer and (until end 2016) an international expert working on the prevention of the recruitment of child soldiers. The project team falls under the Deputy Liaison Officer along with projects on child labour, forced labour and migration.

Despite the first year of implementation of the programme taking place in a context of on-going and in some areas worsening conflict (recorded armed clashes were more frequent in Shan State - some 231 in the period March 2015 to March 2016) – the Consortium reports reasonable progress on implementation; specifically progress is judged as being identifiable in enabling conflict affected communities to discuss and articulate their concerns – with each other and with duty bearers.

III.   Purpose and scope of the evaluation

Purpose

The main purposes of the midterm independent evaluation is for programme improvements and to promote accountability to ILO key stakeholders and donor, and to enhance learning within the ILO and key stakeholders.

The main objective of the evaluation are as follows: -

- Assess the programme design and its theory of change, specifically whether it is still valid;
- Assess the relevance of the programme in responding to peace and reconciliation in Myanmar;
- Assess the effectiveness of the programme and the effectiveness of its management arrangement
- Assess the programme implementation efficiency;
- Provide recommendations;
- Identify emerging potential good practices and lessons learnt

Scope

The evaluation will focus on all interventions under the programme from the start until the time of the midterm evaluation. The evaluation will cover all the geographical coverage of the programme – security permitting for field visits. .

The evaluation should cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluator should reflect on them for learning purposes.

The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and evaluation report.

Client: The primary end users of the evaluation findings is the programme management team and the ILO Liaison Office in Myanmar, ILO technical departments. Secondary parties making use of the results of the evaluation will include the Consortium partners, the EU and tripartite constituents.

IV. Suggested aspects to be addressed

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (and potential impact) to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (i-eval resource kit)', 2013.

Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects" All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

Below are the main categories that need to be addressed:

1. **Design (the extent to which the design is logical and coherent)**
   - Does the programme design (i.e. priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities) and the underlying theory of change still valid given the limited progress in the peace process and the context which has seen conflict continuing in a number of areas in central and Northern Shan State? Assess whether the problems and needs that give rise to the programme still exists or have changed.
   - Does the design need to be modified in the second half of the programme?
   - How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the programme document in assessing the programme's progress? Are the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are indicators gender sensitive?
   - Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?
   - What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving its objectives?

2. **Relevance**
   - Examine whether the programme has responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and still is consistent and relevant to the needs of the peace and reconciliation process in Myanmar?
   - Is the programme relevant to the donors' priorities and policy, implementing partners' need? Are the programme results or approach strategic and include the comparative advantage of the ILO?

3. **Effectiveness (including effectiveness of management arrangement)**
   - Is the programme making sufficient progress towards its planned objectives? Particularly the empowerment activity efforts – assess whether its approach is effective.
   - Will the programme likely achieve its planned objectives upon completion? What are the main constraints, problems and areas in need of further attention?
   - Have the consortium members worked in supporting one another to enhance the effectiveness (and impact) of the interventions?
   - How other stakeholders been involved in programme implementation?
   - Does the programme monitoring plan exist and whether the baseline data has been collected and data collected over time?
   - Does the programme collaborate with other projects and programmes to enhance its impact and effectiveness?
   - What has been the role of Consortium Programme Advisory Committee? And does it work well? any areas of improvement needed?
   - Has the project received adequate administrative, technical and if needed, political support from concerned ILO offices (liaison Office, HQ technical department and DWT-Bangkok, if relevant)? If not why?

4. **Efficiency (A measure of how economically resources/inputs i.e.funds, expertise, time etc. are converted to result)**
   - Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve results? And have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that has been put in place?
   - Has there been a coherent implementation approaches among the consortium members? Given different geographical targeting by consortium partners, would it be possible for the consortium partners to undertake more activities collectively and collaboratively in the Consortium? If so what and how?
   - The extent to which the project resources have been leveraged with other related interventions to maximise impact, if any?

5. **Sustainability**
   - The extent to which the results of the intervention are likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed
   - How effective has the programme been in establishing national/local ownership?

6. **Special aspects to be addressed**

- Has there been any synergies/collaboration between the programme and other initiatives in the area? If so, is it likely to enhance the impact of the programme?
- The extent that the programme has promoted ILO's mandate on social dialogue and international labour standard
- The extent to which the programme has mainstreamed gender into its design, and implementation.

V.   Expected outputs of the evaluation

The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluator are:

1. Inception report: this report based on the Desk review should describe the evaluation instruments, reflecting the combination of tools and detailed instruments needed to address the range of selected aspects. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible. It will cover how the more detailed analysis on the focus areas will be integrated in the analysis and reporting.
2. Quantitative and qualitative data collected in the field.
3. Stakeholders' workshops, as part of the in-country field work to gather collective stakeholder views, present proposed focus of the evaluation and as part of full data collection.
4. Draft evaluation report for the project: the evaluation report should include and reflect on findings from the fieldwork and the stakeholders' workshop.
5. Final evaluation report after comments from stakeholders.
6. Upon finalization of the overall evaluation report, the evaluator will be responsible for writing a brief evaluation summary which will be posted on the ILO's website. This report should be prepared following the guidelines included in Annex and submitted to the evaluation manager.

Draft and Final evaluation reports include the following sections:

- ➢ Executive Summary *(standard ILO format)* with key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons and good practices *(each lesson learn and good practice need to be annexed using standard ILO format)*
- ➢ Clearly identified findings
- ➢ A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
- ➢ Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (i.e. specifying to which actor(s) apply)
- ➢ Lessons learned
- ➢ Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
- ➢ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
- ➢ Standard evaluation instrument matrix (adjusted version of the one included in the Inception report)

The entire draft and final reports (including key annexes) have to be submitted in English.

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 35 pages. This is excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated.

The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO, World Bank, and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

The draft reports will be circulated to key stakeholders (including the EU as the donor, the consortium members, tripartite constituents, other key stakeholders and partners and ILO staff i.e. programme management, ILO liaison Office in Myanmar, HQ technical departments, DWT Bangkok, ILO Regional office) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the evaluation manager and will be sent to the evaluation consultant to incorporate them into the revised evaluation report. The evaluation report will be considered final only when it gets final approval by ILO Evaluation Office.

VI.   Methodology

The ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation provide the general framework for carrying out the evaluation and writing the evaluation report, including the requirements for the recommendations made, lessons learned and good practices documented in the report (http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_176814/lang--en/index.htm).

These guidelines adhere to the evaluation norms and standards of the United Nations system, as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. In addition, the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation are to be followed by all parties involved with the process.

The evaluation is to be carried out independently and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the evaluator, in consultation with the evaluation manager. The following primary and secondary data collection techniques are recommended:

The evaluation process will be participatory. All consortium members and other key stakeholders will have the opportunity to be consulted, provide inputs to the ToR and evaluation report, and use the evaluation findings and lessons learnt, as appropriate.

a.   Sources of information and field visit

The evaluator will conduct a desk review first to be followed by interviews and field visits to programme areas[2] in Myanmar. He/she can make use of the sources of information exhibited below for desk review and interview, namely the review of selected documents (1.1), the consultation of the webpage of the programme (1.2) and the conduct of interviews (1.3).

1. Sources of information

1.1 Documents review

The evaluator will review the following documents to be provided by the programme management through e-mail:

Programme related document:-

---
[2] To be decided. Criteria for selecting the project site visits for the midterm evaluation –has to be established.

- the Description of the Action (the programme document)
- overview booklet setting out objectives and activities
- Inception period review
- Year 1 Interim Progress Report

Mission, meeting, workshop and training reports.
Project budgets – planned and actual- expenditures.
Monitoring and evaluation plan.

1.3 Individual interviews/focus group discussions

Individual interviews in person during the field visit, by phone, e-mail or Skype and/or a questionnaire survey can be conducted with the following:

a) ILO staff in Myanmar

- Mr. Rory Mungoven, Liaison Officer,
- Ms. Piyamal Pichaiwongse, Deputy Liaison Officer
- Mr. Matthew Soudan Maguire, ILO CTA and project staff (including the Administrative and Finance Officer), if relevant
- Mr. Selim Benaissa, Chief Technical Advisor, MyPEC
- Mr. Michel Jamar, Chief Technical Advisor, SME
- Ms. Elkaye Santos, Programme Officer

b) All representatives from the consortium and the donor (EU)
- Save the Children – Thanda Kyaw, Head Child Protection (thanda.kyaw@savethechildren.org)
- Foundation for Local Development – Alan Smith, Director (alansmith.cld@gmail.com)
- Maggin Development Consultancy Group – Maung Maung Kyaw Nyein Director (maungmaung.nyein111@gmail.com)
- Aids Support Group – Myint Aung, Director (asghfz01@gmail.com)
- Manuel DE RIVERA LAMO DE ESPINOSA, EU Delegation Yangon (Manuel.DE-RIVERA-LAMO@eeas.europa.eu)

c) Other key stakeholders:
- Community groups/ community organisations (*including Youth and Women's groups); CSOs and CBOs.
- Ethnic Armed Organisations – principally – the Restoration Council of Shan State – Shan State Army South; the Pa'oh National Liberation Organisation and (less so) the Shan State Progressive Party – Shan State Army North
- Local government officials and local political representatives
- Beneficiaries
- ILO tripartite constituents

   b.   The evaluator responsibilities and profile

Responsibilities	Profile
• Desk review of programme documents and other related documents • Development of the evaluation instrument • Briefing with ILO • Telephone interviews with HQ and DWT-Bangkok specialists • Undertake a field visit in Myanmar • Facilitate stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders • Draft evaluation report • Finalize evaluation • Draft stand-alone evaluation summary as per standard ILO format	• Not have been involved in the programme. • Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of complex development programmes, in particular with programme in conflict and post conflict areas • Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context - human rights based approach – inclusiveness • Adequate technical specialization in some of the subject areas of peace building, community empowerment, child rights, labour-based employment, local economic development will be an asset • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience • Experience in Myanmar will be an advantage • Fluency in spoken and written English and understanding of ILO cross-cutting issues • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.

VII.   Management arrangements

The evaluator will report to the *Evaluation Manager*, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org), Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Office in ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.   The evaluation manager takes the responsibility in drafting TOR in consultation with all concerned and will manage the whole evaluation process and will review evaluation report to make sure it has complied to the quality checklist of ILO evaluation report.

Evaluation Office in Geneva (EVAL) will do quality assurance of the report and give approval of the final evaluation report.

ILO Liaison Office for Myanmar and the ILO project management team will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission. The project management team will also assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda, and to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.

Roles of other key stakeholders: All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff, the donor, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, NGOs and other key partners will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They will have the opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and to the draft final evaluation report.

VIII.   Calendar and payment
The duration of this contract is for 25 working days between March to May 2017. The mission in Myanmar is expected during 13-24 March 2017.

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Proposed timeline	Number of days
I	Evaluator	o Desk Review of programme related documents o Telephone briefing with the evaluation manager, and project CTA o Preparation of the inception report	Early March	3
II	Evaluator (logistical support by the project)	o Field visit (to Liaison Office in Myanmar and to programme sites) o Interviews with project staff and other relevant stakeholders (including ILO officials –via skypes?) o Preparation of the workshop o Workshop with the programme management and ILO relevant offices for sharing of preliminary findings	13-24 March	10
III	Evaluator	o Analysis of data based on desk review, field visit, interviews/questionnaires with stakeholders o Draft report	Draft report to be submitted to Evaluation Manager by April 12	5
IV	Evaluation manager	o Circulate draft report to key stakeholders o Stakeholders provide comments o Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader	Second half of April	
V	Evaluator	o Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	By end April 2017	3
VI	Evaluation Manager	o Review the revised report and submit it to EVAL for final approval	Early 5 May 2017	
		Total no. of working days for Evaluator		21

The project will finance the evaluation. It can be spent on:

- Consultancy fee;
- Travel and DSA
- Stakeholders' workshop

Based on the TOR, the ILO will prepare an external collaborator contract with an evaluator.

Interpreters will be sourced to support the international evaluator in meetings and interviews where it is required

IX. LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines will be followed.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for Windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the ILO consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

X. Annex: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

1. Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluator)
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

2. Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

3. Checklist 5Preparing the evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

4. Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

5. Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

6. Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

7. Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

8. Template for evaluation title page
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

9. Template for evaluation summary:

http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc