Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Terms of Reference

Outcome Mid-Term Evaluation of the Inclusive Democratic Governance Pillar

1 BACKGROUND

These terms of reference are focusing on an outcome evaluation of UNDP's support to the country's Inclusive Democratic Governance outcome: *Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.* The programmatic pillar is derived from the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for Tanzania for 2016-2021 which is aligned with the UN Development Assistance Plan for Tanzania II (UNDAP II) 2016-2021 and the Government's National Five-Year Development Plan II 2016/17-2020/21.

Within the Inclusive Democratic Governance pillar, UNDP works with the Government of Tanzania to contribute to effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive governance. The Pillar works with the Government of Tanzania to strengthen institutional capacity and promote sustainable development in line with the Sustainable Development Agenda. Working with development partners, private sector and civil society, projects are designed to support the Government in its efforts to meet democratic governance challenges by specifically supporting the National Assembly to more effectively and responsively perform core functions of representation, law making and oversight of executive functions; developing responses to address the structural causative factors and their implications in the rise of violent extremism ; improving access to justice and human rights protection; supporting anti-corruption initiatives in private and public institutions; and improving the capacity of implementing and financing the national, regional and global development agendas.

The pillar is divided into five outputs namely:

i. Parliaments and electoral bodies are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency, accountability and citizen participation
ii. Citizens have improved access to and are better served by the justice system and human rights reporting
iii. Key public institutions are enabled to address corruption and implement their procurement needs in a transparent manner
iv. Government has effective mechanisms in place to monitor and report on use of ODA and other sources of global development financing
v. Women have enhanced capacities to participate in electoral and decision-making processes at all levels.

The outputs are further articulated through projects, whose full list is provided in Annex 1 which shows the projects under each output. Due to the nature of the interventions, the geographic scope of some projects is wide in various parts of the country. Key partners in the implementation include line ministries at national level, local government authorities in respective locales and civil society organizations. Other partners include UN sister agencies and development partners who directly or

indirectly contribute to the achievement of the outcome. Their work or resources has complemented and/or supported UNDP's work in this area. These are mentioned individually in the respective projects that are under the pillar.

This evaluation fits within the context of measuring and tracking the progress made by UNDP towards achieving its desired contribution to the outcome. It forms part of the CPD Evaluation plan and will feed into the UNDAP II evaluation at mid-term stage next year. Project evaluations (mid-term or final) have been conducted for some projects, whose findings will complement and add inputs to this outcome evaluation to provide a complete picture of how UNDP is contributing to this outcome.

2 Evaluation Purpose

UNDP's corporate policy is to evaluate its development cooperation with the host government on a regular basis to assess progress on how UNDP-funded interventions contribute to the achievement of agreed outcomes, i.e. changes in the development situation and ultimately transforming people's lives. Evaluating a country programme therefore involves ascertaining whether and how UNDP has assisted in improving human development conditions, including for individuals, institutions and systems. Evaluation also helps to clarify underlying factors affecting development, to identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), to generate lessons learned and to recommend actions to improve performance of current and future programme.

The outcome evaluation at mid-term stage aims to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of current programming, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results of the UNDP programme of support, in this case, within the pillar of Inclusive Democratic Governance. The outcome statement that this pillar contributes to states the intention to achieve *Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.* This is the overarching outcome which UNDP, in partnership with national government and other development partners, is contributing to.

3 Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The outcome evaluation will be conducted during the months of September and October 2018, with a view to enhancing programme implementation while providing strategic direction and inputs to the formulation of remaining projects within the outcome. Specifically, the outcome evaluation will assess:

1. The relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP support to the Country on Inclusive Democratic Governance.
2. The frameworks and strategies that UNDP has devised for its support on Inclusive Democratic Governance, including partnership strategies, and whether they are well conceived for achieving planned objectives.
3. The progress made towards achieving Inclusive Democratic Governance through specific projects and advisory services and including contributing factors and constraints.
4. The progress to date under this outcome and what can be derived in terms of lessons learned for future UNDP Inclusive Democratic Governance support to the Country.

The evaluation will consider the pertinent outputs focused towards Inclusive Democratic Governance, as stated in the CPD. The specific outputs under the Outcome to be assessed include:

1. Parliaments and electoral bodies are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency, accountability and citizen participation.
2. Citizens have improved access to and are better served by the justice system and human rights reporting.
3. Key public institutions are enabled to address corruption and implement their procurement needs in a transparent manner.
4. Government has effective mechanisms in place to monitor and report on use of ODA and other sources of global development financing.
5. Women have enhanced capacities to participate in electoral and decision-making processes at all levels.

