Terms of Reference

United Nations Caribbean

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Trinidad and Tobago

Job Title :	Individual Consultant for Evaluation of COE Project
Category :	Evaluation
Brand :	Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Development of SIDS
Duty Station :	Oranjestad, Aruba
Languages Required :	English
Starting Date :	12 November, 2018
Duration of Contract :	14 December, 2018

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The project "Towards creating a Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Development of Small Island Development States (SIDS) in Aruba" seeks to strengthen the capacity of SIDS to utilize sustainable development solutions through the establishment of a Centre of Excellence (COE) for Sustainable Development in Aruba in 2016. In 2019, the COE will transition into a new faculty for sustainable island solutions at the University of Aruba. The project is a collaboration between the Government of Aruba, The Kingdom of the Netherlands and the UNDP. The elements of the project will allow active engagement with other UN member SIDS to transfer lessons learnt and best practices. It is a South South/SIDS-SIDS cooperation initiative and a vehicle for promoting economic development in SIDS, especially important at a time when traditional sources of funding are decreasing. Promoting South-South cooperation is an expressed priority for UNDP and this project will leverage UNDP's experience in South-South cooperation and knowledge management across the region.

Core Objectives of the COE project

> "To leverage Aruba's technical expertise and experience in sustainable development to provide a platform for strengthening innovation and resilience among SIDS through South-South cooperation and exchange of knowledge on sustainable practices in energy, public-private partnerships (PPP), water management, environment, tourism and health."

COE Project Components

- Training in establishing country-specific sustainable development roadmaps;
- A virtual platform for technical support and knowledge exchange beyond the duration of this project;
- In-country technical assistance; and
- Knowledge products and learning tools to support knowledge transfer and exchange.

Key Output/Impact:

"To foster innovation and the transfer of knowledge on sustainable development strategies between SIDS thereby building their respective capacities to develop and implement these strategies in their national interests."

2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

An independent evaluation of the project will be conducted at the conclusion of the project to assess progress with respect to execution, alignment with objectives and achievement of agreed deliverables and targets; the evaluation also serves to assess impact of project over project lifetime. This will specifically support the output (#4) Monitoring & Evaluation as agreed in the project document by the implementing partners.

In an effort to;

- Evaluate the project against the initial and emergent objectives, activities and outputs;
- Capture lessons learned for management of future projects in similar contexts;
- Provide accountability re funding and project agreement to project donors.

The UNDP Trinidad & Tobago office is seeking to contract a vendor to carry out an evaluation of the COE project based on UNDP's framework for M&E. This will include an analysis of the activities and outputs, including where deviations occurred from initial project plan, as well as interviews with key stakeholders.

The evaluation shall be carried out according to the criteria as outlined in the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports (which can be found here: http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607).

The evaluation will apply the following criteria:

Relevance concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries in SIDS. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues.

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the initiative's intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved in SIDS.

Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results for SIDS. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.

Each criteria will be ranked as follows:

Criteria	Ranking
Relevance	• Relevant (R) • Not relevant (NR)
Effectiveness	• Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency • Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings • Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings • Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings • Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency • Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings
Efficiency	• Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency • Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings • Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings • Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings • Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency • Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings
Sustainability	• Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability • Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks • Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks • Unlikely (U): severe risks

Impact, as an evaluation criteria, will not be utilized in this evaluation. Impact results – describing changes in people's lives and development conditions– are considered beyond the scope of this evaluation. Results at the impact level would need to control for the vast array of factors that may have influenced development in this area and would not be feasible nor cost efficient to discern the project's and UNDP's contribution to such change.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Evaluation questions include:

- Were the project's stated outputs achieved?
- What progress toward the project outputs has been made?

- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended project outputs?
- To what extent have the project outputs and assistance contributed to the CPD outputs and UNDP CPD outcomes?
- Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Evaluation questions must be agreed upon among users and other stakeholders and accepted or refined in consultation with the evaluation team.

Suggested questions for each criteria:

Criteria	**Questions**
Relevance	• To what extent is the project in line with UNDP's mandate, the country priorities, and the requirements of the identified target groups including women and men? • To what extent did the project promote UNDP principles of gender equality, human rights and human development? • To what extent is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in a particular development context and its comparative advantage? • To what extent was UNDP's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context? • To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
Effectiveness	• To what extent have the project's expected results been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement? • How have corresponding project outputs delivered by UNDP affected the CPD outputs and CPD outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective? • What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the results generated by the project, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the results? • What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP's work? • To what extent did the results achieved benefit women and men equally?
Efficiency	• To what extent have the project outputs resulted from economic use of resources? • To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time? • To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of the project outputs? • To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? • To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?
Sustainability	• What indications are there that the results achieved will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?

