

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Evaluation for Strengthening Governance of Social Protection in Lesotho: Building an Integrated Social Protection System - EVAL Module Ref. 2019-M-1692

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4: Human Development and Safety Net

Europe Aid/138778/DH/SER/multi

Request No. 2019/409-113/1

Contracting Authority:

The European Union Delegation to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

1. BACKGROUND	3
1.1 RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND	3
1.2 THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED	4
1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION	4
1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	5
2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	6
2.2 REQUESTED SERVICES	6
2.3 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS	9
2.4 SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	13
2.5 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	13
2.6 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT	14
3. EXPERTISE REQUIRED	14
3.1 NUMBER OF EXPERTS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY	14
3.2 EXPERTISE REQUIRED	14
3.3 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING	15
4.1 STARTING PERIOD	15
4.2 FORESEEN DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT IN CALENDAR DAYS	15
4.3 PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF	16
4.4 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT	16
5. REPORTING	16
5.1 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	16
5.2 USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS	17
5.3 COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	17
5.4 ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	18
5.5 LANGUAGE	18
5.6 NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES	18
5.7 FORMATTING OF REPORTS	18
6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE	18
ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	19
ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM	20
ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	21

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE	23
ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....	24
ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S).....	28

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

Lesotho is a small, constitutional monarchy, fully independent since 1966, entirely landlocked within South Africa, with a population of around two million inhabitants. The economy of Lesotho is mainly supported by exports of textiles, water, and diamonds to the United States, South Africa and Belgium. Lesotho, like many countries in the sub-Saharan Africa, is characterised by pervasive poverty, low life expectancy, weak economic growth and highly skewed wealth distribution. To that effect, and with the support of European Union working in partnership with UNICEF and the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), a programme has been developed titled: ***Strengthening Governance of Social Protection in Lesotho: Building an Integrated Social Protection System***: to advocate for and provide support to social-protection mechanisms by improving and expanding social-protection services. The programme further seeks to improve targeting and delivery mechanisms, as well as increase the coverage of social-protection programmes, particularly the three key safety nets: Child Grants Programme (CGP), Orphaned-Vulnerable Children Bursary Programme, and Public Assistance. The capacity building and technical assistance have been provided **since 2008** through **EDF 9, EDF 10** and **EDF 11** for a **total of €31.6 million**.

Recognising the Constitutional obligation under Section 26 and the role of social protection in addressing chronic poverty and inequality, periodic shocks, and emergencies; guaranteeing human rights; promoting human development and economic growth, the Government has been working to strengthen the social protection system that includes strengthening policies, programmes, administration and coordination. The National Social Protection Strategy 2014-2019 sets out the primary goal of social protection as being to "prevent and reduce the economic and social vulnerabilities of the most disadvantaged and socially excluded segment of society" and the more recent National Policy on Social Development expands on this. The coordination within the social protection sector has been increased through the establishment of inter-ministerial platforms, which also include relevant development partners.

National Information System for Social Assistance-NISSA

The National Information System for Social Assistance (NISSA) is the pillar of the social protection strategy in Lesotho as it provides the country with a single national registry in which information on all potential households and individuals eligible for social protection is accessed. NISSA is the most efficient instrument to target beneficiaries as per their vulnerability. It can help eliminate duplication of grant disbursements, ensure the integrity and security of grant recipient records, provide a single source of access for targeting the poor and needy; and enable economies of scale by providing other stakeholders including civil society carrying out social protection interventions.

Political commitment to use the National Information System for Social Assistance (NISSA) as a single registry for social assistance has been secured, with the Ministry of Social Development

(MOSD) formally informing other stakeholders to use NISSA as a single registry. To date two social assistance programmes, CGP and OVC use NISSA. Child grant beneficiaries in 58 councils selected using NISSA and several agencies, for example World Vision, FAO and WFP request NISSA data from time to time. As of 2018, the NISSA database has reached a total of 264, 567 certified households in rural areas.

