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|  | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME** |

**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant for Country Programme Document Outcome Evaluation:**

*“Diversification of the economy provides decent work opportunities for the underemployed, youth, and socially vulnerable women and men”.*

**Job Code Title:** Outcome Evaluation Consultant

**Duty station**: Home-based with a mission to Astana

**Duration**: Up to 23 working days within the period of August – September 2018 – (one field mission to Astana, Kazakhstan, 5 days)

**Type of contract**: Individual Contract (IC)

**Language required**: English, Russian is an asset

1. INTRODUCTION and COUNTRY context

Over the past decade, Kazakhstan has made impressive gains in human development. In 2017, it ranked the 56th out of 188 countries globally, according to the UNDP Human Development Report[[1]](#footnote-1). The country also succeeded in drastically reducing its poverty levels during 2001-2017, from 46.7% to 2.4%[[2]](#footnote-2). Inequalities, as measured by the income distribution among the country’s residents, remain relatively low, with Gini index of 0.278 (2017)[[3]](#footnote-3).

In December 2012, President Nazarbayev outlined his vision in the Kazakhstan-2050 Strategy”, stressing the need to improve development pathways that expand people’s capabilities and well-being and strengthening interaction with civil society and the business sector. Among others, the Strategy prioritizes development of an innovative and knowledge-based economy, to limit its dependence on extractive industries. It emphasizes achieving high quality of life for individuals and society as a whole, and building a modern inclusive society on par with 30 most developed nations in the world. Also, the country aspires to build accountable and open governance systems and institutions, following the standards and principles of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The inspirational vision of the 2050 strategy has been translated into concrete medium-term reform policies such as the Five Institutional reforms and 100 Concrete Steps. Sectoral strategies and programmes such as the “state employment programme 2020”, the “state programme for industrial and innovative development 2020”, the state programme for healthcare development "*Salamatty Kazakhstan 2020*" and others also serve as the implementation mechanisms of the strategy.

In line with the national priorities identified in the *Nurly Zhol* medium-term plan and the longer-term Kazakhstan-2050 vision, reflected in the United Nations Partnership Framework for Development, 2016-2020 (PFD), UNDP CPD Outcome *“Diversification of the economy provides decent work opportunities for the underemployed, youth, and socially vulnerable women and men”* is focusing on enabling structural transformation processes in the regions, including supporting employment and livelihoods-intensive productive capacities of all 16 regions of Kazakhstan. Within the framework of the outcome UNDP has been providing accelerated support to national programmes such as Employment Programme 2020, Roadmap for Business 2020, Programme for AgroBusiness 2020, and Programme on Innovative Industrialization 2020. Therefore, the programmatic activities focus on innovative and sustainable solutions to strengthen competitiveness and improve productive capacities of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) by expanding economic opportunities for women, youth, people with disabilities, and groups/individuals not able to benefit from development gains and opportunities for a variety of reasons. UNDP helps promote new drivers of diversification, such as ‘creative’ and knowledge-based economies to match with modern skillsets and market demands. New social entrepreneurship models are developed and piloted, and knowledge sharing networks supported to promote innovation transfer at local and national levels.

The outcome evaluation is commissioned to assess the progress made on the results of the CPD Outcome during 2016-2018; to assess effectiveness of support towards achievement of national priorities; to ensure improvements in performance and results in the remaining period of the CPD cycle; and to collect lessons learned.

1. Evaluation PURPOSE

UNDP in Kazakhstan aims to evaluate its contribution during CPD 2016-2020 cycle to the achievement of the Outcome on Diversification of the economy and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learnt. Also, this Outcome evaluation should address how UNDP supported programmes help the Government of Kazakhstan in meeting the National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2050 and the Sustainable Development Goals. The evaluation exercise will take stock of the progress made thus far, look into underlying factors that affect the development situation overall, identify possible externalities, generate lessons learned and recommend actions that UNDP can use to for future programming and partnership development.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2018. Its recommendations and lessons learned will be used for the preparation of the new UNDP country programme starting from 2021.

The overall purpose of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP’s programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of economic diversification and poverty reduction. The purpose of the proposed evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to fine-tune the current UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the rest of the CPD 2016-2020 as well as informing the next programming cycle.

