

Terms of Reference for Consultancy to map the framework for evaluating the PEAP

OPM/August, 2007

1. Background

In 1997, the Government of Uganda endorsed the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) as the comprehensive national development planning framework aimed at guiding public action to eradicate poverty in Uganda. It was designed to span a 20-year period with the overall target of reducing the proportion of Ugandans unable to meet their basic needs to less than 10 per cent by 2017 from a baseline of 44 per cent recorded in the inception year. June 2007 marks 10 years of PEAP implementation, and the current PEAP revision expires in June 2008, thus a mid-term evaluation has been scheduled to determine the effectiveness of the PEAP to date and to generate lessons for informing the future strategy.

The PEAP has been revised and implemented on a three-year cycle, matching the medium-expenditure framework (MTEF), with the first revision in 2000 adopted as the country's PRSP. The PEAP was revised for a second time in 2004. Since 1997, the PEAP has been guided by a set of objectives focused on, inter alia, reducing income poverty and inequality, improving human development and increasing GDP growth. However, while the key objectives have remained constant, lower level objectives and the associated mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation have shifted and evolved over time.

The PEAP 1997 focused on priority programme areas and the indicators and outcomes were monitored under the sectors. By comparison, the PEAP revision of 2000 focused on the mechanism of the poverty monitoring and analysis system as a monitoring tool. This tool was based on some of the sector targets, but there was no clear results focus. The second PEAP revision of 2004 developed a specific Results and Policy Matrix that defined clear intended outcomes, measurable indicators, with baselines and targets. Aside from the challenge of establishing a coherent 10-year framework for evaluating performance, evidence from reviews have highlighted gaps in both indicator coverage and data availability.

2. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the consultancy is to establish a clear, logical and evidence-based framework upon which the PEAP 1997-2007 can be evaluated.

The specific objectives of the consultancy are:

1. To review and map together the objectives and indicators of progress used in the three PEAP documents (1997, 2000, 2004)
2. To review the coverage of these indicators against the stated objectives, identify gaps and suggest proxies
3. To review the data availability and quality against the indicators, and, based on this, determine which indicators may be most useful for the evaluation.
4. To construct a tentative objective and indicator framework covering the PEAP period 1997-2007 for consideration by the evaluators.

3. Scope

The scope of the consultancy will be guided primarily by the logical frameworks of the PEAP (1997) and its successors (2000, 2003). The objective is to determine the coherence and relatedness of objectives, quality of indicators (quantitative and qualitative) and the availability of data. Where necessary, this may involve reviewing the contributory sector and line ministry objectives, indicators and data sets.

The Annual PEAP Implementation Review (APIR) 2005-06, completed in May 2007, highlighted a considerable number of indicators without data available. It is important that the availability of data for all indicators is reviewed with an understanding of what will be available for the evaluation, and what will not.

Two areas in particular will require some detailed analysis. Governance, pillar 4 of the PEAP 2004-08, has been revealed to have quite weak coverage and quality of indicators. These can be developed and, where possible, applied post-fact for use in the evaluation to ensure governance issues are adequately addressed. A review has already been commissioned, and the paper can be discussed to take this forwards¹. There are also international indices and data sets² against which it may be feasible to assess elements of progress. Security and conflict resolution, pillar 3 of the PEAP, has also been identified as a challenging area against which to assess progress, and understand enabling and constraining factors. Recent assessments since the cessation of conflict in northern Uganda may provide an improved basis to assess change.

4. Approach

Two consultants will be contracted to complete the work, a lead and a senior researcher. The Consultants will base the work on a review of existing documentation of the PEAP and its revisions, an assessment of data available through NIMES, UBOS and the sector ministry management information systems, local government data, NGO and private sector databases.

The study will need to be carried out through three phases:

1. Review the logical frameworks of the PEAP and its revisions since 1997.
2. Profile indicators, determine data availability, recommend proxies for data gaps
3. Construct framework

The lead consultant will be expected to manage the analytical review and drafting processes. The second consultant, who will be a senior researcher, will be tasked with gathering, analyzing and synthesizing the documentation under the instruction of the lead.

¹ 'The Good Governance Indicator System: Comprehensive and Longitudinal Good Governance Indicators on PEAP Pillar 4 Policy Areas', Draft, Nordic Consultancy Group, 2007

² Including, inter alia, The Doing Business database, the Corruption Index, the Failed State Index

5. Outputs

This task will generate one report of no more than 20 pages (excluding annexes), covering:

- An evaluation framework that maps out the objectives and indicators over the ten-years of PEAP, highlighting credible linkages to be pursued through the evaluation,
- Priority areas that need further attention due to weak indicators and/or lack of data availability,
- Short- and long-term recommendations for addressing indicator and data gaps

6. Management

This assignment will be commissioned by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) but technically guided by the PEAP Secretariat sub-committee on Evaluation, which is composed of representatives of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED), National Planning Authority (NPA) and OPM. The Consultant will report to the sub-committee on the technical aspects and account financially to the OPM.

7. Time frame

This assignment should be for a total of 50 working days, to be completed within six weeks from the date of signing the contract. Two consultants will be contracted to complete the work, a lead and a researcher.

8. Qualifications

The lead consultant should be an economist, statistician or related social scientist with over 15 years of experience in developed macro-level planning and/or evaluation frameworks. The Consultant must have worked with PRSP or other national development framework matrices in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia or Latin America and be knowledgeable about Uganda's PEAP.

The second consultant, a senior researcher, should be an economist, political scientist or related social scientist with over 10 years experience in research and analysis, including evidence of specific work on the PEAP or related planning, monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

Attachments:

- PEAP documents and annexes 1997, 2000, 2004
- draft PEAP Evaluation Terms of Reference, July 2007
- 'Towards the development of results-based monitoring and evaluation plan for the PEAP: profiling of PEAP outcome (results) indicators', OPM, 2005
- 'The Good Governance Indicator System: Comprehensive and Longitudinal Good Governance Indicators on PEAP Pillar 4 Policy Areas', Draft, Nordic Consultancy Group, 2007