



Terms of Reference

PVE & SOCIAL STABILISATION, SOCIAL CONCISION, AND SKILLS EXCHANGE Evaluation

1. BACKGROUND

The spread of violent extremism constitutes a major concern and challenge for citizens, governments, and the international community. Violent extremist groups directly undermine the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as efforts to maintain peace, foster sustainable development, achieve human security, promote the respect of human rights and the safe delivery of humanitarian aid.

Jordan is among the top five countries of origin for Daesh foreign fighters and second globally for foreign fighters per capita. As of March 2016, an estimated 4,000 Jordanian nationals travelled to conflict zones in Syria and Iraq. Furthermore, many Jordanian combatants who fought for terrorist groups have returned, and many more are destined to return shortly. Levels of sectarianism and intolerance are reportedly rising across all governorates in Jordan, creating an enabling environment for violent extremist groups focusing their recruitment efforts on at-risk individuals. In this challenging context, interventions must consider approaches that reintegrate and disengage fighters returning from abroad and prevent further domestic radicalisation by leveraging all imaginable positive change agents in the Jordanian society. Risks and pressures on Jordanian institutions are mounting. First, Jordanian institutions seem to be challenged by a governance deficit that constrains the effectiveness with which it can address Violent Extremism threats. The absence of effective political structures and processes to strengthen state-society relations is likely to contribute to a sense of isolation and prevents state institutions from engaging constructively early on to address local grievances. Poor social cohesion within and between communities and between state institutions and youth could thus risk becoming a driver for increased frustration and eventually fuel alienation and radicalization. Weak 'societal fabric' and the lack of a shared identity are critical enabling factors for violent extremist groups who excel at promulgating and taking advantage of such grievances. The government's policy on *Support to Counter-Terrorism, Stabilisation and Counter-Radicalisation in Jordan* concludes that violent extremism in Jordan is fundamentally "the result of frustration and exclusion" and that "extremism is first and foremost a socio-political phenomenon".

Second, as in many other contexts, youth are disproportionately negatively impacted by unemployment, marginalisation and a sense of hopelessness. These are grievances that violent extremist groups in many contexts have exploited for recruitment purposes. The Jordanian youth bulge will remain a key challenge for at least the coming two decades and a specific focus on engaging young men and women through constructive and meaningful avenues will therefore continue to be a key priority of the Jordanian government and its partners.

At the individual level, powerful messaging, narratives and imagery via social media networks completes peer relations (family, friends, etc.) in portraying an image of camaraderie, adventure and fulfilment enjoyed by those joining violent extremist groups. Friends and family are nonetheless the key stakeholders in recruitment processes in Jordan as many recruitments to violent extremist groups are based on social ties in Jordan rather than social media. Further, the promised prospective of reward, retribution, and revenge wrapped in the guise of religious salvation, comprises a "package" that resonates well with vulnerable individuals' sense of marginalisation, hopelessness and subjugation. The absence of positive, productive, meaningful and constructive ways of channelling the agency and energy that youth are often associated with adds to the "perfect storm" enabling, often swift, radicalisation processes aided by divisive and violent interpretations of Islam.

Unemployed young men and women in Jordan, who increasingly gravitate towards cities in the search for jobs, have become more vulnerable, in part, as a result of often weakening family cohesion and critical family support and in part due to underemployment, economic insecurity and a social gap that is considered increasingly unjust. Without a

labour market able to accommodate them, many young Jordanians are unable to secure a safe and steady income, leading to frustration, loss of identity and financial vulnerabilities. Drug abuse is also often perceived to be a significant driver of Violent Extremism. At the community level, a range of formal and informal institutions play critical roles in enhancing or reducing the risk of violent extremism. Religious institutions are particularly important in this context propagating either a discourse, which promotes tolerance, pluralism and understanding or more divisive and isolationist messages. The Jordanian state is insufficiently capacitated to work with and regulate religious institutions such as Mosques, the multiple informal religious teaching centers and trusted Sheikhs which often act as primary providers of religious guidance. Mosques also need help from the state to be prepared to play an effective guiding role at the community level - particularly when internal institutional governance mechanisms are weak. In such contexts, religious institutions are easy targets for recruiters and the propagation of extremist religious messaging.

Effective PVE interventions are particularly critical soon due to the return of Jordanian fighters from Syria and Iraq. Jordanians who fought with Daesh and other terrorist groups return for a variety of reasons including disillusionment with the Daesh and its project or simply the fact that Daesh has lost most of its territory including the strongholds of Mosul and Raqqa. Hence, some fighters may return with a strong desire to “normalize” and reintegrate into society while others will hold on to extremist ideologies and sympathies for violent extremist groups. Though Jordan has been taking security measures ahead of their expected return, there are neither clear procedures nor comprehensive programming efforts aimed at managing return and reintegration processes. The prevention of violent extremism is not an issue related solely to security measures but necessitates a focus on development-related causes of, and solutions to, the broader phenomenon of Violent Extremism.

The three interrelated phases of PVE projects that targeted the main drivers of Violent Extremism, were formulated during the old CPD; however, they also targeted areas on the current CPD “specifically CDP 1.3”, which delivers on strengthening the National and civic capacities to improve social cohesion and prevent violent extremism. In addition to this, these interventions directly delivered on SDG 16 which targets the area of rule of law at the national and international levels, as well as ensuring equal access to justice for all.

2. OBJECTIVES

The immediate objectives of these projects evolved around:

- 1) Strengthening the capacities of government and civil society to increase the resilience to violent extremism through preventive efforts.
- 2) Enhance national efforts in reducing the threat of terrorism and radicalization, especially among youth and vulnerable marginalized social groups, to ensure the continued stabilization of Jordan.
- 3) Support to the Government of Jordan’s in improving social stabilization through empowering Jordanian and Syrian youth and women, and skill development and employment facilitation.

In addition to these main objectives these projects should have delivered a set of interventions aiming at strengthening the overall enabling environment (institutionally and organizationally) to fight terrorism and radicalization; through supporting livelihoods by employment creation; and by fostering inclusion and participation, especially among marginalized social groups. Moreover, the outcomes of these interventions are expected to be at both the central and local levels, to face terrorism and radicalization, through strengthening an enabling environment that fosters strong government-citizen alliance for counter-terrorism and de-radicalization. Activities under these outcomes aim at pursuing and reinforcing inclusion, and strengthening citizen participation to reduce marginalization, and the subsequent sense of victimization that drives extremism.

In relation to that, the focus of this evaluation will be on these projects interventions in reducing violent extremism in Jordan. The evaluation should assess, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, linkages with other UNDP-

supported programmes/interventions, and partnership 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 the potential resource mobilization partners. Moreover, this evaluation must address whether cross-cutting issues; i.e. rights-based approach and gender equality were taken in to consideration through out all the phases of these projects design, implementation, and monitoring.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

This evaluation will have two main areas of focus. The first will be on assessing the advancements the three phases of this projects have made towards strengthening the resilience and capacities of the government, and civil society in the area of preventing violent extremism; within the context of the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. The evaluation should also consider progress made under the related strategic plan, specifically in the area of resilience and sustainable development. In addition to this, the evaluation should also consider the project's contribution to the current CPD cycle and relevant commitments; and reflect advancements made in relation to the current strategic plan, especially in the area of "Building resilience to shocks and crises".

The second main part that the evaluation should cover is the identification of potential VE programming approaches that the office can build upon for designing future interventions; using the first 3 phases to establish a strong evidence base while clearly outlining lessons learned as well as most prominent risks and assumptions. Moreover, the evaluation should include identification of regional best practices and success stories supported by proposed tools and approaches that the office can use to effectively deliver on the approaches identified.

While the UNDP CO has contributed notably towards PVE in Jordan, there are still some gaps that needs to be covered. These include, but are not restricted to, the below;

- Review of implementation of the National Strategy and Action Plan to identify areas that might need additional support/improvement;
- Facilitation of community dialogue, with a particular focus on PVE across Jordan;
- Mapping of human rights and rule of law programmes;
- Awareness raising & capacity building of local and national politician on identifying the drivers of Violent Extremism;
- Implementing trust-building focused work particularly among "at risk" youth and government/security services;
- Mentorship of youth (particularly those benefitting from skill development and employment facilitation – coupling hard and soft approaches);
- Development and implementation of alternative narrative campaigns;
- Building resilience of faith-based organizations;
- Support towards Selection, Prosecution, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (SPRR) approaches at community level;

As such, in addition to the detailed evaluation report which will outline potential areas of programming, the evaluator is also expected to deliver one full-fledged concept note building on one (or more) of the identified areas.

During the process of the evaluation the evaluator should take the below criteria in to consideration;

3.1 Relevance and appropriateness

1. Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to Jordan and in particular to the PVE Unit, relevant ministries, (i.e. Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Religious Affairs, Public Security Directorate, etc.), civil society organizations (CSOs), community-based organizations CBOs, National Non-governmental organizations, and other direct beneficiaries (NGOs)?
2. Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the mandate, strategy, functions, roles, and responsibility of the above-mentioned stake holders?
3. Extent to which integrating a human rights and gender equality perspective was relevant to achieve the projects' outcomes.

3.2 Effectiveness and efficiency

1. Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
2. Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently?
3. How did the project deal with issues and risks?
4. Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner?
5. Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?
6. Were the resources (time, funding, human resources) sufficient?
7. Extent to which a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the project.

3.3 Impact and sustainability

1. Did the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?
2. Did the activities related to PVE policy impact the government institutions in their way of working? If so, how and how much?
3. Did the activities related to PVE civil society support impact the civil society and communities in their way of thinking towards PVE? If so, how and how much?
4. Did the activities related to livelihoods support impact the communities in their local economic development and sustainable livelihoods?
 - a. Is there any evidence that the livelihoods programming effectively mitigated the risk of VE in targeted communities?
5. Did the activities related to community engagement somehow supported the enhancement of social cohesion within the host communities and/or target communities in Jordan?
6. Were the actions and result owned by the local partners and stakeholders?
7. Was the capacity (individuals, institution, and system) built through the actions of the project?
8. What is the level of contribution of the project management arrangements to national ownership of the set objectives, result and outputs?
9. Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote national ownership and sustainability of the result achieved?
10. The level of change in gender relations, e.g. access to and use of resources, contribution in economy, division of labor.

3.4 Project design

1. To what extent did the design of the project help in achieving its own goals?
2. Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the project?
3. Were there clear objectives and strategy?
4. Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance?

5. Was the process of project design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?
6. Was there coherence, coordination and complementarity by the project with other donor funded activities in the field of tax collection methods?

3.5 Project management

1. Were the project management arrangements appropriate at the team level and project board level?
2. Was there appropriate visibility and acknowledgement of the project and donors?

4. STAKEHOLDERS OF THE EVALUATION

UNDP, key donors (Government of Japan, Government of Switzerland, Government of Netherlands), PVE Unit, relevant ministries, (i.e. Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Interior “MOI”, Ministry of Religious Affairs, Public Security Directorate “PSD”, etc), civil society organizations (CSOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), National Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and other direct beneficiaries. 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

4.1 Specific Issues to be addressed:

The evaluation team is expected to focus on the following points and any other issues considered important for the successful completion of these projects:

1. Creation of short-term employment opportunities and implementation of economic recovery initiatives geared towards improvement of livelihoods, basic social services delivery, and enhancement of social cohesion and PVE (where applicable) at the community level;
2. Enhancement made for local economic development through skills-matching, MSMEs growth and capacity development;
3. Improvements made on state-society trust and social cohesion;
4. Enhancement of community security and crime prevention, and support to legal aid in Jordan;
5. Coordination and collaboration among communities and government entities, particularly for community security matter
6. Technical support to coordination of host community concerns.
7. The level of support efforts to mainstream a PVE lens within and across existing and future national planning processes and government strategies, including those on poverty reduction and youth.
8. The degree of capacity development of line ministries, and implementation of key activities in line with the strategy and its action plan including establishing M&E mechanisms to track progress.
9. The extent to which the Syrian refugee crisis has been turned into development opportunities; through the implementation of these projects’ activities;
10. Successes made in mobilising enough grants and concessionary financing to support to the macroeconomic framework and address Jordan’s financing needs over the next three years,
11. The progress made towards each of the outputs of the project documents.
12. Whether results of the projects achievements have met the needs of the stakeholders,
13. Efficiency of monitoring and reporting mechanism.
14. Measures taken to ensure sustainable operations beyond project durations.
15. Any other significant issues.

4.2 Findings, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

1. The evaluation team will highlight performance, success, failure, strengths and weaknesses of the project to date. Identify of prioritize problems and shortcomings of the project.
2. It is important to indicate the impact of these projects on the previously mentioned stakeholders.
3. Lessons learned should indicate main lessons that can be drawn from the project experience.
4. All the above-mentioned areas should take in to consideration the cross-cutting issues with specific focus on; gender equality, and rights-based approach;
5. Recommendations should outline corrective actions required, and possible new interventions.

5. METHODOLOGY_

Evaluation Methodology:

This evaluation will be conducted using methodologies and techniques suitable for the evaluation purpose, objective and evaluation questions as described in this 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 the 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.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The Implementation Arrangements and Reporting Requirements are as follows:

	Output	Timeline	% of Deliverables	Target date
1	Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report	Within 10 days of contract	40%	
2	A draft preliminary evaluation report and presentation, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with partners	After conclusion of necessary meetings	40%	
3	Final evaluation report; Presentation of major findings; and Executive summary.	Within 7 working days after receipt of comments on the draft report	20%	

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

7. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR_

Experience & Qualifications:

Functional competencies:

Professionalism:

Communications:

- Excellent 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:

Master's degree in Social Policy, Public Policy, Development Studies, Human Rights, Politics, Economics, or in a related area ----- 20 points

Experience:

- More than 10 years of the relevant professional experience; previous experience with CPD/CPAP evaluations and/or reviews ----- 15 points
- Prior experience working on CVE/PVE related projects is required ----- 20 points
- Experience working in areas related to youth, and women empowerment is desirable ----- 20 points
- Experience in implementation of projects including project development and reporting ----- 10 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, 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 would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical	70%	70
Understanding of TORs 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 a clear work plan		15
Financial	30%	30

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and length of the assignment will be discussed with the Consultant prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of the Consultants' assignment is up to 20 working days.

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.

1. **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

2. [Table of contents.](#)

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

3. [List of acronyms and abbreviations.](#)

4. [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.

5. [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.

6. [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).

7. [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.

8. [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:

9. [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:](#)

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).

- [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) 2018-2022;
10. National Human Development Reports.

Annex 3: 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