



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Country: Jordan

Date: 04-Nov-2019

Post Title:	International consultant to evaluate CPD outcome 2013-2017 on livelihoods interventions
Starting Date:	Nov. 17 th , 2019
Duration:	30 working days over One-and-a-Half-month period with 1-week mission to Jordan
Location:	Jordan – Amman – UNDP

Description of the assignment:

Under the supervision of the Resident Representative and, or the Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP Jordan country office. The Evaluation Consultant will conduct an outcome evaluation over the office Livelihoods interventions.

To apply, kindly read the procurement notice, attach the following documents, and submit your application to the following email: ic.jo@undp.org

Any request for clarification must be sent to maen.oweis@undp.org, Mr. Oweis will respond by email and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all applicants.

Please submit above information no later than **13-Nov-2019 at 18:00 HRS.** (Jordan time) by email to: ic.jo@undp.org with subject: **“UNDP CO Livelihoods Outcome Evaluation”**.

Background:

The 2013-2017 country development programme was developed within an emerging national context of socio-political reform, in which the Government priorities and people’s priorities were calling for social justice and an end to corruption. The programme of support had been determined following a thorough analysis of the political context as well as an in-depth study of the issues facing Jordan and their root

causes. In addition to this, the 2013–2017 UNDP CPD worked on both policy and implementation at national and grassroots levels, and achieved major contributions to outcome results of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) through:

- a) Systemic reform. Jordan has undertaken political and institutional reform at national and subnational levels in a participatory, transparent and accountable manner.
- b) Social Protection. Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and subnational levels.
- c) Social Services. Jordan is providing equitable delivery of quality social services for all people.
- d) Young people. Jordan has institutionalized necessary policies and mechanisms for the effective and inclusive participation of young people in social, cultural, economic and political life.
- e) Environment. Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms to develop and implement strategies and plans targeting key cultural, environmental and disaster-risk-reduction issues (including transitioning to a green economy) at national and subnational levels with a gendered lens.

To help achieve these five UNDAF outcomes, the country programme focused on accelerating progress on MDG 1, 7 and 8, which are translated now into SDG 1, 5 and 8 within the context laid out above. Young boys, young girls and women's issues were addressed in all Goals with the three prioritized areas receiving the greatest attention. Support was also provided to strengthening aid coordination and effectiveness, in addition to disaster risk reduction.

UNDP Jordan Livelihoods-Supported Interventions:

UNDP builds on its iterative regional and country-specific experience in programming and implementing of livelihoods interventions. UNDP goes beyond providing only traditional components for enhancing access to livelihoods and income-generation opportunities. The design of market-based livelihoods interventions supports social cohesion/stability, community resilience and self-reliance. Support to young boys, young girls, and women to access sustainable livelihoods opportunities is mainstreamed across all UNDP livelihoods-supported actions. The principle of "Do No Harm" is considered throughout.

While pushing for the sustainable impact of livelihoods interventions, UNDP follows an evidence-based approach for livelihoods programming. Needs assessments and market analyses at the local level are conducted to assess the potential for growth, profitability, and employment in the local economic sectors. Both quantitative and qualitative assessments of livelihoods and employment creation interventions are carried out in tandem to capture the aspects of resilience-building programming and its impact.

As part of support to national leadership and ownership, UNDP promoted partnerships with the relevant governmental and non-governmental actors in livelihoods and employment creation, including the private sector and civil society organizations as well as academia.

UNDP's implementation approach is built around participatory methods for all components of livelihoods interventions. UNDP-implemented livelihoods interventions are tailored in response to the emerging challenges, such as the Syrian refugee crisis, and in alignment with country-specific national priorities. UNDP has also scaled up livelihoods interventions to address environmental-related issues and to prevent violent extremism among potential radical youth groups.

The following are the key UNDP complimentary interventions aimed at improving livelihoods opportunities and resilience-building outcomes for men and women:

- Demand-driven Vocational Training and Employment.
- Micro-Equity (Venture Capital).
- 3 x 6 Approach: Emergency Response and Sustainable Employment.
- Skills Exchange between Jordanian and Syrian refugee communities.

