

## **Section II. Terms of Reference**

### **1. Background**

The Joint Programme funded by the Migration Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) was developed to support and complement existing efforts by the Government and other stakeholders within the framework of the NAP to Combat Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance and the National Development Plan (NDP) 2030 which in terms of Chapter 15 of the NDP has a focus of transforming society and uniting the country. The programme was developed considering the priorities of the affected population host community members and migrants), local, provincial, and national government with the aim of supporting the Government of South Africa in the implementation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) that was adopted by Member States in December 2018 available here: [UNGA A/RES 73/195](#)

This UN Joint Programme (JP) aimed to: (i) Support ongoing national efforts that aim to reduce vulnerabilities of the affected communities through the provision of emergency livelihoods assistance to community resilience as part of the post-COVID-19 recovery process; (ii) Reinforce the strategic holistic approach to promote livelihoods solutions for the affected vulnerable host communities and migrants as well as addressing drivers of violence and outbreak of xenophobic attacks; and (iii) Support efforts to strengthen Early Warning Systems in accordance with the NAP to Combat Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance's Programme of Action for the first five-year cycle of the NAP implementation in targeted vulnerable communities for detecting potential violent episodes. The multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination that women migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers face will be considered to ensure the incorporation of gender-sensitive integration and social inclusion initiatives. These efforts will be anchored in the National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) which provides a framework of the incorporation of gender in prevention, early warning systems and emergency and humanitarian.

The overall objective of JP was to contribute to strengthening migrant, refugee and asylum-seeker integration, social cohesion, and positive relations with host communities. The project focused on populations in vulnerable situations in three xenophobic-affected provinces of Gauteng, Kwa-Zulu Natal, and Western Cape, which contains some of the largest cities, where the interplay between migrants and host communities over limited resources are much more evident and where violence attributed to xenophobia has frequently occurred. The JP sought to employ a "Prevention, Protection and Empowerment" framework using a three-pronged approach based on three interrelated outcomes to stop xenophobic attacks and promote social cohesion and included the following outcomes:

***Outcome 1. National and local systems and capacities improved to prevent and respond to violence and victims of violence.***

***Outcome 2: Social inclusion and peaceful coexistence reinforced between migrants, other groups and host communities.***

**Outcome 3: Improved institutional systems for understanding the causes, and dynamics of crisis and violence, and for articulating responses.**

The expected results for the identified focal areas include among others improved national and local systems and capacities to prevent and respond to violence and victims of violence, social inclusion and peaceful co-existence between migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and host communities and improved institutional systems for understanding the causes and dynamics of crisis and violence for articulating appropriate responses. The project also explores how migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and other vulnerable members in the host communities enjoy greater social inclusion and integration, protection of their human rights and are able to contribute more meaningfully to the country’s transformation and development agenda without being left behind. This will be done by examining to what extent systems and capacities have been strengthened to prevent and respond to xenophobia, how social inclusion and peaceful co-existence improved to prevent the occurrence of xenophobia and how improved systems for understanding causes and dynamics of crisis and violence contributed towards articulating policy responses. All this is in the context of leaving no one behind as stipulated in the UN Cooperation Framework.

**2. Objectives of the Evaluation**

This final evaluation is being conducted to assess the overall performance of the Joint Programme and to assess to what extent intermediate results (outcomes) were achieved and how effective and sustainable they are towards realizing the overall project objective. It will highlight lessons learnt and good practices, and provide recommendations for future programming, based on government and other stakeholder priorities.

This final evaluation is being conducted for use by the different programme stakeholders, as follows:

<b>INTENDED USERS</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF USE</b>
Migration MPTF Steering Committee and the Fund Management Unit – donor phase I	Assess the achievements of the programme
JP Steering Committee	Assess accountability <sup>1</sup> and achievement of the programme
JP Steering Committee and Technical Working Group	Build upon and improve the implementation of the programme interventions in future programming
National and local government and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in South Africa	Assess the relevance and accountability of the interventions in support of national and local development interventions in particular the

---

<sup>1</sup> Accountability is defined as “the obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even a legally sound, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms.

	implementation the government’s priorities on promoting social cohesion and the NAP (2019)
Participating and non-participating UN Organizations	Enhance visibility of lessons learnt and best practices taken by the programme and design future interventions based on these lessons and practices.
Local communities engaged with the programme	Understand the results, lessons learnt, and best practices generated in their communities through the programme
Other Project Stakeholders	Understand the achievements, lessons learnt, and best practices generated by the programme
General audience interested in evaluations	Receive information about the evaluation methodology and use

### 3. Scope of the Services

The scope of the evaluation covers the entire programme period from October 2020 to March 2023. In particular, the evaluation will measure progress towards all outcomes produced since the start of the programme and will assess the overall level of achievement of the three outcomes to understand how and why these have been achieved and to what extent.

Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them.

The evaluation will integrate gender equality and human rights as a crosscutting concern, in line with Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation available here: [UNEG Integrating Gender and Human Rights](#) (Annex 1) particularly regarding vulnerable populations including migrants, asylum seekers, refugees and host communities. The evaluation will follow the guidance as outlined in the UN Evaluation Group’s Norms and Standards for Evaluation 2017 Guidance available here: [UNEG Norms and Standards](#) (Annex 2).

### 4. Evaluation Management

The joint independent evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Management Committee (EMC) integrated by evaluation focal points of the Participating United Nations Organizations (PUNOs) not involved in the implementation of the joint programme. The EMC will be led by the RCO (Resident Coordinator’s Office) designated officer and the Evaluation Manager (IOM Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer) as the lead agency (as per established process for independent evaluations and request of the funder). All officers will have evaluation background and work on this area in the agency they represent. The officer can be based anywhere, as the work will be both virtual and physical.

The IOM evaluation manager, with support from IOM EVAL will provide the highest quality control, using IOM Evaluation Guidelines available here: [IOM Eva Guidelines](#) (Annex 3)

The EMC function is to take full responsibility of the supervision of the evaluation teamwork, particularly the deliverables and assure a good relationship between them and the programme, acting as broker between both key actors for the evaluation. A major role is the approval of the programme deliverables (inception report, draft report and final report) following UNEG and UN agencies evaluation standards and making sure to receive feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group (see below). The EMC assures the independence, credibility and transparency of process and its outcome. The EMC is the highest evaluation decision body, under the supervision of the UN agencies evaluation offices.

The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support of the Programme Management Team led by IOM Programme Coordinator, with the administrative support of the IOM Country Office in Pretoria (with support from the other UN agencies).

As outlined in the Operational Manual for MPTF JPs, RCO, and UN agencies and key national partners will integrate the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). The ERG has no management role. Its function is to provide technical advice to the EMC and through them to the evaluators to improve the quality of the evaluation based on their knowledge of the context and the programme. The ERG will have the following functions:

- 1) Planning
- 2) Inception
- 3) Data collection
- 4) Data Analysis and Reporting
- 5) Disseminate and Follow-up Phase

The evaluation will follow the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, including the UNEG guidance on Joint Evaluation, the Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations guidance<sup>2</sup>. In this context, it also will have due regard to the evaluation policies of PUNOs to ensure the requirements of their policies are met well as the Human Rights and Gender Markers.

The evaluation process will be participative and will involve all relevant programme stakeholders and partners. Evaluation results will be disseminated amongst government, development partners, civil society, and other stakeholders. A joint management response will be produced upon completion of the evaluation process and made publicly available on the evaluation platforms or similar of PUNOs.

Analysis of gender-related concerns will be based on the United Nations Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Programmes.

---

<sup>2</sup> OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations guidance <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616>

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the UNEG joint evaluation guidelines, and those of the other partner UN agencies. This evaluation will follow the UNEG policy guidelines for results-based evaluation.

The final external evaluation is summative in nature, it will be conducted at the end of the programme, acknowledging that all interventions might not be fully completed at the time of the evaluation.

The Final evaluation will cover the following:

1. Programme duration 01 October 2020-31 March 2023
2. All phases and pillars of the programme.
3. The geographical coverage: South Africa's provinces of the Western Cape, Kwa-Zulu Natal and Gauteng.
4. The following Global Compact for Migration (GCM) Principles are to be considered throughout the evaluation, particularly a, f, g, h, i and j:
  - a. People-centered.
  - b. international co-operation.
  - c. National sovereignty.
  - d. Rule of law and due process.
  - e. Sustainable development / 2030 Agenda.
  - f. Human rights.
  - g. Gender-responsive.
  - h. Child-sensitive.
  - i. Whole-of-government approach; and
  - j. Whole-of-society approach.
5. Focus on ensuring use of the evaluation.
6. Include recommendations that are SMART.
7. Include a section on lessons learnt and good practices.
8. Provide an evaluation report, and visibility materials aligned with the programme branding.

## **5. Evaluation criteria**

This final evaluation will focus on the following evaluation criteria by Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development / Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC): Relevance, coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency. It will also assess the progress towards sustainability and impact. However, the programme is a pilot in nature and the focus of the evaluation will be on overall performance, the relevance, achievements towards the intended results, lessons learnt and good practices worth replicating.

## **6. Evaluation criteria and questions**

The main questions that the evaluation seeks response to is “How well did the programme perform towards enhancing the implementation of the GCM, while aligning with the GCM principles?”<sup>3</sup>

EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTIONS
Relevance	<p>Were the project activities and outputs well designed, valid and consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?</p> <p>To what extent were different stakeholders, particularly migrants and affected communities engaged in the design and implementation of the programme interventions?</p> <p>To what extent did the activities and outputs take into account the policies and priorities of the South African Government and beneficiary groups’ needs?</p>
Coherence	<p>To what extent was the intervention consistent with relevant national, regional, and international frameworks, particularly the GCM and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?</p> <p>Do synergies exist with other interventions in South Africa carried out by intervention partners, and other actors? If yes, how these could be scaled up in a future follow up phase?</p> <p>How has the programme contributed to increase the UN coherence and jointness in the social cohesion and in general in the implementing UN agencies work and RC leadership in the UN in the country?</p> <p>How well does the programme complement and fit with other ongoing UN and national and provincial governments programmes in the country?</p>

<sup>3</sup> UN (2019). A/RES/73/195 Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/sites/g/files/tmzbd1416/files/docs/gcm.pdf>

Effectiveness	<p>Have the activities and outputs been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?</p> <p>What were the major factors, internal and external, influencing the delivery of project deliverables?</p> <p>To what extent were the relevant stakeholders reached as expected, and are they satisfied with the results of the interventions?</p>
Efficiency	<p>How well were the resources (funds, expertise, and time) being converted into results?</p> <p>Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way (time and fund) and to the planned scope?</p>
Sustainability	<p>Does the Government of South Africa and its departments at national, provincial, and local level have any plans and/or structures to continue making use of the services/products produced?</p> <p>To what extent were the participating Departments of the South African Government and other relevant stakeholders engaged in the interventions?</p> <p>Which components of the programme should be scaled up to enhance sustainability?</p>
Impact	<p>What significant change(s) does the intervention bring or is expected to bring for South Africa on GCM implementation, whether positive or negative, intended, or unintended?</p> <p>What evidence exists to show that the project made a contribution to outcome results?</p>
GCM principles (Human Rights / Gender responsive / Child Sensitive/ Whole of Government / Whole of Society / People-Centered)	<p>Were the project activities and outputs well designed, valid and consistent with the GCM principles?</p> <p>To what extent was the intervention consistent with international frameworks, particularly the GCM?</p> <p>To what extent did the interventions incorporate the GCM principles, and advanced the enjoyment of human rights by relevant rights-holders; gender equality and empowerment of women and girls; and children’s rights and meeting their needs?</p> <p>To what extent were the GCM principles (Human Rights / Gender responsive / Child Sensitive/ Whole of Government / Whole of Society / People- Centered)</p>

	<p>incorporated into the project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring and reporting)?</p> <p>To what extent did the programme management structure reflect and align with these GCM Guiding Principles? Are there lessons learned and/or good practices that can be identified?</p> <p>Which components of the programme should be scaled up to enhance advancement of the GCM principles?</p>
--	---

## 7. Evaluation methodology

In coordination with the Evaluation Management Committee (EMC), the evaluator will develop a detailed methodology for the evaluation, including quantitative and qualitative methods and tools. The methodology of the evaluation will be proposed by the evaluator through the inception report, and the following elements are to be included in the methodology:

- Design of the evaluation, preferably explanatory, which seek to develop cause and effect relationships of the interventions conducted in achieving the expected results.
- Field visit schedule with interview schedule (minimum of two field sites per agency and two participants per implemented intervention).
- Data collection methods, such as mixed methods can be utilized for data collection from multiple sources to respond the evaluation questions.
- Cultural contexts are to be considered, i.e. locally accepted data collection methods (e.g. face-face interviews, house visits, group discussions and other means advised by the Evaluation Manager).
- Data collection tools which will be developed in English and translated by the evaluator, based on needs. Interpreters can support interviews with stakeholders as required, as per the decision of the evaluator and in compliance with the conditions set below.
- Physical data collection to be conducted in South Africa including the Western Cape, Kwa Zulu-Natal, and Gauteng (areas to be discussed) per agency and in a cost-efficient manner to reduce travel expenses.
- Review and analysis of programme related documents such as proposals, reports, and documents (i.e., written outputs such as policy reviews, tools, standard operating procedures, activity reports), as well as relevant policy documents in the region.)
- Consist of a clear description of sampling and data analysis.
- Users and stakeholders of the evaluation are to be engaged in the evaluation process, through online or physical interventions in South Africa.

### a) Inception phase: desk review

The Desk review will include the following information sources:

- Programme document
- Work plans
- Programme monitoring plans.

- Progress reports
- Programme budget and related financial reports.
- Technical reports
- Reports from various activities
- Others as required.

All documents will be made available by the Joint Programme Coordinator (JPC) in coordination with the EMC (through the RCO and IOM evaluation manager), in an electronic mechanism (Google drive, Drop-box, or similar) at the start of the evaluation.

In addition, the evaluation team will conduct a meeting with the programme UN agencies officers and another with the MPTF Secretariat to reach a common understanding regarding expectations and available data sources.

The Inception report will cover the evaluability assessment regarding the availability of data/information to answer the ToR evaluation questions, the programme materials to be consulted, the preliminary analysis of the theory of change of the project, the evaluation questions and evaluation indicators operationalized in an evaluation matrix, detailed work plan, list of stakeholders to be interviewed, outline of the stakeholders' workshop and of the draft and final report; and all data collection tools as well as logistical arrangements. All elements will follow IOM Evaluation Guidelines

The Evaluation team leader will receive a list of key stakeholders by the JPC in consultation with the Programme Management Team (PMT). If the Evaluator team requires contacting other stakeholders, beyond the list, this can be discussed with the Evaluation Managers leads during the preparation of the Inception report.

The Inception report will operationalize the ToRs and should be approved by the EMC before moving to data collection at field level.

#### **b) Data collection/field work**

The evaluators will undertake group and/or individual discussions. The Programme Management Team (PMT) will provide all its support in organization of these virtual and field interviews to the best extent possible. The evaluators will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women and youth, persons with disabilities, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, host communities and other vulnerable groups as relevant, are equally reflected in the interviews (i.e., individuals and sensitive questions to cover these categories).

The evaluators are encouraged to propose alternative mechanism or techniques for the data collection phase. These will be discussed with the programme and the evaluation managers at the Inception phase. Any alternative should be reflected in the Inception report.

The evaluators should follow the UNEG ethical guidelines on evaluation, Annex 5 (see [here](#)) and the signed IOM Code of conduct.

#### **c) Interviews with UN agencies programme Staff**

A first meeting will be held with the RCO, UN implementing agencies at country level and the and the Programme Management Team comprising all Participating UN agencies focal points. The evaluator will undertake group and/or individual discussions with programme staff based in Pretoria. The evaluator will also interview programme staff of other UN programmes as relevant, and UN agencies staff responsible for financial, administrative, and technical backstopping of the programme. An indicative list of persons to be interviewed will be prepared by the JPC in consultation with the Evaluation Manager lead officer.

#### **d) Interviews with national stakeholders in the country**

To examine the delivery of outcomes and outputs, the evaluators will meet relevant stakeholders including:

- National Department of Social Development (DSD)
- National Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (DOJ & CD)
- National Department of Sport, Arts, and Culture (DSAC)
- National Department of Home Affairs (DHA)
- National Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD)
- South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC)
- UN Resident Coordinator's Office
- UN participating organizations (IOM, UNDP, UNHCHR, OHCHR, UN Women PMT and M & E focal points)
- Donor (MPTF Secretariat, Geneva)
- Key civil society, academic and research institutions
- Provincial and local government departments in the three target provinces (Gauteng, Kwa Zulu Natal, and Western Cape)

A virtual and/ or physical stakeholders' workshop will be organized to discuss initial findings and complete data gaps with key stakeholders, including national stakeholders and implementing UN agencies staff. The workshop will be logistically supported by the programme and programmatically managed by the evaluation team. The details of it should be stated clearly in the Inception report for further preparation during the data collection phase.

#### **e) Report Writing Phase**

Based on the inputs from discussions and interviews with key stakeholders, the evaluation team will draft the evaluation report. The draft report will be sent to the Evaluation Manager Committee for a methodological review, and then shared with key stakeholders for their inputs/comments.

The Evaluation Management Committee will consolidate all comments including methodological comments and will then share them with the Evaluator for consideration in finalizing the report.

The Evaluators will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments and submit the final version for approval by the UN agencies (HQ or Regional level evaluation office as per each UN organization setting).

## I. Deliverables

- Inception report (with detailed work plan and data collection instruments following Evaluation Checklists Guidelines (Annex 6) available here: [UNEG Quality Checklist for TOR and Inception Reports](#))
- Preliminary findings presentation to the ERG to review evaluators' findings and potential recommendations and fill information gaps (PowerPoint presentation).
- A concise draft and final Evaluation Reports (maximum 35-40 pages plus annexes and following UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports (Annex 7) available here: [UNEG Quality Checklist for Reports](#) framed under UNEG standards as per the following proposed structure:
  - Cover page with key programme and evaluation data (ref to IOM Evaluation template in the Guidelines)
  - Executive Summary
  - Acronyms
  - Description of the programme
  - Purpose, scope, and clients of the evaluation
  - Methodology and limitations
  - Clearly identified findings for each criterion
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations
  - Lessons learned and good practices (briefly in the main report)
  - Annexes:
    - TOR
    - Evaluation questions matrix
    - Data Table on Programme Progress in achieving its targets by indicators with comments.
    - Evaluation schedule
    - Documents reviewed.
    - List of people interviewed.
    - Lessons learned and good practices (detailed using IOM- EVAL template)
    - Any other relevant documents
  - Separate Evaluation Summary using the IOM template.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided to the evaluation manager in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

### 8. Ethics, norms, and standards for evaluation

The evaluation must follow IOM Data Protection Principles (Annex 4), UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluations (Annex 2) and relevant ethical guidelines.

The commissioning agencies abide by the norms and standards of UNEG (Annex 2) and expect all evaluation stakeholders to be familiar with the ethical conduct guidelines of UNEG (Annex 5) and the

evaluator(s) with the UNEG code of conduct for evaluations (Annex 8) available here: [UNOG Code of Conduct for Evaluations](#)

### **Reports and Time Schedule (Note this is an indicative timeline for planning purposes)**

- Workshops/consultative meetings incorporated and a detailed and more accurate workplan will be developed and agreed on upon contracting.

### **Evaluation Reference Group**

RCO and UN agencies and key national partners (as identified by the programme) will integrate the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). The ERG has no management role. Its function is to provide technical advice to the EMC and through them to the evaluators to improve the quality of the evaluation based on their knowledge of the context and the programme. In detail the ERG has the following functions:

#### **Planning**

- Review draft TOR and provide feedback ensuring that the TOR will lead to a useful evaluation output and provide any additional key background information to inform the finalization of the ToR.
- Identify source documents for the evaluation team.

#### **Inception**

- Meet with the evaluation team led by the project national coordinator. The ERG is a source of information for the evaluation, providing guidance on how the evaluation team can design a realistic, practical, relevant, and useful evaluation.
- Assist in identifying key stakeholders to be interviewed, identifying, and accessing key documentation and data sources. This is important to safeguard against bias.
- Review and comment on the draft inception report.

#### **Data Collection**

- Act as key informants during the data collection stage. Assist the evaluation team by providing sources of the information and facilitating data access.
- Attend the end of data collection workshop to discuss preliminary findings.

#### **Data Analysis and Reporting**

- Review and comment on the draft evaluation report, specifically focusing on accuracy, quality, and comprehensiveness of the basis against which the findings are presented, and conclusions and recommendations are made.
- Particular attention should be given to ensuring that the recommendations are relevant, targeted, realistic and actionable.
- The ERG must respect the decision of the independent evaluators regarding the extent of incorporation of feedback provided to them by the ERG and other stakeholders, as long as there is sufficient transparency in how they have addressed the feedback, including clear rationale for any feedback that has not been incorporated.

### Disseminate and Follow-up Phase

- Disseminate the final evaluation report internally and externally, as relevant.
- Share, as relevant, evaluation findings within the respective units, organizations, networks and at key events.
- Provide input to the management response and its implementation as appropriate.
- Apply the learning extensively as appropriate.

### Evaluation Work plan & Time Frame

Activity	Responsible party	Timing
Zero draft of TORs to share with donor, Evaluation Management Committee (EMC) and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)	IOM in consultation with EMC and ERG	15 January to 20 February 2023
Selection and contracting of evaluation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of the Call for expression of interest</li> <li>• Selection and contracting process</li> </ul>	IOM in coordination with EMC	24 February to 21 March 2023
Finalize contracting for the evaluation	IOM in coordination with EMC	21 March 2023
Briefing call with the Evaluation Management committee	Evaluation Management committee	24 March 2023
Official commencement of the consultancy	Evaluator	1 April 2023
Inception report including design, methodology, tools and workplan including desk review phase	Evaluator	11 April 2023
Finalize review of the inception report	Evaluation Management committee & Reference group	14 April 2023
Meeting/workshop on the inception report	Evaluation Management committee & Reference group	18 April 2023
Submission of revised inception report	Evaluator	21 April 2023
Data collection and analysis (1 week in Gauteng, 1 week in Western Cape and 1 week in Kwa Zulu Natal) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary data</li> </ul>	Evaluator	25 April to 16 May 2023
Draft report development	Evaluator	17-29 May 2023

Debriefing meeting between evaluator and Evaluation Management Committee for presentation of evaluation findings and data collection.	Evaluator and EMC	<b>26 May 2023</b>
A draft report in an editable electronic copy and presentation for the discussion of evaluation results to EMG and relevant internal stakeholders to solicit feedback and assess whether the evaluation has met its objectives	Evaluator	<b>30 May 2023</b>
Review of the draft report	Evaluation Management committee & Reference group Submission to management for validation	<b>12 June 2023</b> <b>19 June 2023</b>
A final report in electronic and hard copy incorporating feedback received on the draft report.	Evaluator	<b>23 June 2023</b>
Dissemination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upload the report in the MPTF public website.</li> <li>• Joint management response</li> <li>• UN PUNOs use of the evaluation report (continuous)</li> </ul>	IOM/EVAL, UN agencies and MPTF Secretariat	<b>23-30 June 2023</b>
Total number of days for evaluators	58 days excluding weekends	

#### Calendar of payment

- Approval of the inception report: 20%
- Presentation of the preliminary findings (PowerPoints at the stakeholders' workshop) and provide draft report 40%
- Approval of the final report 40%

## II. Evaluation team

#### Evaluation team responsibilities

<b>Evaluation team leader responsibilities</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Desk review of programme documents</li> <li>b. Briefing with EMC</li> <li>c. Preliminary interviews with the RCO, UN agencies, and programme officers</li> </ul>

- d. Development of the Inception report including the evaluation instrument
- e. Undertake interviews with stakeholders (virtual and physical as needed)
- f. Facilitate the virtual / physical stakeholders' workshop.
- g. Draft evaluation report
- h. Finalize evaluation report

#### **Evaluation team member responsibilities**

- a. Support the desk review of programme documents.
- b. Undertake interviews with stakeholders (virtual and physical as needed)
- c. Support the facilitation of the virtual stakeholders' workshop.
- d. Provide inputs in the draft and final evaluation reports

#### **Profile of Evaluation team**

The Evaluation team should have the following qualifications:

#### **Evaluator Qualification Requirements**

##### **Team leader**

##### Education and Experience

- At least 10 years of experience in conducting project and programme evaluations.
- Sound experience with both quantitative and qualitative research methods and analytical tools.
- Multidisciplinary team, at least one candidate should have a Ph.D or master's degree or equivalent in evaluation. Other candidate(s) should have a master's degree or equivalent in relevant fields.
- Demonstrated sound understanding of migration discourse and migration governance instruments.
- Experience in conducting evaluation in migration settings is an advantage.
- Not have been involved in the Joint Programme

##### Competencies

- Excellent analytical, oral, and written communication skills in English.
- Experience with field-based data collection.
- Ability to create graphic visuals on key findings.
- Experience in working in sensitive, sometimes complex social environments.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Ability to work with minimal supervision and to meet deadlines.

Languages: Excellent command of English is required. Knowledge of some of the major South African languages spoken in Gauteng, Kwa Zulu Natal and Western Cape is an added advantage.

#### **Team member**

- University degree in social sciences or related graduate qualifications.
- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience in evaluating social development programmes initiatives or related social research; as team member, data collection and analysis, on the area of social protection will be an added advantage.
- Proven experience with theory of change approaches and other strategic planning approaches, M&E methods, and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), evidence-based analysis and report writing.
- Fluency in written and spoken English required, other official languages in South Africa is an added advantage.
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System of implementer agencies roles and mandates as well as broader UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable.
- Understanding of the development context of South Africa is an advantage.

### **III. Budget**

A budget is allocated for this evaluation and is under the full control of the evaluation lead managers for engagement of the evaluator's organization of workshops and consultative meetings with stakeholders. The evaluation budget includes:

- Fees for the team leader for 58 workdays and for the team member 30 workdays (actual days to be agreed upon with the consultant/consultancy firm);
- Cost of meetings and workshop (optional)

## List of Annexes

1. Annex 1: Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations

[UNEG Integrating Gender and Human Rights](#)

2. Annex 2: UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation

[UNEG Norms and Standards](#)

3. Annex 3: IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines

[IOM Eva Guidelines](#)

4. Annex 4: IOM Data Protection Principles

[IOM Data Protection Manual](#)

5. Annex 5: UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations

[UNEG Ethical guidelines on Evaluations](#)

6. Annex 6: UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation TOR and inception Reports

[UNEG Quality Checklist for TOR and Inception Reports](#)

7. Annex 7: UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports

[UNEG Quality Checklist for Reports](#)

8. UNOG Code of Conduct for Evaluations

[UNOG Code of Conduct for Evaluations](#)

### Other resources

UNEG Resource Pack on Joint Evaluations

[UNEG Resource Pack for Joint Evaluations](#)