



Terms of Reference for

Final Evaluation of Phase I and Phase II Project from November 2014- December 2018

Project Title:

Phase I: Institutionalisation of New Performance Management System and Leadership Development Programme and Civil Service Reforms; and
Phase II: Civil Service Reforms for Excellence in Public Service Delivery

Country: Bhutan

Project Number: Phase I: 2783-00/2014
Phase II: 2783-00/2016

Name of Partner Organisation: Royal Civil Service Commission (RCSC)

1. Introduction/Background

The Royal Civil Service Commission with the assistance from the Austrian Development Agency implemented two projects: Phase I - *Institutionalisation of New Performance Management System and Leadership Development Programme and Civil Service Reforms*; and Phase II - *Civil Service Reforms for Excellence in Public Service Delivery*.

The evaluation of Phase I Project was not conducted as no evaluation was planned combined with the fact that a continuation into Phase II was agreed with an evaluation included into the agreement. Therefore, this evaluation will include both Phase I and Phase II of the project. The Phase II project on *Civil Service Reforms for Excellence in Public Service Delivery* was initiated in April 2017 as the continuation of the Phase I Project implemented from November 2014 till December 2016. Most of the activities identified for Phase II project were in continuation to Phase I project; therefore, it is timely to evaluate and assess the achievement of the project in terms of Outcome and Outputs identified for the projects. The main stakeholders are the Civil Servants and also the beneficiary.

Building on the progress of the Phase I implemented between November 2014 - December 2016 on developing and rolling out of Managing for Excellence (MaX) framework and institutionalisation of various Leadership Development Programs, the Phase II of the Project on Civil Service Reforms was initiated to further firmly institutionalise the reforms introduced and reinforce the



collaboration with the other government agencies including groups like women as civil servants and other civil servants living in remote places in districts as one of the stakeholder for the project.

Under the pillar Promotion of Good Governance (11th Five Year Plan¹, 2013 July – June 2018) there are six National Key Result Area (NKRAs) covering:

1. Improved Public Service Delivery; 2. Democracy and Governance Strengthened; 3. Gender Friendly Environment for Women's Participation; 4. Corruption Reduced; 5. Safe Society; and 6. Needs of Vulnerable Group addressed.

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as reducing turnaround time for Government to Citizen, Government to Business and Government to Government services; monitoring government performance. This Phase II contributes significantly to the first National Key Result Area (NKRA) of Governance - Improved Public Service Delivery particularly enhancing the performance of civil servants and government agencies.

The Phase I of the project on institutionalising Performance Management System (PMS) and Leadership Development Program (LDP) was completed as of December 31, 2016. On institutionalising PMS, the assistance from ADA was instrumental in revising the old PMS through systematic and participatory approach. The draft PMS framework developed was pilot tested in all 65 government agencies covering 26,611 (9,229 Females/17,382 Males), assessed the performance of civil servants based on the new framework, collected feedbacks on the new PMS and incorporated relevant recommendations received from civil servants and those learning obtained from the study visits made to advanced countries including Austria and Singapore. The new PMS is now renamed as MaX – Managing for Excellence. The MaX was in its last stage of implementation at the end of Phase I project and was made online for easy access for monitoring and also to ensure discipline in planning and evaluation of performance with enhanced accountability.

On the faculty for the Bhutan Executive Service Training (BEST), some visiting faculties are invited to deliver courses on specific topic and top leaders within the country are also identified. However, as discussed during the project review meeting held on December 22, 2016, some feedback from ADC, Thimphu on building institutional linkages with top management institutes was recommended. The work on this has already begun, and RIGSS is now in the process of designing the training as well as identifying institute for institutional linkages.

The MaX was expected to particularly enhance the performance of the civil servants aligned to Annual Performance Agreement (APA) of the Agencies that was introduced since 2015 by the Prime Minister's Office, which requires the agencies to develop annual work plans and implement and monitor these plans to ensure the achievements of the targets set for the year vis-à-vis Five-Year Plan. APAs are signed with Ministries,

¹ https://www.gnhc.gov.bt/en/?page_id=15

Autonomous Agencies and Districts and the performance are finally endorsed by High Power Committee (HPC) comprising of secretaries/commissioners from Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC), National Statistics Bureau (NSB), Ministry of Finance (MoF) and RCSC, evaluated and submitted by the National Technical Committee. The main objective is to link the performance of the civil servants to the achievements of the organisational goals thereby ensuring greater accountability.

