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 | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME** |

**Terms of Reference**

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

*“The government of Kazakhstan, together with partners, assists neighboring countries in achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and leads the regional cooperation by promoting United Nations principles, standards and Conventions”.*

**Job Code Title:** CPD 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 Kazakhstan, Astana, 5 days)

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

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

1. Background

Kazakhstan has begun actively implementing the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted by 193 UN member states in 2015. The Government is considering a number of approaches to develop and implement a national SDGs Roadmap, including through utilizing the UN Development Group’s (UNDG) Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support (MAPS) approach[[1]](#footnote-1). In addition, as an emerging donor and a prominent South-South/West-East cooperation partner, Kazakhstan is also playing an active role in championing the regional and global dialogues on the SDGs and other globally important agendas such as the Paris Agreement on climate change[[2]](#footnote-2). The international EXPO 2017 ‘Future Energy’ is one of the most prominent thematic international platforms Kazakhstan is offering to the world to support the implementation of the energy-related SDGs.

Kazakhstan is an important leader in the Central Asian region, and a good global citizen. Such good standing in terms of regional cooperation is due to Kazakhstan’s activism and leadership in promoting worldwide nuclear non-proliferation and in other efforts to promote peace and stability. Kazakhstan actively contributes to regional and international fora such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), Eurasian Economic Union (EEU), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and others. Kazakhstan’s representation as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council during 2017-2018 will elevate the country’s role as a facilitator of the global processes to promote peace, security, human rights and sustainable development agendas.

UNDP internalizes the lessons learned from the previous UNDP CPD and UNDAF cycles (2010-2015) and works towards building a next stage of effective partnership arrangements, including through facilitation of national and international dialogues to support the new stage of reforms, as well as supporting policies that aim to address structural impediments. The advancement of the SDGs agenda at local and national levels in line with Kazakhstan strategy remains a focused priority for UNDP’s programmes and projects.

Three years of UNDP efforts has culminated in Kazakhstan adopting an enabling legislation to establish the official development assistance (ODA) system, provisionally called KazAid. With the growing role of Kazakhstan as a middle-income country and an active international player, an unprecedented opportunity is presented for UNDP to promote regional cooperation as one of the main priorities in the new country programme cycle. UNDP has worked with key government agencies to introduce a new model of civil service and public administration. As a result, the Regional Hub for Civil Service in Astana was established in 2013 as a platform to exchange knowledge and best practices in civil service modernization among Kazakhstan and other countries in the region. This promises to become one of the country’s major platforms for institutionalizing South-South and triangular partnerships.

UNDP is scaling up its fourth, international pillar through two strategic initiatives: KazAid, to support the establishment of Kazakhstan’s ODA system, and the Regional Hub of Civil Service in Astana (Hub). The Hub initiative demonstrates scaling up to meet high demand and expectations both domestically and internationally, by delivering concrete results and innovations in research, knowledge management and capacity building. The Hub platform also presents an opportunity to strengthen practical South-South/West-East partnerships and collaborations, especially for SDG 16 (governance and institutions) and SDG 17 (partnerships). The Hub continues strengthening linkages with UNDP global centres and hubs and other similar entities in order to build broad partnerships and synergies. UNDP supports transforming the KazAid concept into practice by providing policy advisory and technical support on ODA establishment and delivery. UNDP is forming tripartite partnerships with the Government of Kazakhstan and well-known experienced ODA Agencies, such as JICA, USAID, and others to deliver practical ODA projects in Central Asian countries, while providing learning-by-doing platforms for the future KAZAID staff. UNDP supports the Government in regional and global dialogues and initiatives on the SDGs, especially on those issues of shared concern such as management of natural resources, building inclusive societies and accountable institutions, and safe and resilient cities and human settlements.

The UNDP Country Office is commissioning an outcome “The government of Kazakhstan, together with partners, assists neighboring countries in achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and leads the regional cooperation by promoting United Nations principles, standards and Conventions” (further – Regional Cooperation) evaluation to obtain credential, an evidence-based information on UNDP’s contribution to the development results during the 2016-2018 country programme cycle. To achieve the Outcome on Regional Cooperation, the UNDP has focused on enhancing capacities for integrated management of government agencies, private sector, NGOs/CSOs etc.

1. Evaluation PURPOSE

UNDP in Kazakhstan aims to evaluate its contribution during CPD 2016-2020 cycle to the achievement of the Outcome on International Cooperation and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learnt. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in Kazakhstan’s context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development. Outcome evaluation also should be able to answer whether UNDP supported the Government of Kazakhstan in meeting the National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2050 and the Sustainable Development Goals. The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2018 with a view to contributing to 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 promoting SSC. 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 3.1 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CPD OUTCOME INDICATOR(S), BASELINES, TARGET(S)** | **INDICATIVE COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS *(including indicators, baselines targets)*** |
| **Indicator 1 A:** Volume of KAZAID and Kazakhstan’s bilateral and multilateral support for areas critical to socio-economic human development and security in Central Asia and beyond; regional cooperation mechanisms that promote East-East partnership by thematic areas.**Baseline:** in 2016, nascent state of KAZAID and national ODA system**Target:** By 2020, KAZAID/ODA functioning and well recognized by international community and the UN, and regional cooperation hubs demonstrated success in East-East/South-South cooperation (for example, Regional Hub for Civil Service in Astana); | **Output 1. The national ODA Agency (KAZAID) is established and well- functioning** **Indicator 1.1**: Availability and implementation of approved rules and regulations for sustainable operation of KazAid as an ODA Agency **Baseline:** Rules and regulations not in place; Target: Rules and regulations developed and implemented; Source of info: MFA**Indicator 1.2** Effective mechanisms in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on an verify use of KazAid ODA funding Baseline: 0; Target: 3 (M&E system, standard reporting, projects database) Source of info: MFA reports |
|
|  | **Output.2. Regional Hub of Civil Service in Astana providing strategic knowledge and innovative solutions globally contributing to effective SS and triangular cooperation** **Indicator 2.1** Number of Hub participating countries actively implementing joint, innovative solutions for civil service development **Baseline**: 30 participating countries; 6 active; Target: 20 active; 10 new participating countries. Source of info: Regional Hub Website; annual repots **Indicator 2.2** Number of innovative capacity development interventions and joint researches conducted by or through the HubBaseline: 6 publications; 2 capacity development trainings; Target: at least 30 publications in different formats; at least 50 trainings and innovation labs. Source of info: Hub website, media source, project annual reports. |
|  | **Output 3:** Regional and international development initiatives in place and functioning, supporting the positioning of Kazakhstan as an upper MIC country and its emerging leadership role at the regional level**Indicator 3.1** Number of organizations and people participating in dialogues on the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals (SDG) (disaggregated by type of organization)**Baseline:** 3 platforms; 500 people. Target: at least 30 organizations/platforms; at least 100,000 people Source of info: media sources, UNDP/UN reports**Indicator 3.2:** Number of advocacy initiatives by Kazakhstan on SDGs and other priorities, supported by the international communityBaseline: about 3 initiatives/international agreements; Target: at least 10 initiatives supported by countries Source: UN, OECD data, MFA sources |

Following projects have been implemented in the period between 2016 and early 2018 within the Regional Cooperation outcome by UNDP CO in Kazakhstan.

*Projects implemented during the period 2016 – 2018* (Regional Cooperation Outcome)*:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Period** |
| 1 | Expert support for the establishment of a national ODA system in Kazakhstan | 2014-2016 |
| 2 | Institutional Support to the Regional Hub of Civil Service in Astana to assist in increasing the effectiveness of civil service in the countries of the region and beyond | 2014-2017 |
| 3 | Promoting Kazakhstan’s Official Development Assistance Cooperation with Afghanistan  | 2016-2018 |

**Outcome status***:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcomes 3.1 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 Regional Cooperation 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 Kazakhstani ODA system positively contributed to a favorable environment for regional cooperation led by Kazakhstan?
* Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices to promote partnership for SDG?
* Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to promote regional cooperation?
* 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 regional cooperation outcome? Where are the gaps if any?
* How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the regional cooperation portfolio?
* Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the regional cooperation?

**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 promote Kazakhstani ODA system and regional cooperation?
* 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 regional cooperation 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[[3]](#footnote-3)** is planned to be held in Astana (Almaty colleagues might join via Conference Call) to discuss findings of the *Draft Evaluation report* in order to get feedback from stakeholders, circulate the report to all the people who are recommended to attend the meeting, with time to read it first. The evaluation 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[[4]](#footnote-4). 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 including previous substantive research experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management (preferably in regional and international cooperation, ODA establishment and management, partnership communications, partnership policies etc.);
* 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[[5]](#footnote-5).

**Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[6]](#footnote-6) 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 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’[[7]](#footnote-7).

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)[[8]](#footnote-8).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Annex III:* **Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

Consultant must:

* Be responsible for performance and product(s) for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study findings and recommendations.
* Present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
* Reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
* Consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
* Conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
* Protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants, provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time and respect people’s right not to engage.
* Must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source and not evaluate individuals.
* Be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in relations with all stakeholders in line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
* Be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[9]](#footnote-9)**

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

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

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

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

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

1. MAPS approach consists of the following core elements: mainstreaming (landing the SDGs into national, sub-national and local plans and budgets for development); acceleration (targeting resources at priority areas, considering synergy and trade-offs, bottlenecks); policy support (ensuring that skills and expertise of the UN system are available in efficient and effective ways). MAPS approach is underpinned by partnership development, accountability, and monitoring/data collection and analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Paris Agreement’s central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Additionally, the agreement aims to strengthen the ability of countries to deal with the impacts of climate change. http://unfccc.int/paris\_agreement/items/9485.php [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Participation of the evaluation consultant in the Meeting is mandatory. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Evaluation consultant may need to use ‘Times New Roman’ font at a size of 12 points, with Normal margin and line spacing 1.15. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For this reason, staff members of UNDP based in other country offices, the regional centers and Headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation consultant. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNEG, ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’, 2005, available at: [http://www.unEvaluation.org/unegstandards](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegstandards) and UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008, available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at

<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. For more information on Code of Conduct please visit: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)