**TERM OF REFERENCE**

**Final Evaluation of the Joint Programme**

 ***“Improving the welfare and quality of the life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable”***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Positon Title:**  | Evaluation team |
| **Location:** | Republic of Kazakhstan |
| **Type of Contract:** | Institutional contract  |
| **Languages Required:** | English |
| **Expected workload:** | Home based for a period of 29 working days over 2 months with one mission to Kazakhstan (Astana, Kyzylorda region)  |

## Background (programme context)

Kyzylorda region has a number of key strengths and capabilities that remain underutilized and given the complexities of Kyzylorda region’s situation, the region represents a platform for the UN to work with the local authorities in testing a triple win approach by mainstreaming sustainable development at all levels integrating economic, social and environmental aspects and recognizing their inter-linkages.

The Joint Programme “Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable” has been jointly developed by the Ministry of National Economy (former Ministry of Regional Development) and Akimat of Kyzylorda region, and six UN Agencies - UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN Women and WHO. The Joint Programme takes into account the situation analysis of the region and results of the previous programmes and activities. TheProgramme is based on the priorities of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Republic of Kazakhstan 2010-2015. It also corresponds to the state priorities of Kazakhstan, set out in national and regional programme documents such as ‘Kazakhstan-2050’ Strategic Development Plan, the Kyzylorda Territory Development Programme; Employment Roadmap – 2020; Business Roadmap – 2020; Education Development Programme for 2011-2020; National Health Programme “Salamatty Kazakhstan”; Health Code as well as international commitments of the country such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention concerning Maternity Protection (Revised 1952 (Convention No. 183) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are highly relevant for the programme especially in terms of SDGs localization.

The Programme is targeted to improve the quality of life of the population, and advance progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in Kyzylorda region, in particular in the districts affected by the Aral Sea crisis. The proposed joint programme will address the following three areas:

− Diversified economic development of the region through capacitating local government to plan for diversified and balanced economic growth and for the increase of the efficiency of state policy on the formation of the economic growth focal points, support to the local development system and small businesses;

− Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being and health by capacitating local authorities and civil society in addressing the negative social gradients, increase of employment opportunities and ensure availability and improved access to quality health, justice, education and social services for the vulnerable families, their children and vulnerable population groups;

− Formation and application of sustainable development practices in response to current problems caused by climate change, natural and man-made acts, including the energy efficiency issues in housing sector and sustainable eco-management.

In view of the lessons learned from the implementation and Evaluation of the previous programmes, the programme places special emphasis on sustainability of results through awareness-raising of all parties involved on accountability for the results (legislative bodies, relevant UN Agencies, head of institutions and specialists). The programme partners work jointly through co-financing and monitoring the efficiency of resource management.

The Joint Programme envisages achievement of the following objectives in Kyzylorda region the following cooperation areas:

• Strengthen the capacities of local government to plan for the economic development of the region, stimulate productive employment and enhance entrepreneurial skills of the rural population, especially in the core settlements;

• Support to the system of local self-governance by working with state and civil institutions in order to create conditions in which important local issues can be addressed by local population;

• Strengthen the capacity of local institutions at every level including health system (focus on integrated care across all health system levels, from the primary health care level to an efficient hospital care), sexual and reproductive health, child protection, cultural heritage to provide better services to the population, especially those in most need (women, children, youth, elderly, PWDs, repatriates, etc);

• Introduce innovative approaches in the region with regards to the well-being and protection of vulnerable groups of population, including children and youth, support to their social and economic inclusion, creation of social infrastructure and ‘barrier free’ environment;

• Promote sustainable environmental development, including piloting water, energy efficiency in housing and communal sectors, environmentally oriented and adapted usage of land and other natural resources and disaster risk reduction practices. Each agency brings a distinct comparative advantage in the form of specific knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life.

The agencies implement activities based on their individual comparative advantages and thus advance the operational impact of the Programme: UNDP – economic development, democratic governance, including support on local self-government development, poverty reduction, social and environment protection, housing and communal services, energy efficiency and sustainable agriculture, UNESCO – safeguarding of local cultural heritage, access to information and sustainable water resources management; UNFPA – sexual and reproductive health (including family planning) and reproductive rights and sexual health education targeting adolescents and youth; UNICEF – well-being and protection of children and youth; UN Women - women’s empowerment and gender equality; and WHO – public health and health systems.

The Programme duration is 2014-2017 and the total budget is $8,743,999. Financial support for the implementation of the Programme is provided by the Government of Kazakhstan in the amount of $ 6,452,999.

The agencies share of the total porgramme budget is $2,291,000. The joint programme is implemented based on “pass through” fund management arrangements where UNDP plays a role of the Administrative Agent.

## II. Purpose and use of the Evaluation

The overall objective of the Evaluation is to measure the Joint Programme contribution to the regional objectives, namely with respect to the specific objective of reduced poverty among vulnerable groups – children and their families, rural women, youth, people with disabilities, unemployed and self-employed, oralman and stateless persons – through activation of the population in the solution of own problems, employment generation and specific interventions to promote social inclusion and better access to public services; as well as to identify needs, gaps and outstanding issues in the respective area, to recognize emerging good practices that worked and could be scaled up within relevant programmes in the future.

The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the provisions contained in the Programme Document, which are consistent with the respective regulations, rules and procedures of the Participating UN Agencies and guided by UN Evaluation Group norms, principles and standards[[1]](#footnote-2) as the basis for its objectives, criteria and key questions. The Evaluation mainly seeks to assess the level of efficiency and relevance of the assisted interventions, as well as the validity of the Programme components.

It is expected that the Evaluation will feed into management and decision-making processes and provide applicable information to the Participating UN Agencies, Government of Kazakhstan, local administrations in the Kyzylorda Region and other stakeholders about relevancy, efficiency, and effectiveness and the sustainability of the programme results. The Evaluation results also should identify lessons learned from the Programme interventions with a view to ascertaining the suitability of such interventions in future work. As a tool for evidence based practices, the Evaluation results will serve as a clarification not only for the sustainability and exit strategies, but also for determination of the next steps interventions in the Kyzylorda Region and expansion of strategic interventions into other regions of Kazakhstan.

## Scope of the Evaluation

The Evaluation will primarily address the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the porgramme results. Where discernible changes have occurred as a result of programme interventions, the Evaluation should document evidence of this impact where it exists. The illustrative questions below examine the main, planned areas of programmatic achievement as described in the Project Document and Global Performance Monitoring Framework. Questions are organized around each Evaluation criteria.

The evaluation will, to the greatest possible extent, be participatory but seek to be independent, credible and useful and adhere to the highest possible standards in Evaluation. It will be responsive to the needs and priorities of the region and serve as a mechanism for accountability and learning for the Participating UN Agencies. Moreover, the evaluation will be consultative and engage the participation of a broad range of stakeholders. The evaluation team will be expected to work independently on the Evaluation although some organizational support will be available from the Country Offices of the Participating UN Agencies.

The specific Evaluation objectives (please see details under key questions) are:

1. To assess *the relevance* of the Programme in regard to consistency, ownership and congruency, technical adequacy, and complementarity of programme with other initiatives;
2. To determine *the effectiveness* of the programme in achievement of results, highlighting reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results and factors contributing/hindering achievement of the results;
3. To assess *the sustainability* of the programme including the participation of partners in planning and implementation of interventions, as well as assessing the measures taken to ensure that activities initiated by the programme will be completed and continued on cessation of donor support;
4. To provide the best practices/recommendations that may be used in the future programming. The Evaluation including its recommendations will be used as a resource by UN Women as knowledge base on good practices and to inform future programming and direction.

The Evaluation team’s main tasks will consist of the following duties and responsibilities:

* Assess overall performance against the Programme objective and the outcomes as set out in Programme document and other related documents.
* Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, value for money and client satisfaction of the Programme considering the findings for these criteria.
* Prepare questionnaire for the meetings with the Programme stakeholders. Meet with and gather substantive feedback from Programme stakeholders (Government, participating UN Agencies, local and community based organizations and beneficiaries). Indicate the following questions as appropriate in the questionnaires (but not limited to this):
* What were the major issues or problems that affected the programme implementation?
* What, if any, significant unintended impacts/outcomes (positive or negative) were there beyond the original programme plans?
* Comment on the impact of the programme in enhancing and strengthening the implementing partner and the UN system.
* What were challenges met and what mitigation measures were taken? Did mitigation measures resolve the challenges?
* What were the major lessons learnt (positive or negative) learned though the programme? Are there concrete recommendations that could increase the success of future programmes?
* Will the outputs delivered be sustained by national capacities, after the end of the Programme?
* To what extent did the progress have catalytic effect on national actors to engage in further aid activities and donor support?
* Has follow up support after the end of the Programme been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?
* Was the programme coherent with Government priorities and strategies?
* Did the Programme design properly address the issues identified in the region?
* Did the Programme objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?
* Were the relations established with the regional and rural authorities productive and supportive to the achievement of the programme results?
* Analyze critically the implementation and the management arrangements of the Joint Programme including the inter agency cooperation in JP settings.
* Assess sustainability of the Joint Programme’s interventions. Assess to what extent the Joint Programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure sustainability.
* The sustainability assessment should be given special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of JP outcomes and also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of JP will feed into its sustainability.
* Assess the design of Joint Programme M&E system through examining whether or not the Joint Programme has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving programme’s objectives
* Assess whether or not M&E system facilitates timely tracking of progress towards Joint Programme objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual Joint Programme reports are complete, accurate.

These questions are not considered final and it is expected that the Evaluation team will develop an Evaluation matrix, which will relate to the above questions (and refine them as needed), the areas they refer to, the criteria for evaluating them, the indicators and the means for verification as a tool for the Evaluation. Final Evaluation matrix will be approved in the Evaluation inception report.

The Evaluation team is expected to work with key Joint programme stakeholders, including UN participating agencies, Ministry of National Economy of Kazakhstan, akimat of Kyzylorda region, NGOs and other beneficiaries.

## The evaluation methodology

This section suggests an overall approaches and methods for conducting the evaluation, as well as data sources and tools that will likely yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions. However, the final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation team the Participating UN Agencies about what is appropriate and able to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

The final evaluation will be conducted by using methodologies and techniques suitable for the evaluation purpose, objective and evaluation questions as described in this ToR. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, Joint Programme documents, mission reports, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and qualitative tools as means to collect data for the evaluation. The evaluation team will make sure that the voices, opinions, and information of targeted citizens and participants of the Joint Programme are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be agreed upon with UNDP and other stakeholders and clearly outlined and described in detail in the Inception report and final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The evaluation team should seek guidance for their work in the following materials:

* UNEG [Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21)
* UNEG [Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22)

The methodology and techniques to be used in the Evaluation should be agreed upon with UNDP and other stakeholders and clearly outlined and described in the inception report and final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information in the tools used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The evaluation team is encouraged to review the Results and Resources Framework of the Joint Programme that specifies the outputs, targets and indicators for each the Participating UN Agencies’ components. Based on the objectives and scope mentioned above, the evaluation team will elaborate a methodology and plan, which will be approved by the Participating UN Agencies and validate information stemmed from contextual sources such as work plans or monitoring reports.

Evaluation may include, but is not limited to, the following methods of data collection:

* **Desk review –** review and identify relevant sources of information and conceptual frameworks that exist and are available (please, see Annex I).
* **Interviews –** structured, semi-structured, in-depth, key informant, focus group etc. to capture the perspectives of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, participating ministries, departments and agencies, relevant personnel from the Participating UN Agencies and local authorities (regional, district and at the level of a county), donors, other relevant stakeholders (including trainees, community members and community leaders) and others associated with the Programme.
* **Case studies -** in-depth review of one or a small number of selected cases, using framework of analysis and a range of data collection methods. Several case studies can be quite sophisticated in research design, however simpler and structured approaches to case study can still be of great value.
* **Information systems –** analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to a service or process, used for monitoring (desirable but not crucial).

The evaluation will use available data to the greatest extent possible. This will encompass administrative data as well as various studies and surveys, including those conducted by the UN agencies. This approach will help address the possible shortage of data and reveal gaps that should be corrected as the result of the Evaluation.

The reliability of disaggregated data at the district level should be taken into account as the capacity for data collection at the local level is still quite low and it is relatively expensive to conduct comprehensive surveys at sub-regional level. In this regard, it is necessary to use objective and subjective data available from the official sources (national and local statistics offices, administrative data), additionally verified by independent sources such as surveys and studies conducted by local and international research companies, civil society organizations and UN agencies. The relevant sources and access to data will be provided by the Participating UN Agencies and national stakeholders respectively.

The evaluation team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by the Joint Programme partners and applicable to the remaining period of the Joint Programme.

## Evaluation products (deliverables)

The evaluation team will prepare reports which triangulate findings to address the questions of the final evaluation, highlight key significant changes in regard to the key thematic policy documents, draw out lessons learned, present findings and recommendations, reflecting comments and feedback received from selected staff. The structure of the reports should be used to guide the reader to the main areas (please, see Annex II for the Evaluation report template). The language of the reports should be simple, free from jargon and with specialist terms explained. It will be important to receive the report on a timely basis, as the information risks to be wasted if it arrives too late to inform decisions. Here are the principal evaluation products the evaluation team is accountable for following activities and deliverables:

1. **Evaluation inception report** (prepared after **Briefing** the evaluation team before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise and consist of *5-10 pages excluding annexes*) – to clarify the evaluation team’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures (to be presented in an Evaluation matrix discussed below). The evaluation inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.
2. **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the Evaluation inception report) is a tool that evaluation team creates as map in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. (Please, see Table below)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant Evaluation criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection Methods / Tools** | **Indicators/ Success Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

1. **Draft evaluation report** (consist of 30-40 pages excluding annexes) – to be reviewed by the Participating UN Agencies and other respective stakeholders at the end of data collection. The draft evaluation report should contain all the sections outlined in the *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex II) and be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation for a Stakeholders’ meeting.

It should be noted that a **Stakeholders’ meeting[[2]](#footnote-3)** is planned to be held in Astana (Almaty colleagues might join via Conference Call) to discuss findings of the *Draft Evaluation report* in order to get feedback from stakeholders, circulate the report to all the people who are recommended to attend the meeting, with time to read it first. The evaluation team should consider and incorporate stakeholders ‘feedback as appropriate.

1. **Final Evaluation report.** The final task of the evaluation team is to prepare a comprehensive and well-presented copy of the final Evaluation report, covering all section of *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex II) and containing 30-40 pages[[3]](#footnote-4). Evaluation brief and summary are required.

## Required skills and competencies

*Eligibility and requirements for the evaluation team:*

* An organization (public, private, or nonprofit), academic/[research](http://www.fundsforngos.org/category/research-2/) institution;
* Work experience in conducting independent Evaluations,
* Experience in M&E, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science at least 5 years;
* Experience in cooperation with international experts / organizations is an advantage;
* Ability to travel in the regions.

*Functional Competencies:*

* Possess strong analytical skills and the ability to conceptualize, articulate and debate about local governance and human rights issues with a positive and forward-looking attitude;
* Understand human rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming in programming;
* Understand results-based management principles, logic modeling/logical framework analysis;
* Demonstrate ability to communicate with various partners including government, civil society, private sector, UN Agencies and other development donors;
* Excellent organizational and time management skills;
* Strong analytical skills and experience in undertaking of similar assignments;
* Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work with people from different backgrounds to deliver quality products within a short timeframe;
* Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills;
* Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands;
* Be client oriented.

*Corporate Competencies:*

* Sound knowledge of the UN programming principles and procedures; the UN system and common country programming processes; the UN Evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights based approach (HRBA);
* Demonstrate integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promote the vision, mission, and strategic goals of the Participating UN Agencies;
* Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Fulfill all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

*Education of personnel participating in the Evaluation:*

* MA or PhD in economics, business administration, political science, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science.

*Experience:*

* 5 or more years of relevant professional experience is required, including previous substantive research experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management (evaluations in local development and governance, social protection, welfare, and population reproduction);
* Experience with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches;
* Prior monitoring and evaluation experience in Kazakhstan or CIS region (especially Central Asian countries) is an asset.
* Knowledge of the social and political situation and regional development trends in CIS countries is an advantage;

*Language Requirements:*

* Proficiency in English language and proven report writing skills, knowledge of Russian and Kazakh is an asset.

It is demanded by the Participating UN Agencies that the evaluation team is independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation[[4]](#footnote-5).

# *Evaluation ethics*

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[5]](#footnote-6) and should describe critical issues evaluation team must address in the design and implementation of the present evaluation , including evaluation ethics and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

The evaluation team is also requested to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluation teams in the UN System’[[6]](#footnote-7)

# *Implementation arrangements*

As agreed by the participating agencies UNDP bares the responsibility for the management of the Evaluation – in coordination with the other principle partners involved in Programme Implementation.

UNDP will have the following functions:

* Draft the ToR for the evaluation;
* Lead the evaluation process throughout the evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
* Lead the finalization of the Evaluation ToR;
* Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team and make contractual arrangements;
* Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards;
* Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process
* Take responsibility for dissemination;
* Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation within the Joint Programme budgets;

The Joint Programme Team will have the following functions:

* Contribute to the finalization of the Evaluation TOR;
* Provide executive and coordination support to the evaluation team;
* Provide the evaluation team with administrative and logistical support, including for the field mission, and required data;
* Connect the evaluation team with key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a full inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
* Review and provide inputs on draft and final evaluation reports.

The assignment is home-based with at least two missions to Kazakhstan: (i) to conduct field work in Kyzylorda Region and several districts (to be agreed by the stakeholders) of the Kyzylorda Region as well as with UN and national partners in Astana and Almaty, and (2) to attend stakeholders’ meeting with the Participating UN Agencies and implementing partners in Astana[[7]](#footnote-8) to present final evaluation report. The Participating UN Agencies will interact with the chosen evaluation team by communicating through e-mail correspondence while outside of Kazakhstan, as well as support the evaluation team in-country. There will be an office space, supplies, equipment and materials provided in premises of the Participating UN Agencies (available in Astana and Kyzylorda).

# *Time-frame and expected deliverables*

The time required will vary depending on the questions evaluation is attempting to answer, the human and financial resources available, and other external factors. It is important to think through timing issues to ensure that a proposed evaluation will provide accurate, reliable, and useful information.

It is envisaged that the present evaluation will take place in October-November 2016 and will involve 33 working days in total (please see the Table):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Working days** |
| Conducting a desk review | 4 |
| Preparing the detailed Evaluation inception report (to finalize Evaluation design and methods) | 3 |
| In-country Evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) and 2 days of in country analysis with preliminary feedback to country stakeholders. | 8 |
| Preparing the draft report | 6 |
| Finalizing the Evaluation report (incorporate comments provided)  | 4 |
| Participation in Stakeholders’ meeting | 2 |
| Follow up support to the Participating UN Agencies in knowledge sharing and dissemination  | 2 |

*(e.g. 29 working days in total over a period of two months)*

# Cost

The evaluation team is to propose an evaluation design fitting within the limits of available time and resources. If the evaluation team considers the available amount insufficient to ensure the high quality of evaluation products, discussions can take place between the evaluation team and the Participating UN Agencies early on in the process. Overall, the indicative budget for the Evaluation, including but not limited to the cost of the consultants, is estimated at USD 35, 000. The costs of the Evaluation will be shared by UN participating agencies.

# Application procedure

Interested candidates are invited to submit applications together with their CV for the contract with UNDP to conduct the final evaluation (please read the Procurement Notice for more details). The following documents/information must be submitted:

* Letters of recommendation (if any);
* A list of provided services in the field of the evaluation, monitoring and social studies in public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science for the last three years;
* Membership in the research organizations is an asset;
* Proposed methodology of final Evaluation;
* Final Evaluation Budget[[8]](#footnote-9)

Please note that the UN Online Recruitment System allows only one ‘uploading’, so please make sure that you merge all your documents into a single file.

*Payment modalities and specifications*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 10% | At contract signing |
| 30% | Following submission and approval of the draft inception report by all Participating UN Agencies |
| 60% | Following submission and approval of the final Evaluation report by all Participating UN Agencies |

## Annexes

**Annex I**: A list of key documents, among others, to be consulted and analyzed:

* Joint Programme Document
* Country Programme Documents of participating UN agencies
* Country Programme Action Plans of participating UN agencies (if available)
* Programme Board meetings minutes
* Monitoring systems, process indicators and resource framework
* Consolidated Annual Reports, including progress and financial reports and Outputs Tables for 2014 and 2015
* Baseline data on relevant topics in the beginning of the Programme
* Country situation analysis, assessments and publications
* Strategic framework of partnership and development principles
* Variety of temporal and focused reports
* Relevant legislation and policy documents
* State sectoral strategic plan
* Proposal support documents
* Law on Republican Budget for 2014-2016
* UNDAF for 2010-2015, PFD for 2016-2020
* National Human Rights Action Plan
* Human Development reports. Government of RK, UNDP
* Strategic Plans of Ministry of National Economy, Ministry of Health and Social Development, Ministry of Education and Science etc.

**Annex II: Evaluation report template**

This templateis intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible Evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all Evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality Evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ and ‘Ethical Standards for Evaluations’[[9]](#footnote-10).

The Evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

**Title and opening pages —** should provide the following basic information:

* Name of the Evaluation intervention
* Time frame of the Evaluation and date of the report
* Countries of the Evaluation intervention
* Names and organizations of evaluation teams
* Name of the organization commissioning the Evaluation
* Acknowledgements

**Table of contents —** should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page reEvaluationrences.

**List of acronyms and abbreviations**

**Executive summary —** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

* Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the Evaluation, including the audience for the Evaluation and the intended uses.
* Describe key aspect of the Evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**Introduction —** should:

* Explain why the Evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
* Identify the primary audience or users of the Evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the Evaluation, why and how they are expected to use the Evaluation results.
* Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the Evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

**Description of the intervention —** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the Evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the Evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the Evaluation. The description should:

* Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
* Explain the **expected results map or results framework**, **implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
* Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals.**
* Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the Evaluation.
* Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
* Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
* Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
* Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the efEvaluationcts (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
* Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

**Evaluation scope and objectives —** the report should provide a clear explanation of the Evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

Evaluation scope — the report should define the parameters of the Evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.

Evaluation objectives — the report should spell out the types of decisions Evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the Evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.

Evaluation criteria — the report should define the Evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the Evaluation.

Evaluation questions — Evaluation questions define the information that the Evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main Evaluation questions addressed by the Evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

**Evaluation approach and methods** **—** the Evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the Evaluation questions and achieved the Evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the Evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

Data sources — the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the Evaluation questions.

Sample and sampling frame — If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.

Data collection procedures and instruments — Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.

Performance standards — the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the Evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales). A summary matrix displaying for each of Evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.

Stakeholder engagement — Stakeholders’ engagement in the Evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the Evaluation and the results.

Ethical considerations—the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation teams’ for more information)[[10]](#footnote-11).

Background information on evaluation team —The background and skills of the consultant and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the Evaluation.

Major limitations of the methodology — Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for Evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

**Data analysis —** the report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the Evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the Evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

**Findings and conclusions —** the report should present the Evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

Findings — should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the Evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors afEvaluationcting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently afEvaluationcted implementation should be discussed.

Conclusions — should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to Evaluation findings. They should respond to key Evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

**Recommendations —** the report should provide practical, Evaluationasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the Evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

**Lessons learned —** as appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the Evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about Evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

**Report annexes —** suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

* ToR for the Evaluation
* Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
* List of supporting documents reviewed
* Project or programme results map or results framework
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
* Short biographies of the evaluation team
* Code of conduct signed by evaluation teams

The Evaluation Report will be submitted to the UN Agencies’ Quality Assessment System to ensure the appropriate quality of the Evaluation and to make it available for knowledge sharing purposes.

**Annex III: Key stakeholders and partners**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Organization** | **Name and Position of the focal point** | **Contact information** |
|  | * **Government partners**
 |  |  |
|  | * Ministry of National Economy
 | To be provided  | economy.gov.kz/‎ |
|  | * Akimat of Kyzylorda oblast
 | Krymbek Kusherbayev, Akim | http://e-kyzylorda.gov.ru |
|  | Division of Economy and Budget Planning  | Saule Kulumbetova, Head |  |
|  | Division of Employment Coordination and Social Programmes  | Marat Delmukhanov, Head |  |
|  | Division of Entrepreneurship and Tourism | To be provided  |  |
|  | Division of Healthcare  | To be provided  |  |
|  | Education  | To be provided  |  |
|  | **Civil Society Organizations** |  |  |
|  | Support of Initiative, NGO | To be provided  |  |
|  | Kamystybas, NGO | To be provided  |  |
|  | * **UN Agencies**
 |  |  |
|  | * UNDP
 |  | www.kz.undp.org |
|  | * UNICEF
 |  | [www.unicef.kz](http://www.unicef.kz) |
|  | * UNFPA
 |  | http://countryoffice.unfpa.org/kazakhstan/ |
|  | * UNESCO
 |  |  |
|  | * UN Women
 |  |  |
|  | * WHO
 |  |  |
|  | **Donors and International Organizations** |
|  | * Ministry of National Economy
 | To be provided  | www.government.kz/‎ |
|  | * Samsung
 | To be provided  | ? |
|  | * **Corporate and Private Sector**
 |  |  |
|  | * Entrepreneurship Development Fund ‘DAMU’
 | To be provided  |  |
|  | * National Commercial Board “Atameken”
 | To be provided  |  |
|  | * JSC “Fund of Financial Support of Agriculture”
 | To be provided  |  |

***Annex IV: List of local towns and rural districts (rayons) involved in the Programme***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Activity** | **Number of beneficiaries with aggregation by affiliation where possible** | **Special deliverables** | **UN agency** |
| Aralsk | 1. 2 online centers in Kambash and Saksaulsk villages.
2. Installation of two greenhouses with energy-efficient and water-saving technologies (in Aralkum and Amanotkel)
3. Replacement of street lighting in Amanotkel and Shizhaga villages.
 | Savings up to 7 times compared to the previous year | Free access to high-quality information technologies for the residents of remote rural areas;Budgetary savings for lighting up to 7 times compared to the previous year;New technologies in rural schools               | UNDP |
| Kazalinsk | 1. 2 online centers in Orkendeu and Zhankozha villages;
2. Women and persons with disabilities employed in the Sewing workshop in Kozhabakhy village;
3. 2 greenhouses with the use of energy-efficient and water-saving technologies at schools of Bekarystan bi and Karashengel villages;
4. Installation of a boiler in a rural House of Culture in Kazalinsk;
5. Installation of a modern playground for children in Aiteke bi village;
 | 5 women including 1 woman with disabilities were employed. | Comfort conditions made for leisure time activities for: 150 pupils and students; 130 pensioners and vulnerable persons; 25 state employees | UNDP |
| Syrdarya | 1. Opening of a resource center for the development of rural NGOs of Syrdarya region due to inclusive grant of "Akmurat" NGO;
2. 2 greenhouses with the use of energy-efficient and water-saving technologies at the schools of Terenozek village;
 | More than 12 trainings were organized for the regional NGOs and vulnerable target groups. | Capacity building | UNDP |
| Zhalagash | 1. NGO "Society of people with disabilities of Zhalagash region" with a project "Social enterprise - new opportunities for people with disabilities", opening of a printing center with special training for employees and subsequent employment of people with disabilities;
 | 2 jobs for people with disabilities created |  | UNDP |
| Kyzylorda | 1. Specialist” educational center provided trainings for 20 unemployed persons in two new specializations of a seamstress and a master on repairing household appliances with subsequent employment;
2. Advanced training on the usage of sign language for 24 social workers to provide special services to the people with disabilities;
3. "Izet" Public Fund, project "Accessible Environment" - installation of special equipment for people with disabilities in the House of social institutions;
4. "Kyzylorda association of librarians" Public association, "Shanyrak Intelligence Center" project - creation of courses on computer literacy and expansion of library services for public, including people with disabilities;
5. «Orkenietti Kazakhstan» - establishment of a club of young persons with disabilities to address socio-economic and educational issues;
6. «Syr Ulandary» Public Association - Social audit of the implementation of state program of modernization of apartment housing in Kyzylorda»;
7. «Arylu» Public Association - establishment of Volunteers Club in the rehabilitation center for people with disabilities in Talsuat village;
8. "Society of Women the small entrepreneurs" Public Association opened the Crisis Center "ZHAN" for women and children sufEvaluationred from domestic violence
9. Three-stage advanced training of NGOs' representatives of Kyzylorda region (Trainer: Ainur Absemetova);
10. Forum of social workers with the participation of representatives of the Ministry of Health and Social Development, the regional akimat and social workers of Kyzylorda oblast. 50 social workers were trained on providing social services for the people with disabilities;
11. «Social Good Summit» attracted volunteers, regional NGOs and business people.
 | 1. 3 persons with disabilities were trained and 2 of them were employed afterwards.
2. 20 persons were trained and 13 young people were employed.
3. Advanced training for rural social workers on November 4 - 7
4. October 26: Seminar for State authorities to ensure accessible environment for people with disabilities; 48 representatives of state agencies took part in this seminar.
5. 20 trainings were organized for 45 participants, 5 young people were employed.
6. A club for 30 young people with disabilities was established. 4 trainings and 1 survey on the needs and problems of young people with disabilities were organized on December 12 – 22
7. 4 trainings were held for the Association of Cooperative of apartment owners (CAO) and public hearings were organized on raising the problems of housing and communal modernization campaign.
8. A Volunteer Club consisting of 30 volunteers was opened in the Center; 2 trainings were organized for people with disabilities and Center employees;
9. Volunteers support classes on photo taking, art therapy and winter garden.
10. 2 trainings and 1 round table were held for women and employees of social and law enforcement agencies since November 24 to December 23. Over 20 women-victims of domestic violence were consulted.
11. 3 two-days trainings were organized for 36 regional NGOs on November 1 – 30.
12. Over 120 specialists and managers of social sphere of Kyzylorda region took part in this Forum on November 6
13. More than 30 NGO, state agencies and business representatives took part in this event on September 28
 | Capacity buidling | UNDP |
| Kyzylorda region - whole | Capacity building and technical assistance to the local authorities in the implementation of the law On Prevention of Domestic Violence Building capacity of the civil societyRaising awarenessImproving the quality of public services | 31 staff from the unit for the protection of WAV, police for juvenile ofEvaluationnders, and the district police; 41 psychologists and social workers;1 local akimat;1 local healthcare department;1 education department. 3 NGOs;1 crisis centers; 3 schools.26 victims of domestic violenceLocal community | Report of activities UN Women MCO implemented through a partnership with the Crisis Centre “Podrugi” Kyzylorda region in 2015, under Output 2.1 | UN Women |
| Kizylorda city;Syrdarinski rayon | Review of quality assurance mechanisms for health services at primary health care (PHC) - focus on adult population | Oblast hospital quality management team; (patients/population served by Oblast hospital)Rayon central hospital/primary health care department: patients/population served by the PHC | Base-line report | WHO |
| Kizylorda cityShiely rayon | Assessment of quality of health care at PHC; Interviews on quality of care and patient satisfaction with pregnant women and mothers of newborns | Patients (pregnant women and mothers of newborns) served by Policlinic No. 3 – Kizylorda city and Shiely rayon central PHC | Overal report for Kazakhstan with recommendations to MOHSD;Specific report with recommendations for management of two health facilities | WHO |
| Kizylorda city Shagansk rayonTerenozek | Patient satisfaction survey – (adult population/patients with heart diseases and diabetes) | Kizylorda policlinics: No. 1, No2, No3, No 6 and oblast hospitalShagansk rayon hospital and policlinicTerenozek (hospital and policlinic) | Report; Presentation for health and akimat authorities; communication strategy for better communication of management with health proEvaluationssionals | WHO |
| Kizylorda cityShiely rayonSyrdarinski rayon | Assessment of management capacities, budgetary planning and management of human resources | Management of health facilities: Kyzylorda oblast (four health facilities providing inpatient and outpatient care; patients served by the health facilities in selected rural and urban areas) | Presentation and report on round table | WHO |
| Kizylorda city | Increasing knowledge of central and oblast authorities on climate change efEvaluationcts on health: round table | Oblast health authorities, and authorities from department of education, social care, branch of committee for consumer rights protection |  | WHO |
| Kizylorda oblast | Presentation of the findings of the assessment of management capacities in PHC | Oblast authorities and oblast health department | Report and presentation | WHO |
| Kizylorda cityShiely rayon | Training – Introduction of quality assurance principles for health care services and setting up quality improvement plans for pilot facilities | Health proEvaluationssionals of the pilot facilities; population served by the pilot facilities | Quality improvement plans for pilot facilities | WHO |
| Kizylorda cityAral district | Assessment of socio-economic determinants of health and identification of “mortality” hot spots | Population of Kizylorda oblast | Report pending due to unavailability of information on mortality per rayon and linkage with socio-economic data | WHO |
| Kizylorda city | Review of implementation of TB programme in Kizylorda | TB oblast hospital, Pediatric TB hospital in Kizylorda; TB sanatorium Kizylorda |  | WHO |
| Kizylorda oblast | Assessment of environmental challenges related to chemical pollution – desk review of data  | Kizylorda oblast  | Report – Karaganda institute on occupational health | WHO |
| Shiely rayon and Aral rayon | Review of meteorological data – extreme weather events related to mortality from stroke in specific rayons | Population of Shiely rayon | D-base with data – baseline for analysis | WHO |
| Art gallery of Kyzylorda city | Exhibition, devoted to the 550 anniversary of the Kazakh Khanate,September 2015 | 60 artisans of Kyzylorda oblast participated | Best works were sent to Astana, where the exhibition "Evaluationstive ethnic-aul" also dedicated to the 550th Anniversary of the Kazakh Khanate | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda and Aralsk cities | Series of meetings with the local stakeholders in the regional centers of Kyzylorda and Aralsk, 25-28 October 2015 | n/a | The programme of activities for the community based inventory of the intangible cultural heritage in Kyzylorda oblast of Kazakhstan was drawn | UNESCO |
| 7 rayons of Kyzylorda | “Strengthening potential of the crafts sector of Aral Sea Area of Kazakhstan”, 26-31 October 2015 | 30 |  | UNESCO |
| 14 regions of Kazakhstan, including Astana and Almaty cities | Training-workshop on “ICH documentation and inventorying”, 18 November 2015 | 18 Representatives of Culture Departments from each of 14 regions of Kazakhstan, including Astana and Almaty cities | ICH guidelines | UNESCO |
| Country wide  | Legislation on Access to Information Adoption 18.11.15 | Country Population will benefit since 1.01.16 | 1 Law  | UNESCO UNDP |
| Kyzylorda | Training of Media Trainers  | 1 trainer |  | UNESCO UNDP |
| 10 core villages where on-line centers are located | Capacity building of librarians of on-line centers inAkkum, Madeniet, Enbekshi, Sulutobe, Shiraga, Kambash, Zhalantos, Orkendeu, Inkardarya, Akzharma villages | 10 centers staff  | 4 centers are functional and 6 potential staff is trained | UNESCOUNDP |
| Kyzylorda region | UNESCO Media and Information literacy actions | Potential beneficiaries: 10 online centers | 1 publication Media and Information Literacy in Russian and Kazak | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | the 9 - 12 July 2015 the ІII International Summer School on Media and Information Literacy | 4 Media outlets |  | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | Mobile application to access multilingual information | 10 online centers | multilingual application UNESCO Almaty | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | Development of a pilot study course on Climate Risk Management for Universities of Kyzylorda region | Local universities of Kyzylorda region | Study module on Climate Risk Management for universities | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | Training on Climate Risk Management (CRM) course, 6 November 2016 | - 11 proEvaluationssors of local universities;- 4 Heads of Departments of local Akimat;- 1 local college;- 1 local research institution;- 2 local NGOs | List of recommendations on improvement of the CRM course | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) training for university teachers, 11 December 2015 | 1 local university |  | UNESCO |
| Kyzylorda region | Field work wetlands monitoring in the Syr Darya River delta and the North Aral Sea, August-September 2015 | Local authorities and local population | Field work report “Eco-monitoring of the Syr Darya River Delta and the North Aral Sea” | UNESCO |
| Aral district, Kyzylorda region | Promotion of Barsakelmes Biosphere Reserve (BR) nomination for inclusion in the UNESCO World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR) | 74,700 people of Aral district (57,9% of which is rural population) | Nomination endorsed; Barsakelmes BR was officially included into the UNESCO WNBR on March 19, 2016 | UNESCO  |

## Annex V: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation team:

* Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
* Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
* Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an Evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
* Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting Evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
* Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
* Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
* Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the Evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[11]](#footnote-12)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_* Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Available at [http://www.unEvaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\_id=22](http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Participation of the evaluation team in the Meeting is mandatory. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Evaluation team may need to use ‘Times New Roman’ font at a size of 12 points, with Normal margin and line spacing 1.15. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. For this reason, staff members the Participating UN Agencies based in other country offices, the regional centres and Headquarters units should not apply for the position of the evaluation team. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Please see, Annex VI [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Participation of the evaluation team in the Meeting is mandatory. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. UNEG, ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’, 2005, available at: [http://www.unEvaluation.org/unegstandards](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegstandards) and UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008, available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at

<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. For more information on Code of Conduct please visit: [www.unEvaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)