The leadership development component of the Phase I project provided training on domain like Health Sector Management, Education, Economics, Finance etc. to more than 10% (28-22Males/6Females) of executives then, conducted four executive forums for 65 head of agencies (59 Males/6Females), developed curriculum for BEST and trained 124 executives during Phase I. The feedback received from the executives on all the trainings is positive although no systematic evaluation has been carried out. Since August 2016 with the assistance from ADA, RCSC has introduced an executive performance feedback system, which particularly aims to capture 5 leadership traits and 82 behaviour indicators as per Leadership Capability Framework. The feedback system allows all civil servants in supervisory, professional & management category to provide feedback to their supervisors, which include Chief of Division (P1) and head of the agency (Executives) to provide information on each leadership traits as per behaviour indicators. All these feedbacks are accessible to RCSC. RCSC also closely monitors the use of this feedback system and is one of the main criterion for selection, transfer, appointment to critical positions and promotion of the Executives to higher posts. One of the other highlights of the Phase I project was the development of the in-country training; BEST, which was institutionalised and launched at the Royal Institute for Governance and Strategic Studies (RIGSS) as the mandatory training for executives, and is continued in future through Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB) financial support and regular trainings will be imparted to the executives.

The above focused intervention through Leadership Development Programme and through PMS reforms received support from critical position holders particularly to enhance accountability of civil servants. Therefore, as a continuation of the Phase I project, Phase II project was initiated with the aim to achieve improved efficiency and effectiveness in public service delivery through further systemic reforms. The main outcome will be professional and quality service delivered by the civil servants (26,611, 17,382Males/9,229Females) civil servants resulting in positive behavioural change leading to enhanced services delivery. The main outputs was the Managing for Excellence – new Performance Management System, which will be firmly institutionalized; Succession Planning and Leadership Development System (SPLD) developed and institutionalized; the Bhutan Civil Service Examination Selection process improved/enhanced, and Civil Service Wellbeing Program institutionalised. The reforms, which are now firmly institutionalised as the revised Chapter 12 and 13 on Performance Management System and Promotion and Chapter 7 on Bhutan Civil Service Examinations of the Bhutan Civil Service Rules & Regulations 2018, which was launched in January 2018. Two new chapters, one on Executives and another on Civil Service Wellbeing is also included as part of Bhutan Civil Service Rules (BCSR) 2018, hence firmly institutionalising reforms on LDP and Civil Service Wellbeing.

The total number of beneficiaries of the trainings are 30,258 (19,369 males /10,889females) civil servants (including the fresh graduates with a total of 3,647 (1,987males/1,660females) annually). The main target group are the 138 Human Resource (HRO) Officers (92males/46 females) and 400 P1 officers (Managers) (267males/133females), 143 Executives (131males/12emales).

RCSC is pursuing gender-balanced approach by ensuring that at least 30% participants for the activities identified are female on HR training on P1 (Manager /P1), concretely 133F Managers/P1 will be trained. As of now, there are 9,228 female civil servants and 12 at the executive level. However, there are 4,806 females in professional (Manager/P1) level which is the main pool for executive selections and initiatives are in place to ensure more and more female candidates apply for the executive level. In 2015, the maternity leave for working mothers has been extended from three to six months. Many other facilities and incentive that are gender friendly are initiated example introduction of crèche and longer feeding hours.

A total of EUR 750,033 with EUR 370,033 for Phase I and EUR 380,000.00 for Phase II was approved for the implementation of the two phases of the Project. The summary of Project Design including project impact, outcome, outputs/expected results, number/types of beneficiaries and also supported institutions are reflected in Log Frame.

Log frame is attached as Annex I Log Frame for Phase I and Annex II Log Frame for Phase II

2. Purpose

Assess the degree of achievement of the outcome and outputs including learning and accountability of the interventions on: Institutionalisation of New Performance Management System and Leadership Development Programme and Civil Service Reforms; and Civil Service Reforms for Excellence in Public Service Delivery from November 2014 until December 2018.

The main users of the evaluation are the Royal Civil Service Commission to evaluate intervention by the current Commission out of the five reforms areas introduced by the current Commission in 2014. Two important components of the Reform Areas-enhancing delivery through Performance Management System and great leadership through success planning and leadership development program was initiated and institutionalised under these ADC projects.

3. Objective

The main objectives of the evaluation are:

- a) To assess the relevance and coherence of the project including the design of the log frame matrix and the underlying theory of change and its assumptions including effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the intervention.
- b) To assess the extent to which the project has already achieved its objectives and results or is likely to achieve them.
- c) To assess the extent to which the institutions supported through various capacity development measures have already benefitted people and the likelihood that these results can be sustained.
- d) To assess the efficiency, including the conducive and hindering factors in terms of planning, management, and implementation and monitoring.
- e) To identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for enhancing institutional learning for the different key stakeholders.

4. Subject and Focus

This final evaluation will assess achievement of the intended purpose of Phase I - Institutionalisation of New Performance Management System and Leadership Development Programme and Civil Service Reforms; and Phase II - Civil Service Reforms

for Excellence in Public Service Delivery initiated since November 2014 at least at the outcome and output level.

This evaluation will cover both Phases I and II of project implemented from November 2014 till December 2018.

It is recommended to note that the intervention introduced by the project is complex, impinging on sensitive areas like reviewing capability and productivity of individuals in terms of performance and all civil servants may not welcome such intervention and may have resistance to such changes introduced which has more objectivity and scrutiny. The report should highlight impact of such sensitivities.

The reforms introduced by the RCSC for the Civil servants which are both the target and the beneficiary cover all civil servants across the country. The assessment will also include assessment of the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender, social inclusion of local and environment mainstreaming) have been applied and with what success.

5. Specific Evaluation Questions

Relevance

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for the partner country, the partner organization and the beneficiaries?
- Are the expected results/outputs of the project consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the log frame matrix and the presentation of the theory of change and its underlying assumptions)?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) or will be likely to achieve it/them?
- To what extent has the project already achieved its expected results/outputs or will be likely to achieve them?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome(s)/expected results/outputs? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
- Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- Did the project contribute to capacity building as planned?

- To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were the recommendations from the ADA gender-assessment considered and implemented?
- To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA environment-assessment considered and implemented?
- To what extent were the social standards mainstreamed in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA social standards-assessment considered and implemented? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?

Efficiency

- To what extent were all items/equipment purchased and used as planned under this project?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way (time, personnel resources)? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?

Impact

- How many males and females in total have already benefited from the project (immediate impact)?
- What exactly has already changed in the lives of male and female (immediate impact)?
- Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender, environment and social standards can be possibly be attributed to the project?
- Which institutions have already benefitted from the project and how? What has changed for whom (immediate impact)?

Sustainability

- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the withdrawal of the donor?
- If the project continues will it be integrated in local structures and/or funded by other sources?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- What needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?

6. Approach and Methods

The evaluation will consist of an Inception Phase, Field Phase and a Reporting Phase. The Procurement of Consultancy Services will be in accordance with the 2009 Procurement Rules and Regulations (PRR) - Chapter VII - Procurement of Consultants' Services of the Royal Government of Bhutan. RCSC will advertise a request for expressions of interest for the evaluation in both national and international media to reach out to international consultants who can lead the evaluation. The evaluation of the proposals will be carried out in two stages: first the quality, and then the cost. Details on the parameters for evaluation of the proposals are available in the above PRR.

Contract and Kick-off meeting: RCSC, following negotiations, if need be, including discussions of this TOR, the methodology, staffing, RCSC's inputs, and any special conditions of the contract, will sign a contract with the successful bidder followed by a discussion of the assignment, providing the consultant the relevant background documents, such as the agreed project documents, progress reports, contacts to civil servants including available data.

Desk Study: Desk study of the relevant background documents will be the first method used for the evaluation. The evaluation team will study the background documents; re-construct, if needed and analyse the intervention logic and theory of change and its assumptions. The consultant will analyse and interpret the available data.

Inception-Phase: The consultant will submit a draft Inception Report describing the design of the evaluation around the evaluation criteria including elaborating sampling and data collection methods – for e.g., individual face-to-face interviews with the executives, and group interviews arranged by occupation groups and/or beneficiaries of specific trainings delivered and/or on-line survey – and how these primary data will be triangulated and analysed. The consultant will propose a workplan including data collection methods enabling RCSC to discuss the field phase for data collection, analysis and interpretation. To save time and reach out to a larger sample size, the preferred method would be an on-line survey combined with representative interviews.

The field trip to be determined by the proposed sampling method will only take place upon official approval of the Inception Report by the RCSC.

In addition, the parties will agree on the outline of the evaluation report.