The evaluation will analyse the contributions made by the CPD towards the Inclusive Democratic Governance Pillar during the current programme period and UNDP's strategic position within the country. It will also identify factors affecting the development situation and the results observed, generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in the remaining duration of the CPD. The outcome evaluation should assess how UNDP's programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions within that sector. It can also contribute to a fine-tuning of the current UNDP programme, providing the most optimal pillar balance and project formulation structure that will guide implementation of the remaining period of the CPD 2016-2021.

A set of appropriate and forward-looking recommendations will be drawn at the end of the evaluation. It is expected that evaluation results will be used in the formulation of the next country programme document.

4 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The Outcome evaluation seeks to answer the key questions according to the criteria against which the subject to be evaluated. The questions should cover the following key areas of evaluation criteria:

a) ***Relevance:*** *the extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation:*

- To what extent is UNDP's engagement in Inclusive Democratic Governance support a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in the development context in country and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners?
- Are the intended outputs and outcome aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the country?
- Are the results and/or progress towards results aligned and contributing to the respective global goals as outlined in the Agenda 2030 and its targets? If not, what should be done to ensure this is achieved?
- To what extent has UNDP selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
- Has UNDP been influential in country policy debates and dialogues on Inclusive Democratic Governance and has it influenced country policies on governance reforms and human rights protection?

b) ***Efficiency:*** *measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.*

- Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
- Has UNDP's Inclusive Democratic Governance strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
- Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?
- Were alternative approaches considered in designing the Project?
- Are adequate resources mobilised to achieve the desired result? What strategies were put in place to close the resource gap? To what extent have these strategies been implemented?

c) ***Effectiveness:*** *the extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives.*

- Have the outputs been achieved and did they contribute to the stated outcome at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?
- If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the outcome indicators presented in the results framework?
- What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in country's capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- Has UNDP worked effectively with other international partners to deliver Inclusive Democratic Governance initiatives and services?
- How effective was the partnerships aspect of programming implemented to ensure achievement of this outcome?
- To what extent has the project supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies?
- Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its Inclusive Democratic Governance programming?
- Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Inclusive Democratic Governance effectiveness and integrity in the country?
- Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP CO, is UNDP well suited to providing Inclusive Democratic Governance support to the country?

d) ***Sustainability:*** *the benefits of the Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted*

- What is the likelihood that UNDP interventions are sustainable?
- What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP to support the government/ institutional partners to sustain improvements made through these Inclusive Democratic Governance interventions?
- How UNDP has contributed to the capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?
- What markers or evidence is there to show that the results achieved so far will be sustained beyond the programme period?
- Are there national plans/ reforms to promote inclusive democratic governance in place or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years? And beyond the programme period?
- What changes should be made in the current set of governance partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
- Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP work in support of Inclusive Democratic Governance?

Gender mainstreaming

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of inclusive democratic governance projects?
- Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (focus should be placed on gender marker 2 and 3 projects)?
- To what extent has UNDP's outcome on inclusive democratic governance promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP country office' Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2016 - 2017.

Based on the above analysis, the consultants should provide recommendations on how UNDP in Tanzania should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the outcome change is achieved by the end of the current UNDAP II and UNDP CPD period. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for UNDP support in country and elsewhere based on this analysis.

5 METHODOLOGY

The outcome evaluation will be carried out by a team of external evaluators (see section 7 for the *Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies*) and will engage a wide range of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, academicians and subject experts, private sector representatives and community members.

The outcome evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determine causal links between the development challenges, the interventions that UNDP has supported and observe progress in inclusive democratic governance at national and local levels in Tanzania. The evaluators will develop a logic l framework model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to national governance which is more effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive. In the case of the four related outputs, a theory of change was not explicitly defined when the outputs were established. However, the outcome level TOC is defined in the CPD and it forms part of the results chain of the programme, with interlinkage with the other two outcomes of the CPD. The evaluators are expected to analyse the TOC described in the projects, and see whether they are aligned and correspond to the programme's TOC, and where there are deviations, note them especially if these may affect the attainment of the outcome changes planned in the CPD.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator baseline, milestones and target achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The following steps in data collection are anticipated:

5.1 Desk Review

A desk review should be carried out of the key strategies and documents underpinning the governance pillar of UNDP in Tanzania. This includes reviewing but not limited to the Country Programme Documents 2016-2021, the UNDAP II as well as concept notes and project document developed to address the outcome. The team shall also review a wide array of monitoring and evaluation documents produce within the CPD period, to be provided by the UNDP country office. This includes but not limited to individual project evaluations that have taken place during the period under evaluation. The review should include Governance Pillar projects with and without strategic linkage to the CPD (relevant projects are indicated in Annex 1).