1.2 The Action to be evaluated¹

Title of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening Governance of Social Protection in Lesotho: Building an Integrated Social Protection System
Budget of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EUR 15,800.000.00
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FED/2015/371-934
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start: 22/12/2015 • End: 21/08/2022

Please refer to Annex VI- Log-Frame

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

At the government level, the main stakeholder is the Ministry of Social Development for whom the programme is a significant step in the implementation of the National Policy on Social Development and the National Social Protection Strategy. At the decentralised level of government, the stakeholders are the district officials and community councils whose involvement has been to target vulnerable households and provide support to case management. The Ministry of Finance as well as other Ministries responsible for life-course social assistance interventions are also considered. The ultimate stakeholders and beneficiaries of the programme are the disadvantaged sections of Basotho society and in particular those house households that consist primarily of vulnerable children and their care takers.

The key institutions in the sector in Lesotho are:

- UNICEF
- Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) as leading and coordinating the sector
- Ministry of Finance (MoF), including the office of the National Authorising Officer (NAO)
- Ministry of Development Planning
- Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship (MoLGC), local governments, chiefs and local authorities
- Ministry of Health (MoH)
- Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT)

¹ The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

- Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA)
- Ministry of Labour (MoL)
- CSOs, CBOs and Faith Based Organisation, including those active in social development
- Other development partners active in the sector including the World Bank, Food Aid Organisation and World Food Programme.

1.4 Other available information

ROM Mission 025-008- Strengthening Governance of Social Protection in Lesotho: Building an Integrated Social Protection System

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the European Union Delegation to the Kingdom of Lesotho, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with information to understand progress made to date towards achieving project objectives and outcomes and draw out lessons for how the Social Protection programme can be improved during the rest of its implementation for further increase in positive impacts:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the support to Social Protection in Lesotho, paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- Key lessons learnt, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future Actions.

The assignment should focus on progress to date and, by explaining **why** progress is happening or is not happening as planned, provide recommendations on how to improve the Action during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. They should also serve to prepare new actions beyond the lifeline of the current programme and encompass both forward and backward-looking perspectives. The assignment must also consider that all EU funded actions must promote the cross-cutting objectives of the EC: environment and climate change, rights-based approach, persons with disability, indigenous peoples and gender equality.

Type of evaluation	Mid-term Review
Coverage	Strengthening Governance of Social Protection in Lesotho: Building an Integrated Social Protection System
Geographic scope	Lesotho
Period to be evaluated	from 22/12/2015 to time of evaluation

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority² of the European Commission³. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**⁴ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.⁵

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The objective of this mid-term review is to provide the NISSA stakeholders, notably the EU Delegation (EUD), The Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), UNICEF and the members of the NISSA National Steering Committee, with evidence to make an informed judgement about the past performance of the project, to document lessons learnt and to recommend possible adjustments or re-orientation for the remaining period of the project implementation.

The assignment will therefore review the Social Protection programme in light of the following objectives:

- i. To assess the programme against the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, sustainability)
- ii. To assess lessons learnt and recommendations for the rest of the implementation period

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation, MoSD and the UNICEF staff.

2.2 Requested services

The Consultant is expected to provide the following services, which must be described and discussed in the proposed methodology:

² COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

³ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁴ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁵ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

- Review documents and submit inception report;
- Develop the detailed evaluation methodology;
- Conduct all data collection;
- Analysis of data and reporting in a clear and accessible format;
- Regular progress reporting to the evaluation manager, including responding to any comments or technical inputs wherever reasonable;
- Production of deliverables within agreed timeline and in accordance with quality requirements of evaluation manager;
- Seeking comments and feedback from MoSD and UNICEF regularly, through the evaluation manager, in sufficient time to discuss and incorporate these into the final report.
- Production of the final evaluation report containing data against all indicators in the project log frame, evidence-based responses to the key evaluation questions, summary of lessons learnt and recommendations for future implementation.

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and ‘perspectives of’ and/or ‘early signs of’ impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Lesotho and with other EU policies and Member State Actions, and UNICEF.

The evaluation team/consultant shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁶ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

The assignment examines the programme as laid out in the relevant documents, including the Description of the Action as well as the Theory of Change and the Log frame Matrix.

⁶ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

The **mid-term review** will analyse the following questions:

- **Relevance**

-To what extent does the project contribute to the implementation of the partner country's (sector) policies and strategies, or is aligned with these?

-To what extent does the project comply with commissioning party's (EU) basic development-policy orientation?

-To what extent is the project designed in line with international themes and standards?

-To what extent does the strategic orientation of the project address changes in its framework conditions?

-To extent is the project design and implementation based on a systematic examination of the target group's core problems?

- **Effectiveness**

-To what extent is the project design based on plausible hypothesis for achieving the project objective?

-How is the implementation rated in terms of the achievement of its intended outputs and results (prognostic)?

-To what extent do changes in the framework conditions influence the achievement of objectives?

-What other reasons were there for the achievement or non-achievement of the objective?

- **Impact**

-To what extent does the project contribute to the achievement of overarching development-related changes?

-To what extent is use made of the complementarity with other projects/actors of other donors for implementing the project?

-To what extent does the project make use of scaling –up mechanisms, including in the SADC region?

- **Efficiency**

-In view of the funds available, were the best possible results achieved?

-To what extent were the relationship between objectives and funds, and alternatives considered in designing and implementing the project?

-Were local resources, for example, used to achieve or where partner contributions included?

-In designing and/or implementing the programme, were proper checks conducted to investigate whether coordination with the other donors and/or projects was possible and would generate added value?

- **Sustainability**

-To what extent has the NISSA conceived and manage in view of promoting sustainability?

-Will the NISSA project be sustainable beyond the phase of the action?

- **Steering and Management**

-In how far is the steering structure at national and district level appropriate for project implementation?

-To what context are the relevant cross cutting issue (gender equality, HIV etc.) adequately mainstreamed into the project concept and implementation of NISSA?

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in five phases:

- Inception
- Desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 0.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and <i>meetings</i>
<u>Inception and Desk Phases</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Inception interviews • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Interviews [<i>as relevant</i>] • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority and other key stakeholder(s) at the EU Delegation on the 6 or 13 January 2020 (Tentative) • Inception report • Slide presentation of the Inception Report • Evaluation Design Matrix • Slide presentation of the Inception Report • Desk Note • Slide presentation of key findings of the desk phase to be presented during inception meeting • Debriefing meeting at the end of the inception phase.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodological design of the Field Phase 	
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gathering of primary evidence with the use of literature review/secondary data analysis and conducting interview. The qualitative primary data collection will encompass semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KII) (face-to-face or via phone/skype) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with selected stakeholders, including, EUD, MoSD, UNICEF and other relevant stakeholders. Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial meetings at country level with UNICEF, MoSD staff and other key Ministries relevant to social protection. Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase. Debriefing with the EUD, UNICEF and MoSD.
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Final Report Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module Final Report

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with a kick-off session in Lesotho between the EUD, UNICEF, MoSD and the evaluators. Half-day presence of evaluators is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to social protection, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between

outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise, i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix⁷, which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in Chapter 2.3.1 (Synoptic Table).

The evaluation team will then, if needed, present in Maseru the **Inception Report** to the EU Delegation, MoSD and UNICEF.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

Note: the desk phase is merged with the inception phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action. The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected phone/face-to-face interviews with the program management, the relevant EU services may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the desk phase a **Desk Note** and/or a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5.

⁷ The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,

2.3.4 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception Report by the Evaluation Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the Reference Group.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the Reference Group.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.5 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present at the EUD the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence of the evaluation team is required, as a minimum.

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.3.6 Dissemination Phase

Not applicable

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToR's. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EUD, MoSD and UNICEF.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.

- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 *At the Contractor level*

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be: English.

3. EXPERTISE REQUIRED

The proposed mission shall be conducted by a team of two experts, consisting of two Category II experts, with 20 working days for each of them.

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

This assignment has been allocated a total of **40 working days** for two (2) Social Protection experts or any relevant discipline, category II.

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Cat II	2	40	30

The Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be chosen between the two experts, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 20 working days, out of which 15 in the field.

3.2 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team (Cat. II experts):

The following expertise should be adequately covered by the proposed experts.

Qualifications and skills

Education at least Master's Degree Academic level, or, in its absence, equivalent professional experience of more than six (6) years in Social or Development Studies.

General professional experience

At least 6 years' experience in design, management and professional evaluation of social protection projects involving public sectors, preferably in Africa.

Specific professional experience

At least 3 years' experience in undertaking cost-benefit analysis in the social protection programmes;

At least 3 years' experience in managing and advising multi-sector international teams.

At least 3 years demonstrable technical and institutional knowledge of social protection safety nets in developing countries;

At least 4 years' professional experience in social protection initiatives in the Southern Africa region.

Language skills of the team

English: both team members shall possess at least a level B2 expertise;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4. LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

The expert is expected to be in Maseru for a kick-off meeting with the EUD, NAO and UNICEF management on 6 or 13 January 2020 (**Tentative**)

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: 180 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff⁸

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Report). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Maseru District, with one field visit in one of the other 9 districts of Lesotho.

5. REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Report	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods ○ Consultation strategy ○ Field visit approach [including the criteria to select the field visits] • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan 	End of Inception Phase
Desk Note	5 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary answers to each Evaluation 	End of the

⁸ As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
		Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit • Update of the field visit approach if relevant • Update of the work plan of the following phases if relevant 	Desk Phase
Intermediary Note	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities conducted during the field phase • Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted • Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field ones) 	End of the Field Phase
Draft Final Report	40 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	Maximum 50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 14 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 14 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 10 paper copies and in electronic version (Word and PDF) at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE

Other limited identified reimbursable costs, with their details:

- Two international travel costs (round trip) for the deployment of experts.
- Daily subsistence allowances (i.e. per diems) outside of the place of posting defined under section 4.4 'Location(s) of assignment' of the specific ToR
- Local travel costs: 1 round trip from Maseru to one of the districts defined under section 4.4 'Location(s) of assignment' of the specific ToR

Note: these costs, which will be part of the financial offer / budget breakdown, will be paid as a whole (i.e. global price), as long as the related input was implemented (e.g. travel, etc.).

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA****Request for Services n. 2019/409-113/1****FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4: Human Development and Safety Net****Europe Aid/138778/DH/SER/multi****1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price⁹.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</i>	<i>50</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
<i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i>	<i>100</i>

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

Phone interviews will be tentatively carried out during the period from 2 to 9/12/2019.

⁹ For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action(s) to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper on Social Protection and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action(s)
- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module - two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

“This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by name of consulting firm. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission”.

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (*optional*)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions

and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.2 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted

- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹⁰		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹⁰ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning


Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way
Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled
Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers • Highlight the key messages • The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced • Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding • Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report) • Avoid unnecessary duplications • Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors • The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology • The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations • The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
3. Validity of Findings		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings derive from the evidence gathered • Findings address all selected evaluation criteria • Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources • When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts • The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors 		

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
4. Validity of conclusions		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis • Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions • Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation • Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations • (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues 		
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
5. Usefulness of recommendations		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions • Are concrete, achievable and realistic • Are targeted to specific addressees • Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound • (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans 		
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)		

<div>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lessons are identified• When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)</div> <div></div>	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments
Final comments on the overall quality of the report	Overall score

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective: Impact	01 - To assist the government to prevent and reduce the economic and social vulnerabilities of the most disadvantaged and socially excluded segments of the society.	Percentage of the population living under the poverty line.	57% (HBS 2010)	Indicative Target as per the Government National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP)	BOS: Household Budget Survey, Continuous Multi-purpose survey. MOSD/UNICEF: 3rd Impact Evaluation. MOSD: single registry reports.	Continuation of the current economic situation. No change of government commitment and leadership on social protection.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Specific objective(s):	SO – To support the establishment of A social protection system that ensures the most economic and socially vulnerable segments of Lesotho's population are provided with a level of protection	1. Percentage of the population having access to predictable cash benefits in case of need. 2. Number of social assistance programmes integrated under a unified framework	64.6 % households currently in NISSA 38.5% of the extreme poor in NISSA receive CGP support. 3 programmes partially integrated (targeting and enrolment) in 16 councils	100% 3 programmes fully integrated (targeting, enrolment, payment and case management) country-wide	MOSD Quarterly/Annual Report Single registry (currently called NISSA)/MIS Reports 3rd CGP Impact Evaluation	MOSD established key departments for the coordination of social protection programmes. Approval and adoption, by Government, of the National Social Protection Strategy to orient and guide Governments efforts towards a social protection system. Full collaboration of other Ministries and Government agencies.
Outcome 1	1. The MOSD, at all levels, leads, manages and implements a comprehensive and integrated social protection system.	National institutional framework for coordination of SP in place and functional	Approved framework and three coordination committees at national level established and functional	Social Protection coordination committees at all levels functional as per the framework	Implementation plan reports.	National Social Protection Strategy is approved and coordination mechanisms are established across cabinet.
		1.b Number of districts being covered by an	3 districts (3 programmes partially	All 10 districts of Lesotho (3 programmes	Single registry currently called NISSA/MIS	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		integrated social assistance system.	integrated (targeting and enrolment)	fully integrated (targeting, enrolment, payment and case management) country-wide.	Reports.	
Outputs	1.1 Coordination Mechanisms for social protection in place and operational.	# of institutions participating in the Coordination Mechanism Operational M&E system for social protection services in place (Yes/No)	13 Ministries at central level. Draft M&E Framework	13 Ministries at central level, all districts including NGOs. Approved M&E framework	Minutes for coordination committees meetings.	
	1.2. Institutional and operational capacities provided to the	% of MOSD staff who has received trainings at	67% of the positions have been filled as per Ministerial	Fill 95% of all positions as per the revised organogram	MOSD Staffing Establishment List.	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	MOSD at central and district level.	central and district level % of Tools and guidelines updated and in place	Strategic Plan and about additional posts have been approved for filling already. Evaluation recommendations available	and respect the principle of gender equality and equal opportunities. Implementation of recommendation		
	1.3. The Integrated Social Safety Net (ISSN) pilot is completed, documented and scaled up.	# of Community Councils implementing the ISSN	16 CC are implementing ISSNs (partially) programmes	64 CCs implement ISSNs fully	Evaluation reports.	
Outcome 2	2. A single national registry is institutionalised for use in management and monitoring of social assistance.	1. Number of governmental and non-governmental programmes using the single registry.	1 programme fully and two programmes partially used NISSA	3 programmes fully used NISSA (targeting, enrolment, payment and case management country-wide.	NISSA/MIS Reports	NISSA continues to be the database at the core of a single registry.
Outputs	2.1. NISSA Unit operational and its	Number of people	5 officers can use efficiently	80 officers including 72	MOSD Quarterly/Annu	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources means verification and of	Assumptions
	coordination capacities are strengthened to the manage system	capacitated to manage and/or make use of the NISSA. Number of institutions/social assistance programs that share their database with the NISSA registry	NISSA at national level Three programmes partially	auxiliary social worker accessing NISSA Three programmes fully	al Report	
	2.2 NISSA is expanded to national coverage including the development of a strengthened system for updates	Number of HHs registered in the single registry/NISSA Number of CCs covered by the NISSA system Case Management System for social	235,000 HHs 58 CMS for CGP in place in 43 CCs	To be determined 64 including recertification 36 CCs CMS for ISSNns	NISSA/MIS Reports	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		assistance in place in all CCs covered by the ISSN.				
Outcome 3	3. An integrated community development approach is established to support the local management system of social protection.	A Community development model in place and tested for national roll out	The Community development model exists	At least 6 CCs have tested the CDM	Progress reports from contracted NGOs and MOSD	Collaboration and full commitment of MOLGC, MOH, MOET and others. Collaboration /partnerships with civil society.
Outputs	3.1. A Community development action plan linked to social assistance in place	Action plan formulated	Action Plan available	Implemented in 6 CCs	MOSD	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2018)	Targets (2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	3.2 community based interventions complementing social assistance services in place	Number of villages reached with complementary social assistance services	Around 250 villages (to be determined in the final report – Phase II).	At least 500 villages reached.	Progress reports from contracted NGOs and MOSD	
	3.3 A referral mechanism which functions through local structures is piloted and expanded.	Number of community councils implementing one stop shop(citizen service centres)	9 CCs with permanent structure and 64 CCs with outreach services	11 CCs with permanent structure and 64 CCs with outreach services	Progress reports from UNICEF	