Considering the above, this evaluation aims to assess the livelihoods interventions implemented during the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. It is also expected from this evaluation to assess the performance of the UNDP livelihoods-supported interventions, their achievements, and quality of results as well as outlining lessons learned, challenges and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge and future projects in support of the decision and policymaking of partners. This evaluation is also expected to measure the achievements in enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and enhanced social cohesion/stability among affected communities through the use of the resilience lens, in line with the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/ 3RP. Furthermore, the evaluation should serve as an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Jordan with an impartial assessment of the results. Moreover, the evaluation should be tailored towards encouraging constructive feedback from main stakeholders; in order to point out any untapped areas from stakeholder's perspective. In addition to that, the evaluation should consider the aspect of leaving no one behind with special focus on the most vulnerable groups.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives:

This evaluation should mainly focus on the livelihoods support, and resilience interventions that UNDP Jordan Country Office implemented during the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. In addition, the evaluation should also consider the livelihoods interventions under the new CPD cycle. In relation to the old CPD the scope of the evaluation must consider advancements that have evolved under Outcome 2 of the 2013-2017 UNDAF. Moreover, the evaluation should consider contributions towards Outcome 3 of the current UNSDF *"Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the economic, social, environmental and political spheres"*.

Furthermore, the evaluation should also consider the amount of progress these interventions have delivered or should have delivered towards the SDGs; in particular SDG 1,5 and 8.

Social Protection: Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and subnational levels.

In order to comprehensively assess the UNDP Jordan livelihoods interventions, a minimum of the following areas of evaluation should be considered:

- a) Evaluate the exogenous factors (political, social, economic, legal etc.) that could have affected the outcomes attainment in a positive or negative way;
- b) Evaluate the fundamental contributions of UNDP to progress towards the achievement of social protection outcomes, including resilience-building achievements and analysis of strategic positioning of UNDP support to Jordan in adding value to the evolving national priorities and development context;
- c) Assess to what extent the livelihoods interventions addressed problems/needs of the targeted areas and the beneficiaries;
- d) Assess to what extent the livelihoods interventions were able to provide sustainable employment opportunities for the targeted groups;
- e) Assess to what extent the livelihoods interventions contributed to strengthening resilience assets and capacities at individual, community, and institutional level;
- f) Assess to what extent the livelihoods interventions were able to contribute to strengthening youth and women's empowerment;
- g) Assess to what extent the livelihoods interventions linked with national social protection frameworks;
- h) Evaluate the UNDP contribution to enhance the institutional capacity of implementing partners involved in the implementation of livelihoods interventions, including the civil society organizations;
- i) Quantify, as far as possible, the outcomes achieved with special attention to improving living of conditions of beneficiaries, including access to basic needs and improving the quality of services;
- j) Assess the relevance of monitoring and evaluation indicators and their adaptation to the measurement of outcomes and the measurement of resilience as defined in the NRP/ 3RP;
- k) Assess the validity and relevance of risks and assumptions identified;
- l) Assess the resources mobilization and partnerships' strategies and achievement(s) against the set targets and further prospects;

This assessment is also expected to look beyond the immediate outcomes; it should assess the long-term impact of UNDP interventions, and whether the interventions have been effective and contributed to desired changes over time, consistent with the Resilience definition. In addition to that, the evaluation should consider the unintended outcomes that could have been brought by UNDP livelihoods-supported interventions. Therefore, the results of the evaluation should provide guidance for future actions and provide recommendations for potential future (re)orienting or (re)adjustment of the approach for increased and more substantive results.

As mentioned previously, the focus of this evaluation will be on livelihoods interventions. The evaluation will assess relevance, resilience-building achievements, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, linkages with other UNDP-supported programmes/interventions, linkages with national social protection

frameworks, and partnerships with national and international stakeholders, including governmental and non-governmental organizations, international donor community and academic groups. The evaluation should also recommend untapped partner groups and potential resource mobilization partners. In addition to that, this evaluation must address cross-cutting issues – including the rights-based approach, gender equality, and resilience-building measures – in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluation of UNDP livelihoods-supported interventions.

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 actions or add to knowledge.

The evaluation should cover the following prompt areas:

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

- To which extent were the Outcome activities aligned with the national priorities, plans, strategies as well as emerging priorities/challenges faced the development progress in Jordan e.g. the National Resilience Plan 2014 – 2016 and the Jordan Response Plan 2016-2018?
- To which extent were the Outcome activities designed properly to address the issues identified in the CPD 2013 - 2017?
- To what extent did the Outcome objectives remain valid and relevant throughout the implementation phase?
- To which extent were the activities and outputs consistent with the intended impact/results?
- On which basis were the targeted governorates/areas selected?
- To which extent did the Outcome activities, outputs/expected results correspond with the needs and problems of targeted governorate(s)?
- To which extent did the Outcome activities consider the pre-existing capacities of the implementing partners?
- To which extent did the Outcome activities consider broader resilience-building challenges?

b) *Efficiency:* the extent to which the resources of Outcome activities were appropriate for the scope of work and to what extent the resources were efficiently utilized to achieve the objectives/expected results:

- To which extent did allocated resources correspond to the needs of the Outcome activities?
- To which extent were resources efficiently utilized to identify, assess institutional capacity, and select partners appropriate for the scope of work?
- 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 efforts did it take to manage the diversification of the economy outcome? Where are the gaps if any?

c) *Effectiveness: the extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives and the quality of the outputs:*

- To which extent did the Outcome activities reach its targeted population(s)?
- To which extent were the capacities of implementing partners developed regarding knowledge, attitudes and practices on LED?
- To which extent were the Outcome activities implemented effectively, thereby contributing to the achievement of the expected results and support the diversification of economy, specifically at the local community level?
- To which extent did the monitoring of Outcome activities implementation contribute to learning and accommodated changes throughout the implementation?
- What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outcome?
- To which extent did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the implementation of Outcome activities?
- Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices to promote productive capacities of small and medium enterprises, to develop knowledge-based economy and social entrepreneurship, to enhance employability and access to decent work, to improve value chains for SMEs and to strengthen access to financing and market instruments?
- To which extent were cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, rights-based approach, and resilience-building measures understood and pursued in a coherent manner?
- To which extent were the Outcome activities scaled up to accommodate emerging needs/promising sectors for promoting livelihoods opportunities?
- To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to desired changes over time, consistent with the Resilience Lens, including enhanced delivery of quality services to affected populations through national and local systems, strengthened partnerships with and capacities of national/local service providers, enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and social cohesion/stability among affected communities?
- To what extent were programme indicators able to measure achievements of the Outcome activities listed above using the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/ 3RP?

d) *Sustainability: the extent to which the benefits/results of the Outcome activities are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted*

- To which extent are the employment opportunities created/provided sustainable, including differences in gender, if any?
- How has UNDP contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?
- To which extent will the capacity building of Outcome activities sustain some of the results?

- Has follow-up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?
- To which extent are the benefits/results of the Outcome activities sustaining resilience-building achievements?

e) **Impact:** *the extent to which the Outcome activities achieved its intended results and contributed towards achieving its objective*

- To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to the local community development, enhance social cohesion, strengthen resilience assets and capacities at individual, community, and institutional level, and strengthen youth and women’s empowerment in the targeted areas?
- Have any positive or negative long-term effects been produced by the Outcome activities, whether directly or indirectly, intended or unintended?

Apart from the criteria above, there are additional commonly applied evaluation criteria such as coverage, connectedness, economic empowerment, gender equality, value-for-money, client satisfaction, self-reliance, social cohesion/stability 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, they all must be agreed to by UNDP in Jordan. Based on the above analysis, Individual Consultant must provide recommendations on how UNDP in Jordan should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the outcome change is enhanced through 2018-2022 CPD cycle.

Evaluation Methodology:

This evaluation will be conducted using methodologies and techniques suitable for the evaluation purpose, objective and evaluation questions as described in these TORs. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyze 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 considered.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation and the evaluation questions 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](#)
- UNEG [Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

In addition to that, the consultant has the option to consider the following evaluation methods for their data collection activities.

- **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, implementing partners, 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 a result of the Evaluation. The reliability of disaggregated data at the district level should be considered, 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.

The final evaluation report should describe the full approach taken and the rationale for the approach, making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

Evaluation timeframe & Deliverables:

Below are the required activities and expected outputs (deliverables), based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

<u>Output</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
Inception Report, including the time-lined work plan, agenda of meetings, and evaluation questions.	4 days after signing the contract
A first draft of the evaluation report	20 days after signing the contract
Final evaluation report; Presentation of major findings; Executive Summary	30 Days after signing the contract

Notes to be considered for the implementation approach:

- UNDP will designate a Focal Point for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Country Office will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Assistant Resident Representative Programme will arrange introductory meetings within UNDP and Unit Heads to establish initial contacts with government partners and project staff. The consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.
- The M&E Focal point will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Focal Point will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluator is required to address all comments received completely and comprehensively.
- While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluator to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the Country Office

Experience & Qualifications:

Functional competencies:

Professionalism:

- Good knowledge of the UNDP system and UNDP country programming processes (CPD/CPAP);
- Good knowledge of the monitoring and evaluation of resilience-building achievements is required;
- Experience in evaluation methods and techniques is required, especially in analytical methods which can evaluate change and contribution. This includes quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.
- Experience in relation to the local economic development is required.
- Experience in Results Based Management (RBM) principles, logic modelling/logical framework analysis, quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, and participatory approaches is required.
- Experience in relation to private sector development, entrepreneurship development, vocational training and employment support, and market assessment and research is preferable.
- Experience in relation to gender mainstreaming and/or gender equality standards is required.

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:

- University degree (preferably master's degree or equivalent) in economics, social science, or related field. -----30 points

Experience:

- 7 years of the relevant professional experience; previous experience with CPD/CPAP evaluations and/or reviews. -----30 points
- Practical experience or knowledge of the development issues in Middle Income Countries is an asset. -----25 points

Language Requirements:

- Excellent written and spoken English -----10 points. Knowledge of Arabic is an asset----- 5 points;
- 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, disability, sexual orientation, 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;
- In the framework of the ethical obligations of the evaluator during the evaluation process; he/she must confirm their commitment on delivering the evaluation according to the ethical requirements of the United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG (Ethical Guidelines);
- The main ethical areas that the evaluator should sustain during the evaluation process must evolve around the following; Independence, Impartiality, Credibility, Conflicts of Interest, Honesty and Integrity, and Accountability. More details of the evaluator ethical responsibilities can be found under the following link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>.

Documents To Be Included When Submitting The Proposals:

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:

- (i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work
- (ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work.

2. Financial proposal;

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references.

Financial Proposal:

Lump Sum Contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount including fees, travel cost (total of two weeks mission), tickets, DSAs, accommodation. While local transportations (local travel means inside each country) will be covered by the project. 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.

Evaluation Of Candidates

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
 - b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
- * Technical Criteria weight; 70%
 - * Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 50 point will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical	70%	70
Understanding of TOR and the aim of services to be provided.		10
Having carried out similar or related work		15
Overall methodological approach, work plan, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges		30
Organization of tasks, including timetable.		15
Financial	30%	30

Duration of Mission:

The expected duration of this assignment is up to two months maximum, expected to consist of approximately One and a half month with 1-week mission to Jordan to conduct necessary meetings and to finalize the evaluation report.

Annex 1: UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

This **evaluation report template** 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 evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be 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:

1. **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.

2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports (non-GEF) second page (as one page):

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title		
Atlas ID		
Corporate outcome and output		
Country		
Region		
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
Project budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source		
Implementing party		

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/ country programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/ other		
Period under evaluation	Start	End

Evaluators		
Evaluator email address		
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion

3. Table of contents.

including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary (four-page maximum).

A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) 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.
- Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction.

- 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.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—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.

7. 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. It should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results model 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.
- Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
- 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).

8. 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.⁴⁶ The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- **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.

9. 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 report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. 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:

- **Evaluation approach;**
- **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as 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 age 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 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, as well as gender-responsiveness.
- **Performance standards:**⁴⁸ 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 participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women 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 Evaluators' for more information).⁴⁹
- **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** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. 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 for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses 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.

11. Findings.

Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation 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. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. 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, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

13. Recommendations.

The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. 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. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women’s empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. Lessons learned.

As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, 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.

15. 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. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
- List of supporting documents reviewed.
- Project or programme results model 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.

Annex2: Documents to be Studied by the Evaluator “But Not Exclusively”

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
3. Common Country Assessments
4. UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
5. UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR)
6. Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports related to this evaluation
7. National Development Strategies
8. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2017
9. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2018
10. National Human Development Reports

Annex4: Evaluation matrix (Sample Evaluation Matrix)

To be included in the inception report.

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis