

Terms of Reference

Independent End-Term Evaluation of SDGF: More, better and inclusive jobs in Cabo Delgado and Nampula: Harnessing the opportunities of Mozambique's New Economy

1. General Context & rationale for evaluation

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learnt, and best practices of the MDG Fund and the MDG experience, while focusing on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships and gender and women's empowerment as cross-cutting priorities in all our areas of work. The SDG Fund aims to act as a bridge in the transition from MDGs to SDGs providing concrete experiences on how to achieve a sustainable and inclusive world as part of 'Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.'

As per the TORs on designing SDGF Joint Programmes and in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in November 2005, which provides for systematic evaluation of projects/programmes in order to improve quality, accountability, transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision making process and support to constituents in advancing decent work and social justice, **all joint programmes will commission an independent final evaluation in the last three months of implementation.**

The current end term evaluation covers all UN participating agencies: ILO, UNDP and UNIDO.

2. Brief background on project and context

Project codes	Project Code : M25010139011 Project Symbol : MOZ1450MUND
Project duration	28 months-January 30, 2015 to April 30, 2017
Geographical coverage	Cabo Delgado and Nampula provinces, Mozambique
Donor	SDG-F with funds from the Spanish Cooperation
Budget	US \$1,500,000

The programme was designed to contribute to improved articulation, across stakeholders, to promote sustainable livelihoods for young people (both male and female) and female headed households, through adjusting economic policies and strategies to generate sustainable employment based on documented facts that Multi-National Enterprises (MNEs), and extractive industry (EI) in particular, represent an opportunity which is far from being exhausted in terms of absorption of local labour and

the integration of local small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in their value chains to the benefit of local economies.

Recognizing that for a small economy like Mozambique, the ongoing and expanding development of the EI sector should have a positive and transformative impact on socio- economic development and for governance. Youth employment and extractive industries represent two of three "signature" issues for the UN in Mozambique, a choice derived from a perceived urgency to tackle poverty-related issues like social exclusion and economic disparities a contribution to conflict-prevention whilst at the same time strengthening the role of the UN as a trustworthy partner between government, business and labour organizations and civil society.

The development challenges that the programme address are the current low impact of MNE on wealth and job creation particular in the natural resource extraction sector in Mozambique. While investment in EIs contributes positively to increasing GDP and government revenue, the effect on broader based prosperity has so far been marginal for three reasons:

Firstly, many of the jobs created in and around EI mega-projects have not directly resulted in employment opportunities for young Mozambicans. For example, in 2010 the five main mega-projects combined only created an estimated 3,800 direct jobs and Government approved private investments with an estimated value of US\$3.4 billion in 2011 are projected to create a mere 33,871 new jobs – an equivalent cost of US\$ 1,385 million per direct job. The challenge is that the majority of these jobs are highly skilled and specialized whereas the vast majority of young Mozambicans can only offer low-skilled or un-skilled labour, with women falling largely under the last category

Secondly, national firms often fail to source MNEs with local content. "Local content" generally refers domestic value chains. As positive first step the Ministry of Mineral Resources has recognized the policy challenges of during the consultations leading to the designing a draft regulation of the local content strategies for mineral investors. Although the development of local content strategies is expected be implemented in mining concessions, the enforcement of this policy tool may be confronted with a weak manufacturing sector and industrial policies and strategies acknowledged by Government and partners to be in need of urgent upgrading to conform with the present socio-economic and technological challenges. For example, while the value of locally purchased goods and services in 2011 stood at \$350 million, the figure pales compared to the multi-billion dollar investments made by MNEs in the same year.

Thirdly, and related to the above, local SMEs remain excluded from the benefits related to the extractive industries since business (small supplier, big buyer) linkages and value chain development, which could maximize employment creation and local transactions, are far from being made a reality.

For example, several thousand people will need to be resettled to develop the Afungi project in Palma District in Cabo Delgado Province, but the environmental and social impact assessment study commissioned by the investors makes no reference to livelihood creation or to the affected communities.

Based on this analysis, the programme was designed to address these development challenges through promoting and facilitating the development of gender sensitive employment policy, work force skills, and the productive capacity of SMEs and business linkages in partnership with selected MNEs operating in the provinces of Cabo Delgado and Nampula.

With the ultimate goal of supporting the creation of gender friendly, sustainable, new jobs for young men and women and the development of sustainable SMEs the programme objective is pursued through four main outcomes:

- I. JP Outcome 1: MNEs in the extractive industries comply with local content policies, environmental friendly sustainable business practices, and apply gender and age sensitive recruitment policies to hire nationals.
- II. JP Outcome 2: An improved and more egalitarian workforce with vocational skills and competencies have improved employability opportunities in Extractive Industries firms and in SMEs operating in value chains feeding into the EI sector.
- III. JP Outcome 3 National/Local SMEs capitalize on supply chain/value chain opportunities and provide environmentally sustainable services and products to the extractive industries
- IV. JP Outcome 4: the Government of Mozambique and its partners have access to reliable quality data and baseline information on the indicators selected to assess progresses and changes from a quantitative and qualitative perspective on the interventions identified.

[Link to the UNDAF](#)

The programme contributes to UNDAF (2011-2016) Outcome 2:

“Vulnerable groups access new opportunities with special focus on decent employment to improve their income and quality of life”. And more specifically to the following outputs:

Output 2.1: Selected Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) in 5 poorest provinces adopt market and value chain-oriented management and business practices

Output 2.2: MSMEs in the five poorest provinces have access to effective market models and information systems

Output 2.3: Selected MFIs provide increasingly inclusive micro-financial products in line with the needs of vulnerable groups

Output 2.4: MITRAB and key Ministries have the know-how to operationalize gender sensitive decent employment policies and strategies in coordination with other relevant stakeholders

The programme contributes simultaneously to some of the Governance outcomes:

Outcome 6: “Strengthened democratic governance systems and processes guaranteeing equity, rule of law, and respect of human rights at all levels”,

Outcome 7: “Quality of participation of civil society representatives improved in selected provincial Development Observatories, selected District Consultative Councils, and APRM National Forum”, and

Outcome 8: “Government and civil society provide coordinated, equitable and integrated services at decentralized level”.

Project management arrangement

The Joint Programme is composed of 3 UN participating Organizations, being the ILO the Coordinating Agency. The ILO appointed a programme coordinator responsible for the implementation of the ILO’s component and also focal point for the activities to be implemented jointly by all the agencies involved in the program. The Programme Coordinator represents the program and ensure the coordination of the joint delivery. Because of budget constraints UNDP and UNIDO don’t have any staff paid by the program, however they ensure the participation of staff paid with matching funds and provide all the support in the field to facilitate the coordination at provincial level and the implementation of the activities of the other agencies.

To ensure the governance and the sustainability of the program the Joint Programme established a National Steering Committee that has overall responsibility for Programme activities. Provides strategic guidance and oversight and approve the Programme Document including subsequent revisions and Annual Work Plans and Budgets. The National Steering Committee is co-chaired by the UN Resident Representative and the Deputy Minister of Labour with the participation of a representative from Government of Spain and Representatives of the Ministries partners of the program. For the operational coordination of the Joint Programme a Programme Management Committee was established and consists of relevant implementing parties such as Participating UN organizations, Government representatives and civil society representatives as appropriate.

3. Overall goal of the evaluation

To promote accountability, organizational learning, stocktaking of achievements, performance, impacts, good practices and lessons learnt from implementation towards SDGs.

Also, enables programme staff, constituents and other relevant stakeholders assess whether programme outcomes have been met and take stock of lessons learnt that maybe relevant for follow-up phase. The evaluation provides an opportunity for taking stock, reflection, learning and sharing knowledge regarding how the project has performed vis a vis defined project outcomes.

4. Scope of the evaluation and specific objectives

This final evaluation serves three main purposes:

- i. Give an independent assessment of progress to date of the project across the four outcomes; assessing performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement at output level; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities in Mozambique;
- ii. Evaluate the impact of the programme against the proposed changes or outcomes.
- iii. Provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons learnt to improve future related projects/programmes.

This final evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- a. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase. Meaning, measure the relevance of the joint programme according to the needs assessment, and choice of action plans, partners and modalities of implementation.
- b. Measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised
- c. Assess internal and external factors that influenced speed of implementation
- d. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained the results originally foreseen in their project document, M&E frameworks, etc.
- e. Measure the impact of the joint programme on the achievement of the SDGs and UNDAF and relevance of the initiative within national development priorities/frameworks
- f. Assess the extent of government buy-in, support and participation in the initiative, creating the basis for the sustainability of the results attained

- g. Assess management of the operation of the project, including staff management
- h. Assess synergies with other relevant ILO, UNIDO, UNDP, ILO and UNW projects/programmes and activities
- i. Assess knowledge management and sharing, including the information and communication component of the Programme
- j. Assess results based measurement and impact assessment systems
- k. Assess systems for risk analysis and assessment
- l. Identify and document substantive lessons learnt and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic areas and crosscutting issues: gender, sustainability and public private partnerships

Recipients of the evaluation

The primary recipients of the evaluation are the Government of Spain, under Spanish Cooperation as donor of the SDGF, the SDGF, the government of Mozambique as recipient country, constituents, the ILO, UNIDO and UNDP as executers of the project, the UNRCO, as well as other relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, ILO, UNIDO and UNDP offices and staff involved in the initiative.

The evaluation process will be participatory.

All parties involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation findings and lessons learnt.

5. Evaluation criteria and questions

As per the SDGF evaluation guidelines, the evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability which matches ILO evaluation concerns such as i) relevance and strategic fit, ii) validity of design, iii) project progress and effectiveness, iv) efficiency of resource use, v) effectiveness of management arrangements and vi) impact orientation and sustainability as defined in ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation¹. Gender concerns will be based on the ILO Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (September, 2007). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms² and the *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management* developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO,

¹ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 2012

² ST/SGB/2000 Regulation and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation

the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the outcomes/immediate objectives of the project using the logical framework indicators.

Key Evaluation Questions

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and achieving the SDGs

- a) To what extent was the joint programme aligned with national development strategies and the UNDAF for Mozambique?
- b) Is the project relevant to achieve the targets set in relevant regional and global commitments?
- c) Do the beneficiaries consider the projects objectives and approach relevant?
- d) To what extent are the objectives of the joint programme still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?
- e) How has the joint programme contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular with reference to the baseline situation?
- f) To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges described in the programme document?
- g) To what extent have the implementing partners participating in the joint programme contributed added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
- h) How well does the project complement and fit with other ongoing ILO/UNIDO/UNDP programmes and projects in the country.
- i) What links are established so far with other activities of the UN or non-UN international development aid organizations at local, country and international level?
- j) What is the strategic fit with the Spanish Cooperation Strategy and synergies with relevant Spanish Cooperation initiatives and programmes and information sharing with Spanish Cooperation i.e. the Embassy of Spain in Maputo.

Validity of design

- a) The adequacy of the design process (was the project design logical and coherent)? What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of ILO/UNIDO/UNDP to meet projected targets?
- b) Validity, relevance and potential synergies of the Joint Programme

- c) Do outputs causally link to the intended outcomes that in turn link to the broader development objective? Has the design clearly defined performance indicators with baselines and targets?
- d) Considering the results that were achieved so far, was the project design realistic?
- e) Has the project adequately taken into account the risks of blockage?
- f) Has the project integrated an appropriate strategy for sustainability?
- g) Has the project carried out a proper consultation and involvement of ILO tripartite constituents, government, development partners, civil society and other partners during planning, implementation and monitoring?
- h) Have gender issues been addressed in the project document? If so how?
- i) Has HIV and AIDS been mainstreamed into the project's response? If so how?
- j) Does the programme align with UNIDO's mainstream strategy for ISID objectives?

Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

- a) To what extent did the joint programme attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the programme document? Are there any unintended results of the project?
- a) Were outputs produced and delivered so far as per the work plan? Has the quantity and quality of these outputs been satisfactory? How do the stakeholders perceive them? Do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?
- b) In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the project have the greatest achievements so far? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- c) How effective were the backstopping support provided (other field offices, regional office, HQ) to the programme?
- d) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
- e) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- a) Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- b) Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- c) Have targets and indicators been sufficiently defined for the project?

- d) How effectively the project management monitored project performance and results? Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is relevant information systematically collected and collated? Is the data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?
- e) Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - political support from the ILO/UNIDO/UNDP offices and specialists and the responsible technical units in headquarters?
- f) Is the project receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners/implementing partners?
- g) Is the project collaborating with other programmes and with other donors in the country/region to increase its effectiveness and impact?
- h) Are all relevant stakeholders involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?

Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

- a) To what extent was the joint programme's management model (governance and decision-making structure, i.e. lead agency, Joint Programme Coordinator, Programme Management Committee and National Steering Committee, financial management and allocation of resources, i.e. one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- b) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to single-agency interventions? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
- c) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices did the implementing partners use to promote/improve efficiency?
- d) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?
- e) Are resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated and used strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives?
- f) Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?
- g) Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? Are they being used efficiently

- h) How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?

Impact – Positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs

- a) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the SDGs?
- b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the targeted cross-cutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, public private partnerships (PPPs) and sustainability at the local and national levels?
- c) Is the programme strategy, programme management and project activities steering towards impact and sustainability? identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives
- d) Has the project started building the capacity of people and national institutions or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, people's skills, attitudes etc.)?
- e) What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation and results of the joint programme?
- f) To what extent did the joint programme have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
- g) What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint programme have, if any?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term

- a) Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint programme to ensure results and impact, i.e. policy, policy coordination mechanisms, partnerships, networks?
- b) Is the programme strategy, programme management and project activities steering towards impact and sustainability? identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives
- c) Has the project started building the capacity of people and national institutions or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, people's skills, attitudes etc.)?
- d) To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
- e) To what extent will the joint programme be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?

Lessons learned

- a) What good practices, success stories, lessons learnt and replicable experiences have been identified from the programme? Please describe and document them
- b) What should have been different, and should be avoided in an event of a next phase of the project

6. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review, consultations at central level with management and staff from the three participating agencies, constituents, government authorities (programme counterparts), related UN Agencies, Spanish Cooperation as well as other relevant bilateral donors and field visit to the implementing Provinces/Districts for purposes of consulting with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders. Consultations with relevant units and officials from the Agencies Headquarters or Regional offices will be done and the method for doing so will be decided by the evaluation team. The evaluation team will review inputs by ILO/UNIDO/UNDP and non ILO/UNIDO/UNDP stakeholders involved in the project, from project staff, constituents and a range of partners from the private and civil sectors.

This final evaluation will make use of:

- All relevant secondary information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, evaluations provided by the project management and Field and HQ backstopping officers and
- Primary information sources including: interviews, surveys, etc. to ensure participatory approach and appropriate consultation and engagement of stakeholders
- Triangulating of information to allow for validation and discern discrepancies

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory approaches.

The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. This will guide the final evaluation instrument which should be finalized in consultation with the evaluation manager. The evaluation team will review the documents before conducting any interview.

The draft evaluation report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (5 working days). The evaluation team will seek to apply a variety of evaluation techniques – desk review, meetings with stakeholders, focus group discussions, field visits, informed judgement, and scoring, ranking or rating techniques.

Subject to the decision by the evaluation team a guided Open Space workshop with key partners may be organised in Maputo.

The evaluation team will undertake group and/or individual discussions with project staff from the four agencies. The evaluation team will also interview key staff of other ILO/UNIDO/UNDP projects, and ILO/UNIDO/UNDP staff responsible for financial, administrative and technical backstopping of the project at Regional or HQ level. An indicative list of persons to be interviewed will be furnished by the project team after further discussion with the Evaluation Manager.

Around the end of the data collection exercise, the evaluation team will make a debriefing to the Resident Coordinator, the project team and the evaluation manager.

7. Main outputs/ evaluation deliverables

The Evaluator will provide the following deliverables:

Inception Report:

An inception report outlining the approach and workplan to be used in the evaluation.

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme this report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation manager.

Draft Final Report

The draft final report will follow the same format as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 30-40 pages in length.

Final Evaluation Report

The final report should be produced according to the ILO and SDGF evaluation guidelines and reflecting the key evaluation questions.

The maximum length of the final report should be 30-40 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than five pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The final report will be sent to the evaluation manager.

The expected structure of the final report, as per ILO and SDFG guidelines should be:

1. Cover Page
2. Executive Summary – a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations.
3. Acronyms
4. Introduction
 - a. Background, goal and methodological approach
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation
 - c. Evaluation methodology
 - d. Constraints and limitations of the study conducted
5. Description of the Project
6. Description of the development interventions carried
 - a. Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
7. Main Findings/ Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)
8. Conclusions
9. Recommendations
10. Lessons learned and good practices
11. Annexes

The evaluator is required to append the following items:

- Terms of Reference
- Data collection instruments
- List of meetings / consultations attended
- List of persons or organisations interviewed
- List of documents / publications reviewed and cited
- Lessons learnt based on the ILO templates
- Good practices based on the ILO templates

The Evaluation Manager will solicit and revert promptly with collective feedback from project staff and partners, including the Senior Evaluation Officer in ROAF in order for the evaluator to finalize the report. The quality of the report (Executive summary and body of the report) will be assessed against the ILO evaluation checklists 4 and 5 and SDGF evaluation guidelines, which must be strictly adhered to and all questions in the ToR should be sufficiently dealt with in the report. Adherence to these checklists will be considered a contractual requirement when submitting evaluations to ensure full remuneration of the contract. Once the final report is submitted to the Evaluation Manager incorporating comments received, it will be sent for final approval to the Senior Evaluation Officer in ROAR and EVAL before remuneration of the contract. All evaluation report submissions must include a MS Word and a PDF version and a suggested outline is contained in Appendix C.

8. Management arrangements, work plan & time frame

The evaluation will be undertaken by a team formed of at least one international consultant and one national consultant. The team of consultants will take responsibility of the evaluation exercise as well as the evaluation report. He/she will be a highly qualified senior evaluation specialist with extensive experience from evaluations and ideally also the subject matter in question: creation of gender friendly, sustainable, new jobs for young men and women and the development of sustainable SMEs

The evaluation consultant will report to the evaluation manager (Mrs. Denise Monteiro, monteirod@iloguest.org) and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise. The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support and services of the Project, with the administrative support of the ILO projects Office in Maputo.

The total duration of the evaluation process is estimated to be 22 working days from 24th April, 2017 to 31st May, 2017. The independent consultant will spend a total of 5 field working days (2.5 in each) in

Cabo Delgado and Nampula Provinces. The ILO CTA will be the direct focal point for support during this time.

The draft report should be submitted for comments by 22nd May, 2017 to the Evaluation Manager, Mrs Monteiro. Three working days will be allocated to concerned parties to provide inputs, where after the Evaluation Manager will return the draft report to the consultant by 26th May, 2017. The final report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager and CTA, copying the Senior Technical Specialist by 31st May, 2017.

The CTA will be the focal point for all general, logistical and project queries related to the evaluation.

Evaluation Schedule

The evaluation is foreseen to be undertaken in the following manner and time period aiming for submission of the final evaluation report to the donor no later than 31st May 2017.

Date	Day	Activity	DSA	Workdays
24April	Mon	Briefing & desktop review		1
25	Tues	Desktop review		1
26	Wed	Desktop review		1
27	Thurs	Meetings with Programme staff, specialists and backstopping personnel from the 3 agencies		1
28	Fri	Meetings with Programme staff, specialists and backstopping personnel from the 3 agencies		1
29	Sat	Rest		
30	Sun	Rest		
01 May	Mon	Rest (National Holiday)		
02	Tues	Meetings with counterparts, stakeholders, partners, donor		1
03	Wed	Meetings with counterparts, stakeholders, partners, donor		1
04	Thurs	Meetings with counterparts, stakeholders, partners, donor		1
05	Fri	Meetings with counterparts, stakeholders, partners, donor		1
06	Sat	Rest		
07	Sun	Travel to Nampula/Nacala	1	
08	Mon	Meetings with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders	1	1
09	Tues	Meetings with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders	1	1
10	Wed	Meetings with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders Travel to Cabo Delgado	1	1

11	Thurs	Meetings with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders	1	1
12	Fri	Meetings with local partners, implementing partners, beneficiaries, local government authorities and other key stakeholders	1	1
13	Sat	Travel to Maputo		
14	Sun	Rest		
15	Mon	Debriefing to the Resident Coordinator, the project team and the evaluation manager on the data collection exercise		1
16	Tues	Draft report		1
17	Wed	Draft report		1
18	Thurs	Draft report		1
19	Fri	Draft report		1
20	Sat	Rest		
21	Sun	Rest		
22	Mon	Submit Draft report and the Evaluation Manager Reviews and send to UNIDO, UNDP, and ILO for comments		
23	Tues	UNIDO, UNDP and ILO Review		
24	Wed	UNIDO, UNDP and ILO Review		
25	Thurs	UNIDO, UNDP and ILO Review		
26	Fri	Evaluation Manager incorporates comments, Review & send to consultant to revise the report		
27	Sat	Rest		
28	Sun	Rest		
29	Mon	Revise report		1
30	Tues	Revise report		1
31	Wed	Revise and Submit final report		1
		Total	6	22

For this independent evaluation, the final report and submission procedure will be followed:

- The Independent Consultant/team leader will submit a draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager.
- The evaluation manager will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments and factual correction.
- The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and send these to the Consultant.

- The Consultant will finalize the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate and providing a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated. He/she will submit the final report to the evaluation manager
- The Evaluation Manager will forward the report to EVAL for approval.
- The evaluation manager officially forward the evaluation report to stakeholders and PARDEV.
- PARDEV will submit the report officially to the donor.

9. Key qualifications and experience of the Consultant

The **senior consultant** should have the following qualifications:

- Master degree in Public Policy Management, Economics (or Micro Economics), Employment and Labour Economics, Strategic Planning or related social science graduate qualifications.
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating international development initiatives in the employment area, preferably in Africa.
- Demonstrated expertise and capability in technical assessment of small and medium scale enterprise development, regional private sector development, employment creation, related national policies and knowledge of government operational framework,
- Proven experience with logical framework approaches and other strategic planning approaches, M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing.
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System.
- Understanding of the development context of the project country (Mozambique) would be a clear advantage
- Excellent communication and interview skills.
- Excellent English report writing skills.
- Fluent speaker of English and Portuguese ³
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

³ Or at least one of the consultants must be fluent in both English and Portuguese

The **junior consultant** should have the following qualifications:

- University degree Public Policy Management, Employment and Labour Economics, Economics, Strategic Planning or related social science graduate qualifications
- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience, specifically in the area of monitoring and evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations.
- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating development projects/programmes in the employment area, small medium scale enterprise development or related areas of work, preferably in Africa.
- A track record of conducting various types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations in Mozambique.
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System
- Excellent communication and interview skills.
- Excellent English report writing skills.
- Fluent speaker of English and Portuguese⁴
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

10. Request for Proposals

For all interested candidates, please send to monteirod@iloguest.org both CV's (Junior and Senior Consultant) and expression of interest until the 16th April 2017

⁴ Or at least one of the consultants must be fluent in both English and Portuguese