Criteria	Questions
	• To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented? • To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits? • To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support? • To what extent will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The evaluator(s) will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to the expected changes.

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

The evaluation should also adopt other approaches and methods likely to yield most reliable and valid feedback to the evaluation questions and scope. In consultation with the program units, evaluation managers and key stakeholders, the evaluator(s) should develop the most appropriate, objective and feasible methods to address objectives and purpose of the evaluation. It is expected that the evaluation will take into consideration both the qualitative and quantitative approaches, and can therefore encompass a number of methods including:

- Desk review of relevant documents such as the studies relating to the SIDS context and situation, project documents, progress reports, and other evaluation reports.
- Discussions with project board members and project staff.
- Interviews and focus group discussions with partners and stakeholders.
- Questionnaires and participatory techniques for gathering and analysis of data.
- Consultation and debriefing meetings.

However, the final decision about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations among the programme unit and the evaluator about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and existing data

5. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES) AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluator will be accountable for producing the following products:

- **Evaluation inception report—**An inception report should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluator'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. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
- **Draft evaluation report—**The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.
- **Final evaluation report.**

Deliverables by phase	Comments re activities	Payment Schedule upon approval	Timeline for delivery
1. **Evaluation Inception Report**	Preparation and submission of evaluation inception report, aligned to evaluation methodology and framework.	10%	14 November 2018
2. **Draft Evaluation Report** **Submission, review and acceptance of draft evaluation report**	This includes the following: • Desk review of the initial project document, board minutes and all knowledge outputs, including surveys; • Interviews with Project Team (2) and Project Board members (5); • Interviews with beneficiaries of various outputs (5). Note: Interviews should be conducted using a fixed template and methodology for consistency. Review of submission will be conducted by project team and project board members.	40%	26th November 2018

3. Final Evaluation Report **Submission, review and acceptance of final evaluation report**	Review of submission will be conducted by project team and project board members	50%	7th December

6. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The evaluator must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation.

- Minimum of a Master's degree in a relevant Social Science;
- Minimum 5 years' experience in managing programmes and implementation and evaluation of projects, preferably in the Caribbean;
- Experience in results-based management / logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches, evaluation methods and approaches (qualitative and quantitative);
- Affinity with the context of small island developing states and sustainable development goals is preferred;
- Experience with UN Evaluation Guidelines and Methodologies (UNDP evaluation policies, UNEG norms and standards);
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods to projects and/or programmes;
- Experience and work as member of evaluation teams;
- Knowledge of UNDP in the Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Good presentation, interpersonal and communication skills;
- Ability to meet deadlines and prioritize multiple tasks;
- Excellent report writing and editing skills;
- Excellent working knowledge (written and oral) of English is required;
- Ability to deliver against tight deadlines;
- Availability to work on location in Aruba.

7. EVALUATION ETHICS

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'[1]. The evaluator should address in the design and implementation of the evaluation the procedures that will be used to safeguard the rights

[1] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548 .

and confidentiality of information providers. Evaluator should indicate the measures that will be taken to ensure proper storage and secure maintenance of collected information as well as the protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with UNDP Trinidad and Tobago. UNDP T&T CO will contract the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Governments, etc.

This is expected to be a single person evaluation guided by the Project Team, UNDP programme officer and project steering committee. The evaluator will report to the UNDP programme officer. The project team will manage the day to day requirements for evaluation and oversight. The Project Board will review findings and provide feedback.

The UNDP T&T Office Procurement Department is the main point of contact for contracting purposes.

9. ANNEXES

A. Inception report format
B. Evaluation report format
C. Code of conduct

Annex A. Inception Report Format

The inception report should include:

Evaluation purpose and scope—A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

Evaluation criteria and questions—The criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale.

Evaluation methodology—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.

A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities.

Annex B. Evaluation Report Format

This evaluation report format is 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'.[2]

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 (see Chapter 8 of the Handbook for more information). 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 evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents—Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

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 and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.

---

[2] UNEG, 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System', 2005, available at: 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 .

- 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 multiyear 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 effects (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.[3] 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[4]—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[5]—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

[3] The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

[4] All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. See Chapter 8 of the Handbook for more guidance on methodology.

[5] 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.

- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).[6]
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members 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 analyse 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 affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected 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, feasible 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

---

[6] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines .

(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
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

Annex C. Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations System

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.

2. The UNEG1 Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.

3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.

4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, specifically to the following obligations:

Independence
5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality
6. Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.

Conflict of Interest
7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form.

Honesty and Integrity
8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence
9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

Accountability
10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

Obligations to participants
11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality
12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm
13. Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability
14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

Transparency
15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing
16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

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

Name of Consultant: ____

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

Place and date:
Signature: ____