1. Evaluation scope and objectives

The evaluation will cover UNDP CPD Outcomes 1.2 under current UN PFD in Kazakhstan for 2016-2020. This outcome evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. The evaluation will also assess the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UN PFD in Kazakhstan for 2016-2020.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME INDICATOR(S), BASELINES, TARGET(S)** | **INDICATIVE COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS *(including indicators, baselines targets)*** |
| **Indicator 1:**  Share of small and medium enterprises production to the overall economic development in select regions (Kyzylorda, Mangystau, East Kazakhstan)  **Baseline**:  21% of GDP in 2013; select regions: TBD  **Target**:  30% of GDP in 2020 select regions: TBD | **Output 1:** National and sub-national institutions enabled to strengthen productive capacities that are sustainable, and employment- and livelihoods-intensive  **Indicator 1.1**: Number of SMEs/businesses scaled up and value chains created in selected districts in 3 regions.  **Baseline**: 30 Target:at least 70  Data source: Project progress reports, statistics reports; project reports  Indicator 1.2: Youth unemployment rate (15-24) in select regions:  East-Kazakhstan:  Baseline: 4.7% (2014). Target: 4%.  Kyzylorda:  Baseline: 5.0% (2013). Target: 4%.  Mangystau:  Baseline: 6.7%,(2Q 2013) Target: 6%.  Data source: Official statistics, quarterly and annual  Indicator 1.4: Overall PWD employment rate in the country  Baseline: 40.0%; Target: 55.6%  Data source: official statistics, annual  Indicator 1.5: Women unemployment rate in select regions  East-Kazakhstan:  Baseline: 5,2% (2014). Target: 4.5%.  Kyzylorda:  Baseline: TBD (2013). Target: TBD  Mangystau:  Baseline: TBD Target: TBD.  Data source: Regional authorities, annual |
|
|  | **Output 2**: Strengthened engagement between public and private sector institutions in enhancing employability and access to decent work particularly for youth, women and PWD  **Indicator 2.1**: Number of mechanisms including dialogues, focused research on employment and labor-market needs  **Baseline**: 0. Target: at least 2 annually in each region.  Source of info: Project Progress Report, media, local governments’ and self-governing bodies’ reports.  Indicator 2.2: Number of vocational education and training interventions to match industry needs for youth/ women/PWD employment  Baseline: 0. Target: at least 30  interventions each in three selected regions  Data source: media, official reports |
| **Indicator 2**: Action Plan for Youth Employment in the frame of the Employment Road Map 2020 is adopted; Volunteerism Law is adopted.  **Baseline:** None  **Target:** by 2020 youth employment 4%  **Indicator 2A:**  New employment law is adopted.  **Baseline:** current law is outdated. | **Output 3**: Confidence building measures implemented through active value chain development including simplified business processes, access to financing and market instruments for women, youth and PWD  **Indicator 3.1**: Number of improved enterprise value chains benefitting women/youth/PWD/under-employed people  **Baseline**: 0. Target: at least 30  Source of data: Project Progress Report, media, regularly  Indicator 3.2: Number of strengthened Regional/District Employment/Business Development Centers providing streamlined services for women/youth/PWD.  Baseline: 0 Target: at least 20 Source of data: Project Progress Report, media, regularly |

Projects implemented during the period 2016 – 2018 within the Outcome “Diversification of the economy provides decent work opportunities for the underemployed, youth, and socially vulnerable women and men”.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Period** |
| 1 | Support to Country Coordinating Mechanism on work with international organizations in the sphere of HIV and Tuberculosis. | 2016-2017 |
| 2 | 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 | 2014-2017 |
| 3 | Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization | 2014-2017 |
| 4 | Support to capacity development of the Republican AIDS center of the MoH & SD RK in implementation of GFATM grants | 2015-2017 |
| 5 | Improving the system of social protection of population in line with priorities of social modernization | 2015-2017 |
| 6 | Assistance in promoting gender equality and practical implementation of the UN Committee’s comments to Kazakhstan on implementation of the CEDAW in compliance with international commitments. | 2016-2018 |

**Outcome status***:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcomes 1.2 achievement, and also identify the challenges to attainment of the outcomes. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcomes.

**Underlying factors***:* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcomes. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

**Strategic Positioning of UNDP:** Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP’s inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner. The Country Office position will be analyzed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the Country Office is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating value by responding to partners' needs, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP service lines and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in the diversification of the economy result area.

**Partnership strategy***:* Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation? Examine the partnership among UNDP and other donor organizations in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the outcome to the country’s needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in development.

**Lessons learnt:** Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in incubation, and in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve related outcomes. This will support learning lessons about UNDP’s contribution to the outcomes over the current PFD and CPD cycle so as to design a better assistance strategy for the next programming cycle.

1. Evaluation criteria

Outcome evaluation design should clearly spell out the key questions according to the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated. The questions when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. The questions 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:*

* Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?
* Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?
* How has UNDP’s support for the poor and the disadvantaged groups positively contributed to a favorable environment for diversification of the economy in Kazakhstan?
* Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices to promote productive capacities of small and medium enterprises, develop knowledge-based economy andsocial entrepreneurship, enhance employability and access to decent work, improve value chains for SMEs and strengthen access to financing and market instruments?
* Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to diversify the economy?
* To what degree are approaches such as “human rights based approach” to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

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

* Have the results been achieved 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?
* How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the diversification of the economy outcome? Where are the gaps if any?
* How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the diversification of the economy portfolio?
* Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the diversification of the economy?

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

* How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2018?
* What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2018?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?
* Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?
* Has UNDP contributed to governmental institutions be more likely to solicit public opinions relating to issues employability and access to decent work?
* To what extent has the rights-based approach been integrated in CO development programming and implementation activities?
* Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?

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

* How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?
* Are there national plans reforms to promote the diversification of the economy – or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years?
* Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

Apart from the criteria above, there are additional commonly applied evaluation criteria such as impact, coverage, connectedness, value-for-money, client satisfaction and protection used in the evaluation, although, not all criteria are applicable to every evaluation. Within the Outcome evaluation there can be additional evaluation questions specified for each the criteria, however all they must be agreed with the UNDP in Kazakhstan. Based on the above analysis, Individual Consultant (herein referred to as Consultant) must provide recommendations on how UNDP in Kazakhstan 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 UN PFD and UNDP CPD period.

1. 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 consultant the Participating UN Agencies about what is appropriate and able to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

This 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, project documents, mission reports, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. The evaluation consultant 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 consultant will make sure that the voices, opinions, and information of targeted citizens and participants of the CPD Outcome projects 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 consultant 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.

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. 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 UNDP and national stakeholders respectively.

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

1. EVALUATION deliverables AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation consultant 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 consultant is accountable for following activities and deliverables:

1. **Evaluation inception report** (prepared after **Briefing** the evaluation consultant before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise and consist of *5-10 pages excluding annexes*) – to clarify the evaluation consultant’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 consultant 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[[4]](#footnote-4)** 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 consultant should consider and incorporate stakeholders ‘feedback as appropriate.

1. **Final Evaluation report.** The final task of the evaluation consultant 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 40-50 pages[[5]](#footnote-5). Evaluation brief and summary are required.

*Evaluation timeframe*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverables | Working days |
| Conducting a desk review | 4 |
| Preparing the detailed evaluation inception report (to finalize evaluation design and methods) | 2 |
| In-country evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) and in country analysis with preliminary feedback to country stakeholders. | 5 |
| Preparing the draft report | 7 |
| Finalizing the evaluation report (incorporate comments provided) | 5 |

*(e.g. 23 working days in total over a period of two months)*

1. Qualifications and experience:

**Functional competencies:**

Professionalism

* Good knowledge of the UNDP system and UNDP country programming processes (CPD/CPAP);
* Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including data collection and analytical skills, mainstreaming HRBA and gender to programming;
* Results Based Management (RBM) principles, logic modelling/logical framework analysis, quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, and participatory approaches.

Communications

* Good communication (spoken and written) skills, including the ability to write reports, conduct studies and to articulate ideas in a clear and concise style.

**Required Skills and Experience**

Education

* Advanced university degree (Master's or equivalent) in social science, economics, or related field.

Experience

* 7 years of the relevant professional experience; previous experience with CPD/CPAP evaluations and/or reviews.
* Practical experience in Eastern Europe and CIS region and/or knowledge of the development issues in Middle Income Countries is an asset.

Language Requirements

• Excellent written and spoken English. Knowledge of Russian is an asset;

• Excellent report writing skills as well as communication skills.

Other attributes

• An understanding of and ability to abide by the values of the United Nations;

• Awareness and sensitivity in working with people of various cultural and social backgrounds.

• Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

• It is demanded by UNDP that Consultant 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[[6]](#footnote-6).

**Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[7]](#footnote-7) and should describe critical issues Consultant must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights 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, as well as some categories of vulnerable population; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Consultant is also requested to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System’ (Annex III).

1. Application procedure

Interested candidates are invited to submit the following documents:

* Signed UNDP P11 form or detailed CV;
* 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;
* Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided;

*\*P11, the template for financial proposal and General terms and Conditions for Individual Contracts could be found here:* <http://www.kz.undp.org/content/kazakhstan/en/home/operations/procurement/ic-contracts.html>

1. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Lump sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel:

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

***Payment modalities and specifications***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 10% | At contract signing (to cover cost related with initiation of the evaluation, i.e. travel, communication etc.) |
| 30% | Following submission and approval of the draft Evaluation report by UNDP |
| 60% | Following submission and approval of the final Evaluation report by UNDP |

1. Annexes

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

* UN Partnership Framework for Development (UNPFD) 2016-2020
* Country Programme Document 2016-2020
* Country Programme Action Plan 2016-2020
* Project Documents
* Project Progress Reports
* Relevant Government legislation and policy documents (to be provided by UNDP country office)
* Project publications

*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’[[8]](#footnote-8).

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 consultant
* 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 consultant’ for more information)[[9]](#footnote-9).

Background information on evaluation consultant —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 consultant
* Code of conduct signed by evaluation consultant

*Annex III:* **Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct**

Evaluation Consultant:

* 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 consultant must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation consultant 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 consultant 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 consultant 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 consultant 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[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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   <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
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