Democratic Governance Outcome Evaluation

INTERNATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

Terms of Reference

1. BACKGROUND

Rwanda has made remarkable progress in recent decades following the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsis. This progress is marked by sustained economic growth, poverty reduction, national reconciliation, rule of law, and overall security of the country. However, several challenges remain in certain areas of democratic governance.

In line with UNDP’s Strategic Plan 2014-2017 “Changing with the world”, inclusive and effective democratic governance remains an important area of work for UNDP globally and UNDP Rwanda particularly. UNDP Rwanda has been engaged in the democratic governance sector for a long time.

The current programming cycle is aligned to the Government of Rwanda’s second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II) and the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP), both covering the 2013-2018 period.

In September 2015, the UN Member States adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which commits to promoting development in a sustainable way—economically, socially and environmentally—in all countries of the world, leaving no one behind and paying special attention to those people who are poorest or most excluded. It contains 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with associated targets to assess progress.

Given Rwanda’s progress in democratic governance, Rwanda was selected to be part of the global piloting phase on SDG 16, as an elaborated system for data collection, including baselines and targets, was already in place to track progress in governance, rule of law and security.¹

¹ Final report on illustrative work to pilot governance in the context of SDGs, RGB, Feb 2016
Delivering as One in Rwanda

Having been among the first pilot countries, Rwanda adopted the Delivering as One approach many years ago. The 2013 -2018 UNDAP outlines a common vision, planning, and implementation on how the UN system can support the national needs and priorities as described in Vision 2020 and the 2013-2018 Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy II (EDPRS II).

UNDP Rwanda actively participates in two Sector Working Groups of EDPRS II: The Justice and Rule of Law Sector and the Decentralization and Governance sector, including co-Chairing the technical working group on ICT for the first working Group and on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the latter SWG. The evaluation will be conducted at a time when broader development process, such as the elaboration of Vision 2050 and EDPRS III are taking place.

The 2013 -2018 UNDAP is centred around 4 key results areas:
- Inclusive Economic transformation
- Accountable Governance
- Human Development, Humanitarian Response and Disaster Management
- One UN Business Operations

The democratic governance portfolio of UNDP Rwanda is situated in Results Area 2 (‘Accountable Governance’). UNDP Rwanda acts as co-Chair of this Development Results Group, jointly with UN WOMEN, and is the overall lead agency in this results area.

The governance programs of UNDP Rwanda contribute to both outcome of this Results Area 2 ‘Accountable Governance’, namely Outcome 2.1. ‘Citizen Participation and Empowerment: accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels improved’ and Outcome 2.2. ‘Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights: human rights, justice and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels’.

UNDP Rwanda also acts as co-Chair of the Programmes, Policy and Oversight Committee (PPOC) of the One UN Rwanda.

Democratic Governance Portfolio

The Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit (DGPCU) of UNDP Rwanda is one of the two key programmatic units and leads the work in the governance area.

In addition to the roles mentioned above, UNDP Rwanda is also the lead agency for 3 One UN Joint Programmes situated in area of Democratic Governance:
1) Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizen Participation and Accountable Governance (DDAG);
3) Strengthening Civil Society organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance (CSOs).

The 3 Joint Programmes have the following UN partners:
- DDAG: UNDP, UN WOMEN, UNV and OHCHR
The implementing partners of these programmes are the following:

- **DDAG:**
  - the Rwanda Governance Board, which implements components related to generating evidence based research and assessments such as the production of the Rwanda Governance Score Card (RGS), as well as the Citizen Report Card, Mobile School of Governance and media reform activities;
  - the Media High Council, which is responsible for media capacity building activities;
  - the Rwandan Parliament, which is responsible for legislative and oversight components;
  - the National Forum for Political Organizations, which works towards strengthening the political engagement and dialogue among the youth and women;
  - National Electoral Commission, which is responsible for delivering free, fair and credible parliamentary, local level and presidential elections.

- **CSOs:**
  - Rwanda Governance Board, which is the national authority in charge of registering and monitoring national CSOs.

- **A2J:**
  - the Ministry of Justice (MINIUST), which implements activities related to access to justice and human rights protection; It also coordinates activities implemented by the Supreme Court, the National Public Prosecution Authority (NPPA) and the Rwanda law Reform Commission (RLRC).
  - the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), which implements Human Rights related activities;
  - the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which promotes unity and reconciliation among Rwandans; and the
  - Rwanda National Police (RNP), which implements activities related to crime prevention through implementation of community policing concepts, amongst others.

These three Joint Programme are primarily financed through UNDP core resources. The DDAG programme has received One UN funding, whereas the CSO Programme also received support from the Government of Switzerland. The A2J Program received additional support from the Fund for Developing Results Together (DRT-F). Detailed mid-term evaluations were conducted regarding the DDAG and A2J Programs (see list of reference documents); not regarding the CSO Programme as its implementation only started by May 2014.

In addition to these 3 Joint Programmes, the DGPCU of UNDP Rwanda is also supporting a programme with the Rwanda Peace Academy (RPA), as well as contributing to two other One UN Joint Programs: supporting the National Gender Machinery (NGM, UN WOMEN-led) and the Imbuto Foundation (UNFPA-led).

The DGPCU also hosts regular informal meetings on democratic governance of developments partners.
2. **PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, FOCUS AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

**Rationale and Purpose for an Outcome Evaluation**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts outcome evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level.

These are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Rwanda, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess the overall impact of UNDP’s development assistance in the Practice Area of Democratic Governance.

The area of Democratic Governance is a very dynamic field that brings together many different institutions.

The proposed outcome evaluation will evaluate the UNDP Rwanda’s contribution to further advance democratic governance in Rwanda during period 2013-2017. As mentioned above, the main vehicles to structure UNDP’s Rwanda support are the 3 Joint Programmes (DDAG, CSO, A2J).

The goal of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP’s governance programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions.

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to:

- Measure the impact of the UNDP Democratic Governance portfolio and its programmatic strategies.
- Provide substantive input and direction to the formulation of future strategies, including at programmatic level.
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in Rwanda.
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level;
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2017 towards the end of the current programme cycle 2013-2018 with a view to providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the new programming cycle starting from 2018 including the forthcoming new United National Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP) scheduled to start the same year.

3. **Objectives of the Outcome Evaluation**

The evaluation will assess how UNDP Rwanda’s governance programme results contributed to a change in development conditions of democratic governance in Rwanda in collaboration with other key actors in the governance area.

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution, through the Joint Programmes and beyond, in the following fields of democratic governance: citizen participation in decision making; evidence-based decision-making; timely and high-quality service delivery to citizens;
gender parity in leadership at all levels; political space; media development; strengthening of national civil society; access to equitable justice; enjoyment of human rights; building up of sustainable peace.

The specific objectives of the outcome evaluation are the following:

(i) To assess progress (what and how much) progress has been made towards advancing democratic governance (including contributing factors and constraints),

(ii) to assess whether the programme/project is the appropriate solution to the identified problem(s);

(iii) To assess the relevance of and progress made in terms of the UNDP outputs and assess sustainability of results and benefits (including an analysis of both programme/project activities and soft/technical-assistance activities),

(iv) To assess the alignment of the democratic governance portfolio to national development priorities, UNDAP and UNDP’s Strategy 2014 -2017

(v) Evaluate the contribution that UNDP has made/is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome (including an analysis of the partnership strategy),

(vi) to reflect on how efficient the use of available resources has been;

(vii) to document and provide feedback on lessons learned and best practices generated by the programmes during their implementation;

(ix) to identify unintended results that emerged during implementation (beyond what had initially been planned for);

(x) to ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.

(xi) to provide feedback and recommendations for subsequent decision making and necessary steps that need to be taken by the national stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the programme’s outcomes/results;

(xii) Assess the level of gender mainstreaming and human rights based approach to programming and progress against gender equality and human rights expected results.

(xiii) Identify possible future intervention strategies and issues.

Starting from the current UNDP governance portfolio, the evaluation will be forward looking and outline options for a most optimal future portfolio balance and structure in the next programming cycle.

4. **Scope and Focus of the Outcome Evaluation**

The evaluation will look at UNDP’s intervention in a holistic and comprehensive manner, including SWOT analysis of different approaches and programmes.

The primary scope of evaluation will focus on the contributions made by the DDAG, CSOs and A2J Joint Programmes in advancing democratic governance, while not excluding the other contributions made by the DGPCU as described above.

The evaluation will be assess how the programs mainstreamed the UN programming principles subscribed during the program elaboration phase with particular focus on Gender Equality and women empowerment (GEWE), human rights& capacity development.

More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following:
**Outcome status:** Determine whether the outcome (i.e. advancing democratic governance) has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement, and identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance and adequacy of UNDP outputs to the outcome. Evaluate if programme strategies and activities were relevant to achieve outcomes and what is their contribution to recorded outcome achievements. Identify democratic governance changes in comprehension, practices, behaviours which could be attributed to programme activities and outputs.

**Underlying factors:** Analyse the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome including SWOT and PESTEL analysis. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, potential financial constraints, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

**Strategic Positioning of UNDP:** Examine the distinctive characteristics, comparative advantages and features of UNDP’s governance programme and how it has shaped UNDP’s relevance as a current and potential partner in Rwanda. The Country Office (CO) position will be analysed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP’s relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating potential added value by responding to partners’ needs, mobilizing resources for the benefit of the country, not for UNDP, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP services and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in area of democratic governance.

**Partnership strategy:** Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP and how it contributed to support programme activities? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation including of IPs, UN agencies and development partners? Examine the interagency UN collaboration and partnership among development partners in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the environment’s outcome to the country’s needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in governance. Assess the role pattern and stakeholder’s analysis to determine how the partnership benefited the programme outcomes.

**Lessons learnt:** Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas, in relation to management and implementation of programme activities to achieve related outcome. This will support learning lessons about UNDP’s contribution to the governance outcome over the UNDAP cycle to inform an optimal assistance strategy for the programming cycle. Identify cross -learning themes from the programme experimentation captured during the course of programme activities implementation. Identify opportunities that could inform next programme design and programming.

5. **The Evaluations Questions**

The consultants will pay consideration to the following:

a) **Relevance**
   - Extent to which UNDP support is relevant to Rwanda’s Vision 2020 agenda, EPDRS II, UNDAP and those that are currently being developed (Vision 2050, EDPR III, SDG domestication)?
• Extent of the progress towards advancing democratic governance?
• To which extent does One UN influence the relevance of UNDP support in the governance sector?
• How relevant is UNDP’s support for different partners: national authorities of Rwanda, development partners, civil society, and the private sector?
• To what extent did the programme results contribute to the UNDAP and EDPRS II results in the areas of Accountable Governance and the issues related to the Rule of law?
• Were the strategies adopted and the inputs identified, realistic, appropriate and adequate for the achievement of the results? Is there any need to change the focus in view of the next programming?
• Do the programmes continue to be relevant to the GOR priorities in governance?
• How did the programmes mainstream the UN programing principles?

b) Efficiency
• How much time, resources, capacities and effort it takes to manage the programmes and, including the entire portfolio, and where are the gaps if any? More specifically, how do UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints; capabilities affect the performance of the programmes and Portfolio? Has UNDP’s strategy in producing the programme outputs been efficient and cost-effective?
• Extent of M&E contribution to achieve the programme outcome and outputs’ indicators
• Roles, engagement and coordination among various stakeholders in the governance sector, One UN Programme in project implementation? Were there any overlaps and duplications?
• Extent of synergies among One UN programming and implementing partners?
• Synergies between national institutions for UNDP support in programming and implementation including between UNDP and development partners?
• Could a different approach have led to better results? What would be those approaches?
• Do the programmes’ activities overlap or duplicate interventions?

c) Effectiveness
• Extent of UNDP’s effectiveness in producing results at the local levels and at the aggregate national level? Extent of UNDP support towards capacity development of partners, advocacy on governance issues and policy advisory services in Rwanda?
• Assessment of UNDP’s work on advocacy to scale up best practices and desired goals; UNDP’s role and participation in national debate and ability to influence national policies?
• Extent of UNDP’s contribution to human and institutional capacity building of implementing partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?
• Was the scope of interventions realistic and adequate to achieve results?
• Assess the programmatic approach with other approaches used by UNDP and in the sector (e.g. policy advisory services, technical assistance)?
• Contributing factors and impediments to the achievement of the outcome through related supported project outputs?
• Assessment of the capacity and institutional arrangements for the implementation of the UNDP governance portfolio in view of UNDP support to the GoR and within the context of Delivering as One?
• Extent of UNDP partnership with civil society and private sector in promoting democratic governance in Rwanda?
• Are programmes effective in responding to the needs of beneficiaries, and what are result achieved?
• Extent to which established coordination mechanisms enabled achievements of programme outcomes and outputs?

**d) Sustainability**

• Extent to which UNDP established mechanisms ensure sustainability of the governance interventions?
• Extent of the viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcome?
• Provide preliminary recommendations on how the governance portfolio can most effectively support appropriate central authorities, local communities and civil society in improving service delivery in a long-term perspective?
• Assess possible areas of partnerships with other national institutions, CSOs, UN Agencies, private sector and development partners in Rwanda?
• Assess how governance studies and available data are used to build the sustainability of the programmes?
• What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the programmes and benefits after the completion of current program cycle?
• What are the main lessons that have emerged from each programme implementation?

However, the evaluation team is expected to add and refine these questions in consultation with key stakeholders.

Based on the above analysis, provide overall and specific recommendations on how UNDP Rwanda Country Office should adjust and orient its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, monitoring and evaluation strategies, working methods, approaches and/or management structures and capacities to ensure that the governance portfolio fully achieves its outcome by the end of the UNDAP period and beyond.

6. **METHODOLOGY**

An evaluation approach is indicated below, however, the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also approved by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team. The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluations Norms and Standards for Evaluation and OECD/DAG Principles.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful and must be easily understood by programme partners.

Data will be mainly collected from the existing information sources through a comprehensive desk review that will include the analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, and triangulation of different studies. The key documents to be considered during the desk review are mentioned in Annex under List of Recommended documents.
The in-depth desk review will be followed by:

• Interviews with all key partners and stakeholders
• Questionnaires where appropriate
• Field Visits to selected project sites and partner institutions, considering the geographic location of the participants’ beneficiaries and their involvement in the assessment of programmes results.
• Participatory observation, focus group discussions, rapid appraisal techniques
• Validation workshop including all stakeholders, (partners and selected beneficiaries who participated in the programmes)

The evaluation will include a wide participation through interviews, discussions, and consultations of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the GoR institutions, CSOs as well as development partners, private sector representatives, and beneficiaries.

Briefing and debriefing sessions with UN and the Government officials, and potentially development partners, are envisaged.

Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible. Data should especially examine the programmes impact in terms of creating equal opportunities for women and men or addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment issues.

A design matrix approach relating objectives and/or outcomes to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives.

The formulated recommendations should be solution-oriented and as specific as possible.

The evaluation ratings to be used are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Outputs/Deliverables of the Evaluation

1. Inception Report: The inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology,
evaluation questions, key informants, data sources and collection analysis tools for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated.

2. **Draft Governance Outcome Evaluation Report to be put forward during pre-validation workshop (30-50 pages).** The report will be reviewed by all stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation meet quality criteria.

3. **Final Governance Outcome Evaluation Report,** integrating feedback voiced during pre-validation workshop 10 days after receiving the draft report.

   The deliverables will be drafted in English.

8. **Duty Station**

The duty station of the work is Kigali, Rwanda. However, the consultant(s) may be required to travel to project sites outside Kigali but in Rwanda.

9. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

   The individual consultants shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

   - 30% after adoption of the inception reports
   - 50% after presentation and approval of the draft reports
   - 20% after the approval of the final reports

   The consultancy fee instalments will be paid as Lump Sum Amounts inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy. The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

10. **Required expertise and qualifications**

   The Evaluation will be composed of an individual international consultant who will take the lead and one national consultant who are knowledgeable and experienced in conducting outcome evaluations and have strong background on governance issues.

   Gender balance considerations will be considered throughout the evaluation process.

   **Specific Qualifications:**

   The International consultant will:

   - Will be assigned as the team leader in support with a national consultant
   - Have a strong background in participatory evaluation of development programmes;
   - Hold a Master’s Degree in political science, governance, law, international development, or other related areas and at least 15 years’ experience in conducting and leading evaluations/researches.
• Have sound knowledge and practical experience in programme development, formulation, monitoring and evaluation, including experience in the UN development cooperation system;
• Have several years’ experience in working in developing countries, preferably including in Rwanda.
• Have extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance, inclusive participation, access to justice, human rights promotion, conflict prevention and peace building and support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections;
• Have experience in evaluating similar programmes.
• Have strong communication, facilitation and management skills.
• Have good team work experience and skills.
• Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as human rights-based approaches will be an added advantage.
• Have excellent reading and writing skills in English. Knowledge of French is an asset.
• Be fully acquainted with UNDP’s Results-Based Management orientation and practices development.

Management Arrangements for the Evaluation

• UNDP will contract the 1 international consultant as a team leader working with the support of the national consultant.
• UNDP as the focal point for the evaluation will facilitate the logistical requirements for consultant including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.
• An Evaluation Committee will be set up, comprised of UNDP staff as well representatives of implementing partners. The head of the UNDP’s DGPCU will provide overall oversight with the Head of UNDP’s Management Support Unit technical oversight, quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria.

11. Duration and Work Schedule of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted starting in September 2017 for an estimated 42 working days.

Upon signing of the contract, the consultant will be given the necessary working documents for reference and all necessary information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Time allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Meeting Initial briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents review and stakeholder consultations</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft Evaluation Report

Validation Workshop

Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP and GoR

| Final evaluation report | 7 days |

### Selection Criteria

Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

- **a. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- **b. Personal CV or P11**, indicating all experience from similar evaluations, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- **c. Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- **d. Financial and Technical Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

### Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:

1. The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%

2. A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and compared. Only proposals that achieve above the minimum of 49 points (i.e. at least 70% of the total 70 points) on the technical proposal shall have their financial proposals reviewed.

3. Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)

4. If the technical proposal achieves the minimum of 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial proposal will be considered in the following manner:

5. The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g.

6. \[30 \text{ Points} \times \left(\frac{\text{US$ lowest}}{\text{US$ other}}\right) = \text{points for other proposer’s fees}\]

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:
### Technical Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least Master’s Degree in political science, governance, law, international development, or other related areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance, inclusive participation, support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections; rule of law, access to justice, human rights and conflict prevention;</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation; experience in evaluating similar programmes; experience in gender and human rights mainstreaming.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 15 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors; and demonstrable experience working for the United Nations System</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in English and a working knowledge of one of the other language</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 12. Format of the final evaluation report

The key product expected from this programme evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents but could adjusted with the approval of UNDP:

- **Title and opening pages**
  - Name of the evaluation intervention
  - Names and organizations of evaluators
  - Acknowledgements
- **Table of contents**
- **List of acronyms and abbreviations**
- **Executive Summary**
- **Introduction**
- **Description of the intervention**
- **Evaluation scope and objectives**
- **Description of the evaluation methodology**
  - Findings and conclusions
  - Programme Relevance
  - Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome
  - Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness
    - Internal programme efficiency
Partnership strategy
  - Changes in context and outside of programme control
  - Sustainability of results

- Recommendations

- Lessons Learned (including good practices and lessons learned)
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

Annex - List of Recommended Documents

1. Republic of Rwanda, Constitution
2. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
4. United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018
5. United Nations Rwanda, Mid-Term Evaluation of UNDAP 2013-2018
7. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms and Standards for Evaluation
8. 2012 Governance Outcome Evaluation -UNDP Rwanda
9. Project documents: DDAG, CSOs and A2J
10. Mid-term evaluations of DDAG and A2J
12. Overview of financial expenditure of DDAG, CSO and A2J from the start till present
13. Annual reports of the Sector Working Groups JRLOS and Decentralization and Governance
14. 2015 UPR report for Rwanda (CSO, NCHR, UN Compilation, GoR) and subsequent action plan
15. Gender Audit Documentation of 20 years of Reconciliation (NURC)
16. 2015 UPR reports (GoR, CSO coalition, NCHR, UN Compilation.
17. Rwanda Governance Scorecards (2010-2016)

Studies, Surveys and Evaluations

18. Rwanda Reconciliation Barometers (2010 -2016)
19. Citizen report cards
20. Media barometer
21. Rwanda Governance Score Card 2015
22. Gender Audit JRLOS Final Report 2015
23. Civil Society Development Barometer 2015