The evaluators are expected to review relevant strategies and reports developed by the Government of Tanzania that are relevant to UNDP's governance support. This includes the Government's National Five-Year Development Plan II 2016/17-2020/21, Vision 2025, MKUZA III, Vision 2020 for Zanzibar and other national reports, to be made available by the UNDP country office.

5.2 Stakeholder Interviews

The evaluation team will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the country. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

5.3 Field Data Collection

The evaluation team will visit select project sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. The evaluators will build on the documented evidence through an agreed set of field and interview methodologies, including:

- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders
- Survey questionnaires where appropriate
- Participatory observation, focus groups, and rapid appraisal techniques

6 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 (see Annex 4). The language of the reports should be simple, free from jargon and with specialist terms explained.

Here are the principal evaluation products the evaluation Team Leader is accountable for:

1. **Evaluation inception report** (prepared after **Briefing** the evaluation consultants before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise) – to clarify the evaluation consultants 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 in Annex 3) and the TOC. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The

inception report should be discussed and agreed with the Senior Management before the evaluators proceed with site visits

2. **Draft evaluation report** – to be reviewed by UNDP and other respective stakeholders and presented in a validation workshop (if applicable), that the team will organise. Feedback received from these sessions should be considered when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.
3. **Final Evaluation report** - the evaluation Team leader will prepare a final Evaluation report (see Annex 4 for structure and content). Evaluation summary is required.

The evaluation team should refer to the UNDP Evaluation Guide for the evaluation report template and quality standards.

7 Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The outcome evaluation will be undertaken by two (2) external evaluators comprising of an Evaluation Team Leader and an Evaluator. The evaluation team leader will be hired as an international consultant, while the Evaluator will be hired as a national consultant.

7.1 Required Qualifications of the Evaluation Team Leader

- Minimum Master's degree in democratic governance, access to justice, rule of law, constitutional or parliamentary studies, human rights, development studies, social science or any related field;
- Minimum 10-15 years of professional experience working in the areas of democratic governance;
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting governance-related evaluations of government and international aid organisations;
- Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate in Tanzania, and more specifically the work of UNDP in support of government and civil society in Tanzania;
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Relevant; Time-bound) indicators;
- Excellent reporting and communication skills.
- Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal will be weighted at 70% as follows; Methodology – 35%, Experience on the related field – 25% and educational background – 10%. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the inception report, draft and final evaluation report and will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Develop the inception report, detailing the evaluation scope, methodology and approach;
- Conduct the project evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Manage the team during the evaluation mission, and liaise with UNDP on travel and interview schedules;
- Draft and present the draft and final evaluation reports;
- Lead the presentation of draft findings in the stakeholder workshop;

- Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP.

7.2 Required qualification of the Evaluator

- Minimum master's degree in democratic governance, access to justice, rule of law, constitutional or parliamentary studies, human rights, development studies, social science or any related field;
- Minimum 5 years' experience carrying out governance-related /development evaluations for government and civil society;
- Experience working in or closely with UN agencies, especially UNDP, is preferred;
- A deep understanding of the development context in Tanzania and preferably an understanding of environmental issues within the Tanzanian context;
- Strong communication skills;
- Excellent oral, reading and writing skills in English and Kiswahili;
- Tanzanian citizen with extensive experience working in Tanzania during the last 5 years.
- Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal will be weighted at 70% as follows; Methodology – 35%, Experience on the related field – 25% and educational background – 10%. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The Evaluator will, *inter alia*, perform the following tasks:

- Review documents;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Assist in carrying out the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objectives and scope of the evaluation;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed with the Team Leader;
- Assist the Team Leader to finalize the draft and final evaluation report.

8 Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and they must sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. Evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the outcomes and programmes under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 5.

9 Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP Country Office will select the evaluation team through an open process and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. The Coordinator of Programme will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Governance Pillar Lead to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Country Office (CO) Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report.

The Governance Pillar Lead will arrange introductory meetings within the CO and the Country Director or her designate will establish initial contacts with partners and project teams that the evaluators will

express intent to meet. The consultants will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The CO management will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

The Governance Pillar Lead will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts from within the CO or it might involve other stakeholders, to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detailed comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detailed rationale to the Advisory Panel for any comment that remains unaddressed.

The evaluation will use a system of ratings standardising assessments proposed by the evaluators in the inception report. The evaluation acknowledges that rating cannot be a standalone assessment, and it will not be feasible to entirely quantify judgements. Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting up interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Contact details will be provided by the Pillar Lead upon request. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the Country Office.

10 Time-Frame for the Evaluation Process

The evaluation is expected to take 24 working days for each of the two consultants, over a period of six weeks starting mid-September 2018. The following table provides an indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

Activity	Deliverable	Work day allocation		Time (days) for task completion
		Evaluation team leader	National Consultant	
Review materials and develop work plan	Inception report containing detailed evaluation schedule	5	4	9
Participate in an Inception Meeting with UNDP Tanzania country office				
Draft inception report				
Review Documents and stakeholder consultations	Draft evaluation report and Stakeholder workshop report	13	16	30
Interview stakeholders				
Conduct field visits				
Analyse data				
Develop draft evaluation and lessons learned report to Country Office				
Present draft Evaluation Report and lessons learned at Validation Workshop	Final evaluation report	6	4	7

Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders				
	totals	24	24	6 weeks

11 FEES AND PAYMENTS

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expression of interest in USD or TZS for National Consultant. Travel costs and actual daily allowances will be paid against invoice, and subject to the UN payment schedules for Tanzania. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP Country Office of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Deliverable	Payment
Inception Report	10%
Draft Evaluation Report submitted and all relevant feedback from stakeholders incorporated. Stakeholder Workshop report accompanied the revised draft report.	50%
Final Evaluation Report	40%

Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name: Natalie Boucly

Designation: Country Director

Date: 30/08/18

12 ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 - LIST OF OUTPUTS TO BE EVALUATED

UNDAP II / CPD OUTCOME	National Governance is more effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive.	Projects contributing to each of the outputs
Strategic Plan Outcome 2	Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stringer systems of democratic governance.	
Output 1:	Parliaments and electoral bodies are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency, accountability and citizen participation.	1. Legislative Support Project I 2. Legislative Support Project II
Output 2:	Citizens have improved access to and are better served by the justice system and human rights reporting.	3. Strengthening Access to Justice and Human Rights Protection in Tanzania 4. Support to Zanzibar Legal Sector Reform Program
Output 3:	Key public institutions are enabled to address corruption and implement their procurement needs in a transparent manner.	5. *Project is under formulation and not yet finalized*
Output 4:	Government has effective mechanisms in place to monitor and report on use of ODA and other sources of global development financing.	6. Enhancing Capacity for Development Results and Effectiveness
Output 5:	Women have enhanced capacities to participate in electoral and decision-making processes at all levels.	*No project under this output.*
Projects which are not linked to the CPD but to be included in the evaluation for CPD review recommendations.		7. Preventing and Responding to Violent Extremism in Tanzania 8. Preventing Conflict and Building Peace through addressing the Drivers of Conflict and Instability associated with Forced Displacement between Burundi and Tanzania (UNDP component, Project Outcome 3)

ANNEX 2 - DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSULTED

- United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2016 – 2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document 2016 – 2021
- UNDP PME Handbook
- UNDP Evaluation Guide and addendum
- UNDG RBM Handbook
- UNDG Ethical Code of Conduct of Evaluators
- Project Documents, reports and project evaluation reports
- ROAR
- UNDAP II, Review and evaluation reports
- National Policies and Development Plans of Tanzania
- NB; While the mentioned documents are must to review and consult, it should not limit consultants from reviewing and consulting other documents which will be considered of help to ensure adequate and reliable information for the purpose of this assignment.

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation matrices are useful tools for planning and conducting evaluations; helping to summarize and visually present an evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. In an evaluation matrix, the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods appropriate for each data source are presented, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated is shown.

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION REPORT TEMPLATE

The length of the Report should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes)

- Title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
    - Evaluation scope
    - Evaluation objectives
    - Evaluation criteria
    - Evaluation questions
- Evaluation approach and methods
    - Data sources
    - Sample and sampling frame (if applicable)
    - Data collection procedures and instruments
    - Performance standards
    - Stakeholder engagement
    - Ethical considerations
    - Background information on evaluators
    - Major limitations of the methodology
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
    - Findings
    - Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Report annexes

ANNEX 5: ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNDP EVALUATIONS

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. 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.
3. 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. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. 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, evaluators 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 during the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[1]

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 ___ on _____

Signature: _____

[1] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct