# Annexes

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

**Statement of Work**

EVALUATION OF THE PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF) PROJECT PORTFOLIO IN

**KYRGYZSTAN**

The PBF has been engaged in Kyrgyzstan since 2010, when – amid underlying political and social tensions – violence erupted in the southern cities of Osh and Jalalabad, and their surrounding areas, resulting in the death of at least 470 people and displacement of 400,000 people, of whom 75,000 fled to Uzbekistan.[[1]](#footnote-1) Following its initial round of support, in 2013, PBF approved a $15,1 million allocation against a Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP). Implementation of the PPP ended in December 2016. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the PBF’s results achieved from 2013-2016 and analyse the portfolio’s overall added value to peacebuilding in the country. The evaluation will be used for learning and accountability, and to contribute to the PBF’s decision-making regarding further engagement in Kyrgyzstan.

This Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the work of the team of institutional consultants for an independent final evaluation of the implementation of the PBF portfolio, including the progress of project-level outputs towards the outcomes of the Priority Plans, institutional arrangements among the implementing agencies as well as Government stakeholders, expenditure rates, and opportunities for learning.

BACKGROUND

A. Analysis of conflict and peace drivers underpinning PBF engagement

A Peacebuilding Needs and Priorities Assessment (PBNPA) from Spring 2013 identified the following key issues, among others:

1. A lack of trust has led to increasing segregation of different ethnic communities in some areas which directly experienced and were affected by the violent conflict in June 2010. In addition, local authorities do not always enjoy the trust of people, and local authorities and people together highlight communication and coordination problems they face with national authorities.
2. A lack of justice and the memories of violent conflict in June 2010 and previous conflict in 1990 compounds lack of trust and increases the sense of insecurity. Many people feel that past justice-related issues have not been adequately addressed and there was no widely accepted and recognized reconciliation process, lacking the sense of closure over past conflicts.
3. The sense of human insecurity among many people was deemed high. The sense of insecurity exaggerates and is compounded by stereotypes, nationalism, inequality and discrimination, among other things. Attaining a level of human security – defined as freedom from want and from fear – must be part of the foundation for peace. In order to address the question of human insecurity, a common civic identity uniting all Kyrgyz citizens was deemed necessary if society is to become more equitable. In this context, the national language policy is an important issue and widely debated. The National Sustainable Development Strategy for 2013-17 considers linguistic and cultural diversity as a source for enrichment of the society and a key for sustainable human development, while recognizing the importance of the state language, Kyrgyz. The use of language, therefore, has significance both as a uniting factor among citizens and as an indicator of tolerance and inclusiveness in society.
4. Inadequate legislation and partial implementation of laws and policies, lack of respect for the rule of law among sections of the population and among some officials, and the fact that people often are not held accountable for their actions cause and compound the problem of impunity. This issue can be highlighted with the high prevalence of violence particularly against children and youths in families and schools. There is an atmosphere in society, including in homes and schools, that violence is viewed as acceptable by some, which undermines the creation of a favourable environment for peace.

In addition to these key factors the PBNPA also highlighted the need to address structural factors such as implementing international human rights laws, strengthening state control and governance and improving state institutions’ relationship with citizens, and consistent upholding of the rule of law by authorities.

This analysis provided the basis for development of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan, further detailed below.

B. Overview of PBF’s involvement in Kyrgyzstan

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), established in 2006, is a flexible peacebuilding tool that supports the United Nation’s broader peacebuilding objectives in countries emerging out of conflict or at risk of relapsing into conflict. It is intended to be a catalytic fund, driven by planning, coordination and monitoring mechanisms tailored to support the peacebuilding strategies of incountry United Nations and Government leadership. The Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) is responsible for the overall management of the PBF; the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP’s) Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) is the Fund’s Administrative Agent. At the country level, management of the Fund is delegated to a Joint Steering Committee (JSC), co-chaired by the national Government and the United Nations with a broader membership representing national and international stakeholders.

The PBF has been engaged since the middle of the crisis in 2010. Its goal at the beginning was to react quickly – using its Immediate Response Facility (IRF) – to build momentum behind the stated peacebuilding objectives of the transition government. These included support to the democratic transition process and dealing with peacebuilding and stabilization efforts in the south. PBF funded activities ranging from supporting human rights work in the south, assisting women’s organizations, strengthening an infrastructure for peace and supporting peace dividends that reached across ethnic and other divides. PBF provided $10m of support through the IRF in 2010 and 2011. An independent evaluation found that assistance had helped empower different communities, especially youth and women’s networks, to engage in a proactive response to violence. The Government pointed out that the Fund’s support had brought the Government and the United Nations into a closer and more coordinated response. The evaluation also highlighted, however, that several activities were not as focused on peacebuilding outcomes as they could have been, and that more support should be provided to partners during the programme design stage.

In the fall of 2012, the President requested further assistance from the UN Secretary General, articulating long-term peacebuilding priorities of the country. Under the auspices of the Office of the President, a Joint Steering Committee for peacebuilding was established, and PBSO – in a partnership with PeaceNexus Foundation –assisted the JSC to undertake the Peacebuilding Needs and Priorities Assessment noted above and develop a Priority Plan.

On 9 September 2013, PBSO allocated $15.1 million through its Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility to Kyrgyzstan. Funds supported three priority areas: rule of law and human rights promotion; improving local governance capacity to prevent and resolve local conflicts and reduce tensions in collaboration with civil society and communities; and promotion of national unity and interethnic relations, focusing on the role of language policy and media. Thirteen projects were eventually approved by the JSC and implemented from 2014-2016.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Table 1: Priority Plan Funding Allocation (Total $15,100,000)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Outcome Area** |  |  | **Amount in US $**  |  |
| Outcome 1. Critical laws, policies, reforms and recommendations of human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review,[[3]](#footnote-3) are implemented to uphold the rule of law, improve access to justice and respect, protect and fulfil human rights  | 4,000,000  |
| Outcome 2. Local self-government bodies, in partnership with related state institutions, and civil society[[4]](#footnote-4), have the capacity to bridge divisions and reduce local tensions | 5,750,000  |
| Outcome 3. Policies, pilot initiatives and approaches are developed and implemented that enable the further development of a common civic identity, multilingual education and respect for diversity and minority rights  | 4,500,000  |
| Secretariat, including monitoring  | 850,000  |
| **TOTAL**  | **15,100,000**  |

The JSC is responsible for providing overall policy guidance and coordination between the

Government, UN in Kyrgyzstan and the PBSO. The JSC comprises senior representatives from Government, civil society, the United Nations and international development partners and is cochaired by a representative from the Office of the President and the United Nations Resident Coordinator (RC). The JSC meets regularly to review progress on the implementation of the Priority Plan and other PBF investments, and to provide general guidance and policy direction on issues pertaining to peacebuilding.

PURPOSE AND USE OF EVALUATION

After three years of PRF implantation in Kyrgyzstan, this final, summative evaluation presents an excellent opportunity to assess the PBF’s achievements and its overall added value to peacebuilding in Kyrgyzstan for the period of 2014-2016. A final evaluation of the PBF’s programmatic investments in Kyrgyzstan is requested by the PBSO’s Senior Management as an independent evaluation of peacebuilding results of the PBF-funded work at country level. This evaluation is timely, as it will contribute to better understanding the effectiveness of the PBF’s strategic decision-making and overall learning on how the PPP has contributed to the overall outcomes. Moreover, it will help inform decision-making on the appropriateness of any future PBF engagement.

Hence, the purpose of this evaluation is to:

* assess to what extent the PBF envelope of support has made a concrete and sustained impact in terms of building and consolidating peace in Kyrgyzstan, either through direct action or through catalytic effects;
* assess how relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable the PBF support to Kyrgyzstan has been;
* assess where the critical remaining peacebuilding gaps in Kyrgyzstan are;
* assess whether the peacebuilding interventions supported by the PBF factored in gender equality;
* provide lessons for future PBF support internationally on key successes and challenges

(both in terms of programming and management of the PBF funds); and

* serve as a useful evidence-based input for decision-making on any possible future support.

There are two main clients for the evaluation, to whom the recommendations will be addressed: (i) the Kyrgyzstan PBF management team, including the RC’s Office and the JSC; and (ii) the PBSO/PBF. The evaluation’s evidence, findings and recommendations on the peacebuilding results of the PBF-funded work in Kyrgyzstan will be useful for consideration and action by relevant actors, including the PBF staff, staff of the PBF’s Administrative Agent, the UNCT and national partners. It will also serve as relevant inputs to the PBF policies and guidance, and other reviews.

The outcome of the final evaluation will be a report that presents main findings and recommendations from the evaluation, as well as presentations to the PBF Senior Management and other stakeholders, as appropriate. The evaluation findings and recommendations will be used to inform actions to further strengthen key aspects of the PBF’s current and future work. The recommendations should be actionable and on how the PBF and its partners can improve their effectiveness. The final report will be a public document.

SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The evaluation will have a broad scope and will consider the overall performance of the PBF support from 2014 through 2016, including individual projects funded through the PRF modality (see Annex 1 for list of projects to be evaluated). The scope of the evaluation can be broken down into the following three components:

A. Evaluation of impact of the PBF portfolio of support to Kyrgyzstan since 2014

The evaluation will examine the combined effect of the portfolio of projects funded under the Priority Plan by the PBF in order to assess the PBF’s overall contribution to the building and consolidation of peace in Kyrgyzstan since 2014, particularly within the three outcome areas noted above.

The broad questions to be answered are based on the evaluation criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

(OECD-DAC) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards (see Appendix A to Annex B) (including those on gender mainstreaming), which have been adapted to the context at hand as follows:[[5]](#footnote-5)

Relevance:

* What was the relevance of the proposed theory of change for the total PBF Kyrgyzstan portfolio and the different outcome areas?
* To what extent did the PBF and the Priority Plan respond to urgent funding needs and/or peacebuilding relevant gaps?
* To what extent did the Priority Plan take into account contextual changes, conflict analyses, and lessons learned following PBF’s initial $10 million investment?
* How relevant was the Priority Plan in achieving strategic outcomes?

Efficiency:

* How fast and responsive has the PBF been to supporting peacebuilding priorities in Kyrgyzstan?
* What role did the Joint Steering Committee play in ensuring efficient use of PBF’s investments?
* How efficient was the implementation of the PBF support through the Priority Plan and the projects, and how significant were the transaction costs?
* Overall, did the PBF investments provide value for money through the Priority Plan?
* To what extent were efficiencies gained in implementing the Priority Plan based on lessons learned from the PBF’s first investments?

Effectiveness:

* To what extent did the PBF portfolio from 2014-2016 achieve higher-level results in the three priority areas?
* To what extent did the PBF support take risks to achieve peacebuilding objectives, especially in areas where other donors were not ready to do so?
* How strategic was the Priority Plan at seizing important political opportunities for greater peacebuilding impact and creating catalytic effects?
* To what extent did the PBF projects contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in the PPP?
* To what extent did the PBF projects of the Priority Plan complement each other and have strategic coherence?
* How effectively were risk factors assessed and managed throughout the PBF support to Kyrgyzstan (both in the PPP as well as within individual projects)?

Gender:

* To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the PBF support to Kyrgyzstan (both in the PPP as well as within individual projects)?
* To what extent did the PBF help address women’s needs during the post-conflict period, and did the theory of change address gender equality?
* To what extent did the PBF support gender-responsive peacebuilding?

Sustainability:

* How strong is the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of the PBF support and continuing any unfinished activities?
* What, if any, catalytic effects did the PBF support in Kyrgyzstan have (financial and nonfinancial)?

Following from the overall assessment, the evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the PBF’s total contribution to the three priority areas from the Priority Plan. Examples of types of questions to be considered to examine this strategic, substantive contribution are provided below:[[6]](#footnote-6)

Outcome 1: Critical laws, policies, reforms and recommendations of human rights mechanisms, including UPR, are implemented to uphold the rule of law, improve access to justice and respect, protect and fulfil human rights

* To what extent have the PBF-funded projects promoted equality before the law and nondiscrimination?
* How effectively have the PBF-funded projects helped empower people to demand their rights?
* How effectively did interventions help build the capacity of state institutions to take forward their human rights and justice obligations?
* To what extent was dialogue on how issues related to justice for past conflicts addressed? If dialogue was fostered, how effective was it in nurturing a shared vision for the future among diverse groups of the population?
* To what extent were rights-holders empowered to articulate and demand change?
* How well did interventions support the role of youth and women, as well as other marginalized groups such as minorities, in decision-making forums and in equally leading peacebuilding activities?

Outcome 2: Local self-government bodies, in partnership with related state institutions, and civil societyhave the capacity to bridge divisions and reduce local tensions

* To what extent have the PBF-funded interventions helped to reduce mistrust among community members and foster greater social cohesion?
* How effectively have Local Self-Governing bodies supported conflict resolution, dialogue and mediation to reduce inter-communal tension at the local level? If effective, has their enhanced capacity led to an increase in trust in their offices by diverse groups of community members?
* Have the initiatives led to an increased role for youth, women, minority groups within their local communities?

Outcome 3: Policies, pilot initiatives and approaches are developed and implemented that enable the further development of a common civic identity, multilingual education and respect for diversity and minority rights

* To what extent have the interventions promoted a balanced language policy through the State’s application of multilingual education? Have the projects succeeded in increasing knowledge of Kyrgyz among the target populations while safeguarding language diversity and protecting again language-based discrimination?
* Has the promotion of the language policy through the PBF-funded projects led to greater ascription of a common civic identity among the interventions’ target populations?
* Have the PBF-funded interventions contributed to media coverage that is more sensitive to ethnic minorities and less inflammatory of tensions?
* How effective were the PBF-funded interventions in promoting ideas of tolerance and respect for diversity in targeted communities?

B. Evaluation of PBF management and oversight structures in Kyrgyzstan

The evaluation will examine the management of the PBF support in order to comment on the overall effectiveness and efficiency of arrangements both in-country and between the PBSO/PBF and the UNCT. This should include the funding, programming and decision-making arrangements between all the actors and the quality and inclusivity of national ownership of the processes. Examples of types of questions to be considered are provided below:[[7]](#footnote-7)

PBF/PBSO:

* How transparent, effective and efficient was the decision-making regarding the PBF/PBSO support?
* How timely was the process of approving the Priority Plans? What were the main factors facilitating or delaying it?
* How effective was the support provided by the PBF/PBSO (and its partner, PeaceNexus) to the Recipient United Nations Organisations (RUNOs), the UNCT, the JSC and other stakeholders throughout the process (approval, design, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation)?

Joint Steering Committee (JSC):

* How suitable was the JSC composition to its role and how did the JSC evolve over time?
* To what extent did civil society organizations participate in the JSC, including women’s organizations?
* How strong was the government leadership/ownership of the JSC?
* How timely was the process of project approval? What were the main factors facilitating or delaying it?
* How effective were the JSC support bodies, if any?
* How strategic was the selection of projects to be supported and of the RUNOs to implement them?
* How strong was the strategic anchorage of the PBF support, the Priority Plan, and the individual projects in the national and United Nations frameworks for Kyrgyzstan?
* How effective was the in-country oversight of the Priority Plan and projects by the JSC, including quality assurance of monitoring data and reports?
* What kind of early warning/risk management systems were in place and how were they used?

Implementing RUNOs/United Nations Country Team (UNCT):

* What was the implementation capacity of the individual RUNOs and their implementing partners?
* How did different RUNOs work together towards common strategic objectives?
* What was the process for compiling half yearly and annual reviews and reports and what was the quality of those reports?
* How effectively did the RUNOs report against higher-level outcomes?
* How was gender considered throughout not only project design but also implementation, monitoring and reporting?
* Was adequate gender expertise available in the country team to support the integration of gender within the PBF-supported interventions?
* How were the principles of Do No Harm integrated in day-to-day management and oversight?

C. Key lessons learned and recommendations

The evaluation should provide an overview of key lessons and recommendations based on the assessment of the PBF support to Kyrgyzstan over the period 2014-2016. These should be addressed to PBSO as well as the PBF management in Kyrgyzstan (JSC and UNCT), and consider important entry points with key Governmental Ministries. Where possible, lessons should be made general and phrased in a way that can be used to strengthen future PBF programming in Kyrgyzstan and other countries. The lessons and recommendations should speak to:

* the main programming/implementation factors of success;
* the main programming/implementation challenges;
* the main administration factors of success;
* the main administration challenges; and
* the ways to address the main challenges.

The major lessons and recommendations should come out clearly in the evaluation Executive Summary.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY/APPROACH

The evaluation will be summative, and will employ, to the greatest extent possible, a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide and verify the substance of the findings. Proposals should outline a strong mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.

Evaluators should review any theories of change that either explicitly or implicitly framed the programming logic of the PPP and individual projects. The evaluation team should propose, where necessary, suggestions for improving or strengthening existing theories of change, or identifying theories of change where they are absent.

The PBF encourages evaluations teams to employ innovative approaches to data collection and analysis. The methodologies for data collection may include, without limitation:

* Desk review of key documents including: the PPP, project documents, results frameworks, pertinent correspondence related to the initial allocation decisions and subsequent project design and implementation, project reports, surveys, other information produced by the RUNOs with respect to the PBF-funded projects, and any previous evaluations and other reviews. Some of these documents will be supplied by the PBSO and the UNCT (others are available through the MPTFO Gateway website);
* Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with major stakeholders in New York, including the PBSO, MPTFO, and key RUNOs;
* Systematic review of monitoring data from the RUNOs, the JSC and other key sources of data;
* Direction observation through on-site field visits of PBF-funded projects, where possible;
* Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with all major stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries in Kyrgyzstan (including the JSC, United Nations agencies, implementing agencies, the Government, beneficiary institutions, a sample of individual beneficiaries, other development and peacebuilding partners, etc.). Beneficiaries should represent diverse groups, including women from different ethnic groups. Proposals should clearly indicate how interview and focus group discussion data will be captured, coded and analysed; and
* Survey of key stakeholders, if relevant

Other methodologies to consider, as appropriate, include the development of case studies, cluster analysis, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc. The evaluation team will produce a detailed methodological plan during the inception phase, specifying which methods will be used to answer which key evaluation questions. The plan should include a detailed description of the triangulation strategy and gender analysis. The plan should also describe the methodology that will be used to review the portfolio as a whole and the individual projects.

EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS

The evaluation findings will be evidence based and following the evaluation standards from OECD-DAC and UNEG. The PBF will brief the evaluation team on quality standards.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

The PBF evaluation staff will manage and oversee the evaluation process. Day-to-day work of the evaluation team and their logistics will be supported by the PBF, with assistance from the incountry management team and the UNCT. While evaluations are fully independent, a PBF staff may accompany the evaluation team during data collection for quality assurance.

An Evaluation Reference Group of key stakeholders will be created to provide the PBF with advice on key deliverables, including the Inception and Final Reports. The Evaluation Reference Group is likely to have members from the JSC, key in-country stakeholders and the PBF. The PBF will approve each of the deliverables by the evaluation team, following internal quality assurance and consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group. The evaluation team is expected to work responsively with the Evaluation Reference Group, while still maintaining independence.

The evaluation team will prepare an Inception Report to further refine the evaluation questions and detail its methodological approach, including data collection instruments. The Inception Report must be approved by the PBSO prior to commencement of the evaluation team’s incountry data collection trip.

In addition, before leaving the field following in-country data collection, the evaluation team will schedule a presentation of preliminary findings with the JSC and the UNCT with view to their validation. A separate validation exercise will be scheduled with the PBSO and the Evaluation Reference Group prior to the submission of the draft report.

The PBSO will retain the copyright over the evaluation. The evaluation findings will be made public following final approval by the PBSO and incorporating feedback from the country office.

EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIREMENTS

While firms should propose team compositions based on their understanding of the needs of the evaluation, at a minimum, the evaluation team should consist of one senior evaluator (ideally with experience in peacebuilding evaluations), one specialist on peacebuilding programming and another specialist on the current political, human rights, governance and reconciliation challenges in Kyrgyzstan. At least one of the team members should have a background on gender equality and women’s empowerment. The Team Leader will be responsible for the evaluation methodology, coordination of other team members, and the overall quality and timely submission of all the deliverables.

The Team Leader should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

* Master’s degree in a relevant area including social sciences, international development, research methods, or evaluation;
* Eight to ten years of evaluation experience, including the use of mixed methods. Ideally some evaluation experience within post-conflict countries and peacebuilding programmes;
* Demonstrated familiarity with the United Nations and its Agencies, Funds and Programmes;
* Demonstrated understanding of gender issues and women and peacebuilding within evaluation;
* Ability to plan effectively, prioritize, complete tasks quickly, and adapt to changing contexts;
* Demonstrated leadership in managing a team;
* Strong analytical skills, including with qualitative and quantitative research methods; - Excellent written and oral communication skills, including in cross-cultural contexts; and - Fluency in English, while facility with Kyrgyz or Russian desirable.

The Peacebuilding Specialist should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

* Master’s degree in a relevant area including social sciences, international development, conflict studies, law, or public administration;
* Five to seven years of post-conflict/peacebuilding experience, including experience in peacebuilding programming design and implementation;
* Demonstrated understanding of conflict analysis, conflict drivers and post-conflict recovery;
* Demonstrating understanding of political, human rights, governance and/or reconciliation issues;
* Demonstrated understanding of gender issues and women and peacebuilding;
* Experience in working with government officials, international development community and people recovering from conflict;
* Demonstrated familiarity with the United Nations and its Agencies, Funds and Programmes;
* Excellent written and oral communication skills, including in cross-cultural contexts;
* Strong team work skills; and
* Fluency in English, while facility with Kyrgyz or Russian desirable

 -

The Kyrgyzstan Specialist should possess the following skills and expertise, at a minimum:

* University degree in a relevant field, including social sciences, history, conflict studies, etc.;
* Five years to seven years of relevant work experience, including experience working in Kyrgyzstan;
* Excellent knowledge of Kyrgyzstan’s cultural, political and socio-economic context with a focus on post-conflict recovery;
* Knowledge of Kyrgyzstan’s governance institutions and existing contacts in those institutions, facilitating team’s communication and analysis of the stakeholders/beneficiaries of the PBF programme;
* Understanding of past and current state of political, human rights, governance and reconciliation key issues in Kyrgyzstan;
* Experience in research and analysis of data;
* Strong team work skills;
* Strong written and oral communication skills; and
* Fluency in Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Tajik, and/or Russian

BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

The total budget for this evaluation will include:

* Between 65 and 85 days of work by the Team Leader (a Research Assistant can be included in this fee), out of which up to 21 days should be in the field;
* Up to 40 days of work by each of the two specialists;
* One return ticket for each of the team members from place of residence/current location to Kyrgyzstan (economy class), with actual cost reimbursed;
* One return ticket for the Team Leader from place of residence/current location to New

York (economy class), with actual cost reimbursed;

* Accommodation and daily allowance for the Team Leader (and non-resident team members) for the days in Kyrgyzstan;
* An allowance for communication, including teleconferences with New York before and after the field mission;
* Travel costs within Kyrgyzstan (some of these maybe covered by the country team, where possible).

The schedule of the evaluation is expected to be as follows covering in total four months:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task**  | **Expected Start**  | **Expected Finish**  |
| 1.Scoping exercise: preliminary document review, teleconferences/meetings with New York stakeholders (PBF, PBC, MPTFO, other United Nations agencies) and in-country reference group, and write up of inception report for PBSO approval  | Upon contract  | 4 weeks from commencement  |
| 2.Field mission, including travel and interviews with all key stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners, site visits and surveys  | One week after conclusion of Task 1  | 4 weeks after commencement of Task 2  |
| 3.Analysis and preparation of draft report and its presentation to PBSO New York and Evaluation Reference Group for validation  | Commence during data collection  | 4 weeks after conclusion of Task 2  |
| 4.Finalizing of report following comments  | Commence after conclusion of Task 3  | 3 weeks from commencement of Task 4  |

Payments will be made in three tranches as set out below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Milestone**  | **Fees Payable**  |
| Inception Report  | Payment of 20% of total contract value  |
| Approval of draft Report by PBSO  | Payment of 50% of total contract value  |
| Approval of final Report by PBSO  | Payment of remaining 30% of contract value (This will be adjusted based on actual reimbursables and actual total days worked, up to the maximums specified in the contract and following submission of actual receipts)  |

DELIVERABLES

The Team Leader is responsible for the timely provision and quality of all evaluation deliverables. Their approval will be based on OECD-DAC and UNEG standards for evaluations, tailored for the specific purposes of peacebuilding evaluations. Each deliverable shall be in English.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable**  | **Content and Audience**  | **Tentative** **Due Date**  |
| Inception Report  | The Inception Report will have a maximum of 20 pages and include:  * the evaluation team’s understanding of the ToR, any data or other concerns arising from the provided materials and initial meetings/interviews, and strategies for how to address perceived shortcomings;
* key evaluation questions and methodological tools for answering each question;
* list of key risks and risk management strategies for the evaluation;
* stakeholder analysis;
* proposed work plan for the field mission; and
* table of contents for the evaluation report

 The Report will be approved by the PBSO and receive Evaluation Reference Group endorsement prior to consultants’ field travel.  | TBD  |
| Presentation of preliminary results and aide memoire  | The aide memoire will have a maximum of 5 pages and will include:   | TBD  |
| **Deliverable**  | **Content and Audience**  | **Tentative** **Due Date**  |
|  | * a brief summary of the purpose of the evaluation; - an overview of the mission, including activities assessed and stakeholders consulted;
* an overview of preliminary findings and lessons; and
* an explanation of next steps

 The aide memoire will be presented to the JSC and the UNCT in the last week of the field mission.  |  |
| Draft Report  | The Draft Report will have a maximum of 40 pages, plus an Executive Summary and annexes. The draft report should include individual project evaluation summaries as annexes that will not be counted against the total page count.  The Draft Report will be reviewed by the PBSO and the Evaluation Reference Group. The PBSO will provide a consolidated matrix of comments which should be formally addressed in the Final Report.  | TBD  |
| Final Report  | The Final Report will have a maximum of 40 pages, plus an Executive Summary, title page and annexes.  The Team Leader will be responsible for ensuring that comments from the PBSO and the Evaluation Reference Group are formally addressed. The Final Report will include all the annexes, including project evaluation summaries. It will also have a five-page Executive Summary that can be used as a stand-alone document outlining key findings on successes and challenges of the PBF support and recommendations. The Final Report will be evidence based and respond to the questions in the Inception Report with clear and succinct lessons learned and targeted recommendations. The PBSO will approve the Final Report, following consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group.Following acceptance of the Final Report, the PBSO will coordinate a management response as a separate document.  | TBD  |

1. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2011), Kyrgyzstan Revised and Extended Flash Appeal, End Report (June 2010 – June 2011). P. 1. By 28 June 2010 almost all refugees had returned to Kyrgyzstan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. While the portfolio formally includes 13 projects, two of these are one project split between two outcome areas and should be considered as one project for the purposes of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. While the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) and the implementation of recommendations of human rights mechanisms, including UPR, present a cross-cutting issue that is critical for all outcomes in the Peacebuilding Priority Plan, a particular emphasis on the implementation of recommendations made by human rights mechanisms is made under outcome 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This does not only mean that the capacity of LSG bodies will be strengthened but also that civil society at the local level has to be supported so that LSG bodies and civil society can work together on peacebuilding more closely and effectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. These should be adapted and further elaborated by the Team Leader in the Inception Report. Moreover, the questions do not need to be answered one by one but used as a basis for the evaluation narrative and conclusions. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Team Leader should adapt and elaborate on these in the Inception Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Team Leader should adapt and elaborate on these in the Inception Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)