Field-phase: Subject to the agreed data collection methods the consultant will undertake field trip (s), gather data, use both quantitative and qualitative data analysis to interpret and present them. Since the trainings in the two phases of the project reached out to more than 32,000 civil servants, the consultant will analyse, and present the interpretations disaggregated by sex.

Final Draft Report: The consultant will submit a final draft report for feedback and if need be presented virtually. The consultant must ensure that the feedback from the stakeholders are incorporated and report revised including a draft executive summary and key findings and recommendations. The findings and recommendations will be structured around the evaluation questions.

Final Report: The consultant in adherence to the **reporting requirements under point 9 below** will submit a final evaluation report containing the final executive summary, final version of the findings and recommendations structured according to the evaluation questions.

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process.

Also see:
http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaeden_Evaluierung.pdf

7. Timetable

Optional: A total of 34 working days is currently estimated for this assignment.

Action	Responsible	Date
Submission of bid sealed envelop	Contractor	January 30, 2019
Contract signed and documents provided	Contract signed between RCSC and consultant	February 4, 2019
Kick-Off meeting	Meeting between RCSC and consultant	February 5 , 2019
Desk Study	Consultant	February 6-7, 2019
First interviews	Consultant	
Submission of draft inception report and initiation of the on-line survey	Consultant	February 7, 2019
Inclusion of comments in inception report	Consultant	February 8, 2019
Submission of final inception report	Consultant	February 9, 2019
Field visit, interviews etc. and feedback workshop	Consultant	February 10-20, 2019
Submission of final draft report	Consultant	February 23, 2019
Presentation of final draft report	Consultant	February 24, 2019
Inclusion of feedback in final draft report	Consultant	February 25, 2019
Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor	Consultant	February 26, 2019

8. The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of an international consultant as team leader and a Bhutanese counterpart.

Key Qualifications in the team should be:

- Relevant academic degree, preferably Masters in Public Administration
- A minimum of three years' experience and expertise in the field of public sector reforms, including civil service, good governance and related capacity development
- Team leader has lead at least three evaluations in the last five years in the relevant field i.e. public sector reform, good governance
- Team member has conducted at least three evaluations in the relevant field i.e. public sector reform, good governance.
- Proven knowledge of Bhutan with focus on topics such as public sector, governance.

- Working experience in developing countries preferably in South Asia.
- Experience in project cycle management.
- Proven experience in preparing and analysing a theory of change.
- Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues, such as gender, social standards and environment.
- Experience in social science methods.
- Excellent oral and written English skills.
- Sound MS Office and IT skills.

The consultants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project/programme.

9. Reports

The consultants will submit the following reports:

- an inception report (10-15 pages without annexes),
- a final draft evaluation report (about 25-30 pages without annexes), including a draft executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**
- and the final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**
- **Consultants to arrange transportation on their own.**

All reports need to be written in English.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

- Is the results-matrix format part of the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
- Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
- Are all evaluation questions answered?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe) and present/analyze a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
- Are cross-cutting issues analyzed in the report?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?
- Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

10. Co-ordination/Responsibility

Ms. Louise Monger, Project Manager, RCSC will be the contact person for this evaluation and will facilitate the provision of all background documents, data, contacts of civil servants to be interviewed or surveyed, approval of visa and confirmation of meetings. The team leader will rely on his/her Bhutanese counterpart to arrange local transport for pick up, drop and attending all meetings including field visit.

Contact details: +975 17125887, lmonger@rcsc.gov.bt

11. Annexes:

- Results-Assessment Form, to be filled in by the evaluation team

Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.

Title of project (please, spell out):			
Contract Period of project:			
ADC number of project:			
Name of project partner:			
Country and Region of project :			
Budget of this project:			
Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators:			
Date of completion of evaluation:			
Please tick appropriate box:			
a) Evaluation managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office		<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Evaluation managed by project partner:		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please tick appropriate box:			
a) Mid-Term Evaluation	b) Final Evaluation	c) Mid-Term Review	d) Final Review
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others: please, specify:			
Project Outcome <i>(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):</i>			

For Final Evaluation²: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) was/were:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not? (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review³: Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) will most likely be:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, also explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs⁴ according to the Logframe Matrix ? Please, tick appropriate boxes

Output 1 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

² Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review.

³ Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review.

⁴ In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.

--	--	--	--

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 2 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output 2 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 3 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output 3 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.

Impact/Beneficiaries:

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:

Gender: To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

Environment: To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain

Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

Overall/Other Comments: