TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

FOR

Consolidating the Democratic Rule of Law and Peace through a strong Justice System (Phase IV) Justice System Programme, UNDP TIMOR-LESTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title:</th>
<th>EVALUATOR – International Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Dili, Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Unit:</td>
<td>Governance Unit, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to:</td>
<td>Programme Analyst, UNDP Governance Unit Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised by:</td>
<td>Governance Team Leader, UNDP Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contract:</td>
<td>Individual Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages required</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Date:</td>
<td>28 October, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Date(s):</td>
<td>28 October 2019 – 5 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Contract:</td>
<td>27 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. PROJECT TITLE: Consolidating the Democratic Rule of Law and Peace through a Strong Justice System (Phase IV, 2014 - January 2020), Justice System Programme, UNDP Timor-Leste

B. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Timor-Leste has made remarkable strides in state-building since its referendum in 1999 and the restoration of independence in 2002, being considered a success case within post-conflict developing countries.

Two decades of state-building paved the foundation of the justice institutions, and yet both the procedural and substantive rule of law issues remain significant. The presence of the formal justice system is limited. There are four district courts across the country, which, for those who live in rural areas, can take hours or days to reach. The number of legal professionals is still handful and severely concentrated in Dili, the capital. The conventional method of resolving conflicts in local communities – compensation and reconciliation – is regarded as the most accessible and cost-efficient.

Laws are written in Portuguese, a language in which the majority of the Timorese people do not have much proficiency. This frustrates the performance of justice actors and hinders the accessibility of
laws for ordinary people. Whereas the Constitution of Timor-Leste upholds the rule of law as a fundamental principle to reinforce democracy and protect human rights, many justice actors openly express their concerns about political interference that threatens the independence of the judiciary.

In line with the National Strategic Development Plan 2011-2030 (SDP), Justice Sector Strategic Plan 2011-2030 (JSSP) highlights five priority areas for the sector development: institutional development, legal reform and framework, human resources development, infrastructure and IT, and access to justice. The program of the current VIII Constitutional Government places justice within the broader goal of peace, state-building, and business enabling environment, and reiterates the priority areas in the justice sector by calling for strengthening legislative reform, capacity building of human resources, and access to justice. The Government Programme further stresses that the institutional cooperation and ownership by national decision-makers are the main contributors to solving the challenges faced by the sector.

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION and EVALUATION:

Justice System Programme (JSP) is a comprehensive capacity development initiative that was initially developed by the Government of Timor-Leste and UNDP in late 2003 to support the nascent justice system in the country. The programme was aligned with the country’s National Development Plan 2002-2007 and the Stability Programme 2003, and provided technical assistance and resources to establish the infrastructure and develop human and institutional capacities for the justice system.

The past JSP phases have largely focused on international technical assistance to individual institutions for their respective competencies, with a few cross-institutional interventions such as the Legal & Judicial Training Center, mobile courts, JSSP and the Council of Coordination. While the present phase IV of the JSP ensured that these gains are consolidated and expanded, it focuses on furthering the consolidation of the rule of law in Timor-Leste by strengthening the institutional capacity and improving access to justice for the vulnerable. The capacity development support emphasizes on quality legal education for professionals and reform of the state-owned legal aid system. Continuing JSP’s mobile court initiative and the new establishment of legal aid clinics are expected to reinforce access to justice for women and disadvantaged people in rural areas of Timor-Leste.

The objective of JSP IV is to systematize and consolidate institutional and human capacities in the justice sector so that justice is administered in an effective, efficient and accessible manner and worthy of the confidence of all citizens of Timor-Leste. This overarching objective is implemented through four main outputs:

**Output 1:** Coordination, management and oversight capacities of justice institutions enhanced for more effective and efficient formulation and implementation of laws, plans and overall administration of justice;

**Output 2:** Capacity of justice sector strengthened and expanded to provide quality services and uphold the rule of law;

**Output 3:** Improved access to justice and dispute resolution mechanisms for all with a focus on women and more vulnerable populations;
Output 4: Coordination, co-operation and integrated systems between justice, police, communities and corrections supported in a “pilot – scale up access to justice district model.”

In accordance with UNDP policies and procedures, the project is required to undergo a Terminal/End-of-Project Evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation of the project, Consolidating the Democratic Rule of Law and Peace through a Strong Justice System, UNDP Timor-Leste. Therefore, the UNDP is seeking a qualified International Consultant to undertake the terminal evaluation of the project and all activities undertaken between 2014 until January 2020 and prepare and present the Terminal Evaluation Report.

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, based in the region and key stakeholders.

D. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The project evaluation is being carried out to evaluate the progress made by the project against the project outputs and indicators, with an in-depth analysis to review the results achieved in the project document. The evaluation will also assess the approaches applied by the project for implementation and achieving the results and measure the impact of the project in the country. The evaluation should look into the relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency of the assistance provided by JSP to the Justice Institutions of Timor-Leste.

The analysis and recommendations presented by the evaluation will be useful to UNDP, other justice institutions, development partners and CSOs in measuring the contributions made by the project and in designing future interventions for strengthening the justice system in Timor-Leste.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- To analyze the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy
- To assess and evaluate the progress made by the project towards an attainment of the results as specified in the project monitoring and evaluation framework, UNDAF and CPD
- To measure the contributions made by the project in enhancing the accountability, effectiveness, efficiency and inclusiveness of the justice and rule of law system
- To evaluate the sustainability of the project interventions
- To examine the cost efficiency and effectiveness of JSP project assistance
- To document main lessons learned, best practices and propose recommendations

E. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION.

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, partnership strategy, gender, and social inclusion as defined and explained in the Terminal Evaluation Guidance.
During the evaluation, the evaluator is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis.

- Desk review of relevant documents (project document, project progress reports, evaluation surveys, etc);
- Briefing session with UNDP;
- Interviews with partners, stakeholders, and donors (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved);
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions with project teams, project beneficiaries and major stakeholders;
- Consultation meetings, focus group discussions as relevant, check lists, capacity development assessment tools, etc.

F. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance

- To what extent JSP’s technical and operational assistance were relevant in addressing the needs and strategic priorities of Timorese justice institutions and other judicial stakeholders?
- To what extent were interventions informed by gender and social inclusion analyses to enhance the access to justice of women, youth, people with disability and other marginalized groups?
- How relevant was the project in making the national justice system as inclusive, credible and transparent as possible?
- To what extent the project was able to cater the needs of the beneficiaries in the changed context? If and when required an alteration of focus/strategy, was the project flexible?
- Is there any evidence that the project advanced any key national rule of law, human rights, gender or inclusion policies and the priorities of UN, UNDP, including the UNDAF?
- How relevant was the geographical coverage?

Effectiveness

- How effective has the project been in strengthening the Timorese Justice System?
- Has the project achieved its outputs? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outputs?
- To what extent the planned outputs contributed towards the achievement of the CPD and UNDAF outcome and what are the evidences to validate these claims?
- Did women, men, people with disability, youth and marginalized groups directly benefit from the project’s activities? If so, how and what was the impact?
- Were any changes made in the project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries etc. suggested by project mid-point evaluation, context/risk analysis? Did it affect project results?

Efficiency

- To what extent have resources (financial, human, institutional and technical) been allocated strategically?
• Were the project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others?
• To what extent did the coordination with other UN agencies and UNDP projects reduce transaction costs, optimize results and avoid duplication?

**Impact**

• What impact did the work of JSP have on the institutional/professional capacity of justice institutions and other judicial stakeholders? Is there evidence of knowledge transfer?
• What impact did the work of JSP project have on the strengthening of the Justice System in Timor-Leste?
• What impact did JSP have in increasing access to justice services?
• Is there evidence of changes in their credibility, effectiveness and/or sustainability?

**Sustainability**

• Have JSP interventions enhanced the capacity of national justice institutions and judicial stakeholders for sustainable results?
• What is the level of ownership of national justice institutions towards the project? Will they be able to sustain project supported interventions (programmatically and financially) after the project phases out?
• Is there any evidence that JSP project reduced assistance over the years due to national justice institutions increased ownership and leadership?

**Partnership strategy**

• To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
• Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing partners’ programmes?
• How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs?
• Has UNDP worked effectively with partners to deliver on this current initiative?
• How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote Access to Justice in the country?

**Gender**

• To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of Access to Justice interventions? Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?
• How were gender issues implemented as a cross-cutting theme. Did the project give sufficient attention to promote gender equality and gender-sensitivity?
• To what extend did the project pay attention to effects on marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups?
• To what extent was the project informed by human rights treaties and instruments?
• To what extent did the project identify the relevant human rights claims and obligations?
• How were gaps identified in the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations, including an analysis of gender and marginalized and vulnerable groups, and how the design and implementation of the project addressed these gaps?

**Social inclusion**

• How did the project consider the plight and needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged to promote social equity, for example, women, youth, disabled persons?
Based on the above analysis, the evaluator is expected to provide overarching conclusions on the project results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP Timor-Leste Office would best direct development of programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities for similar justice initiatives in the future in Timor-Leste.

G. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND TIMEFRAME

Under the overall supervision of the Team Leader of the Governance Team of the Timor Leste Country Office (CO), the Consultant will be responsible for the evaluation covering all activities as outlined in the framework of the project.

Duration: 28 October 2019- 5 December 2019

The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to at least a couple of programme municipalities (namely, Baucau and Suai Judicial Districts) to observe project’s work and hold discussions with stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Minister of Justice, Director General of the Cabinet, and Heads of Departments of Legislation and Legal Affairs, Human Rights and Citizenship, Prison Services and Social Reintegration, Registry and Notary, Land and Property
- President of the Court of Appeal
- Judge Administrators of the District Courts in Dili, Baucau, and Suai
- Prosecutor-General
- Public Defender-General
- Public Defender Administrators in Baucau and Suai Judicial Districts
- Director of the Legal & Judicial Training Center
- Development Partners, Japan, Korea, Portugal, Australia, Brazil and Norway
- Members of Civil Society Organizations (Judicial System Monitoring Programme (JSMP), Ba Futuru, Pradet, Justice Facility, BELUN, Justice and Peace Commission (JPC) in Baucau, JNJ Advocacia and others relevant CSOs)
- Office of the Ombudsman for Human Rights and Justice (Provedoria dos Direitos Humanos e Justica, PDHJ)
- Project staff (former and current)
- Relevant UN agencies and other UNDP projects
- Relevant members of the UNDP Country Team

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Progress Reports, project work plans and budget revisions, Quarterly progress reports, combine delivery report (CDR), any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The project team will provide these documents to the selected evaluator.

The tentative schedule will be the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
<th>Tentative Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and preparation of inception report including design, methodologies,</td>
<td>3 days, home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaboration of evaluation questions, etc. Submission of draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report to UNDP and the reference group (home based)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating the feedback from UNDP and the Reference Group and refining</td>
<td>1 day, home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the design of the detailed scope and methodology (including the methods for data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection and analysis) &amp; inception report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing by UNDP, Stakeholders meetings and interviews in Dili, and Field</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit(s) outside Dili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, preparation and submission of draft report</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of draft findings to UNDP and presentation to stakeholders</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(separate events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate feedback from above presentations and submit a final draft to UNDP</td>
<td>3 days (home-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize and submit report (Home Based)</td>
<td>27 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. EVALUATION CRITERIA &amp; RATINGS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation of the project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, partnership strategy, gender, and social inclusion**.

Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

- Overall quality of the project design/programming
- Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Implementation
- Overall quality of M&E
- Overall project outputs and contribution to outcomes
- Quality of UNDP implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
- Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
- Sustainability of financial and human resources
- Institutional framework and governance sustainability

In addition, the evaluation will also assess the key financial aspects of the project utilization of funds. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures, revision of budget, donors' financial reports. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete assessment of financial reports which will be included in the
terminal evaluation report. The evaluation will also highlight the way forward for UNDP in developing additional programming in the justice sector. Recommendations need to be specific regarding who, what, when, where and how – to ensure they are actually actionable by identified actors.

I. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

To facilitate the evaluation process, the project will assist in connecting the evaluator with national justice officials, development partners and key stakeholders. In addition, the project will provide operational support in organizing meetings and field visits and one project national staff will accompany the evaluator to overcome the language barrier, where necessary.

Key project materials will be sent before the field work and will be reviewed by the evaluator prior to the commencement of the field work. The evaluator will prepare and share the draft inception report before the field mission. The evaluator will be briefed by UNDP remotely on the objectives, purpose and output of the project evaluation before the preparation of the inception report.

The evaluator will assess project based on interviews undertaken, discussions and consultations with all relevant stakeholders or interested parties and review of project’s documents. As a minimum indication, the evaluator should consult with implementing partners, other key government stakeholders, development partners and civil society representatives. UNDP will provide guidance in identifying, contacting and arranging for discussions, meetings with the stakeholders as required.

Comments from UNDP, Project Board members, and key stakeholders received at a mission wrap-up meeting and via emails will be noted for incorporation in the final review report.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Timor Leste. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and facilitate travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator.

J. SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE OF THE EVALUATOR

Required qualification and skills for the international evaluator:

- Proven experience of having conducted evaluations of justice sector projects and written evaluation reports.
- Advanced university degree in law or related field
- At least 7 years of experience in the field of justice, with sound knowledge and understanding of the specifics and developments of the justice sector, in the areas of technical advice at senior level, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation of justice programs
- Sound knowledge of results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation)
- Previous work experience working on justice in post-conflict countries will be an asset.
- Fluency in English with excellent writing skills and good communication skills.

K. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant should deliver the following outputs:
• Inception report detailing the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated, why it is being evaluated, and how (methodology) it will be evaluated. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, evaluation tools, activities and deliverables.
• Presentation of the inception report to and consultation with the UNDP CO, government counterparts, implementing partners, and development partners.
• Presentation on findings and initial recommendations to UNDP, Project Board members and key stakeholders.
• The draft review report within 23 days of the start date
• Final report within 27 days of the start date with sufficient details and quality and taking on board comments from, with annexes and working papers as required

The reports to include, but not be limited to, the following components:

• Executive summary
• Introduction and overview
• Description of the intervention being evaluated
• Evaluation scope and objectives
• Evaluation approach and methods
• Data analysis
• Findings and conclusions
• Lessons learned
• Recommendations on future engagement in the justice sector
• Annexes, including evaluation matrix, data-collection instruments, list of individuals/groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited, list of documents reviewed, summary tables of findings.

The evaluator is required to discuss the full draft of its report prior to departure from Timor-Leste.

Schedule of Payments

The payment will be made based on the following deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Deliverable/Output</th>
<th>Target Due date</th>
<th>Percentage disbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Submission and acceptance of Inception Report</td>
<td>31 October, 2019</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report</td>
<td>29 November, 2019</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Submission and approval final terminal evaluation report</td>
<td>5 December 2019</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The financial proposal must be expressed in the form of an "all-inclusive" lump-sum amount, supported by breakdown of costs as per template provided. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.) Under the lump sum approach, the contract price is fixed, regardless of changes in cost components.
For duty travels, all living allowances required to perform the demands of the TOR must be incorporated in the financial proposal. A total of around 3-5 travel days will be required to at least the two focus municipalities during the period of the assignment with approximately 2-4 of these may require overnight stay.

M. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF OFFER

- Letter of application with duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Statement of Availability for the entire duration of the assignment;
- Personal CV and P11 Form, indicating all past relevant experience, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) and three (3) professional references;
- Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable and how they will approach and complete the assignment;
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided by UNDP.

N. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF BEST OFFER

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a 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 weighting: 70%
* Financial criteria weighting: 30%

*Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the technical evaluation criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum obtainable points</th>
<th>Weight Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced university degree in law or related field</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience and Knowledge of the Justice Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 7 years of experience in the field of justice, with sound knowledge and understanding of the specifics and developments of the justice sector, in the areas of technical advice at senior level, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation of justice programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Proven experience in conducting evaluation of justice programs and having written more than two (2) evaluation reports 20 20%

• Sound knowledge of results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation) 20 20%

• Previous work experience working on justice in post-conflict countries 5 5%

Language requirements:
• Fluency in English. Working knowledge of Portuguese and/or Tetun is desirable 5 5%

Total technical score 70 70%
Financial proposal 30 30%
Final Score 100 100%

O. ANNEXES TO THE TOR

Annex 1: Recommended list of documents
1. UNEG standard for evaluation in the UN system, UNDP evaluation policy and guidelines
2. UNDP handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation of development results
3. UNDAF Timor-Leste
4. Past JSP Project Documents
5. Mid-term and other evaluations and reformulation documentation.
6. Project annual work plans
7. Project quarterly and annual reports
8. Project board minutes
9. Justice Sector Strategic Plan
10. Timor-Leste National Development Plan
11. Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR)

Annex 2: Indicative Structure of inception report

Introduction 1.1. Objective of the evaluation
1.2. Background and context
1.3. Scope of the evaluation

Methodology 2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions
2.2. Conceptual framework
2.3. Evaluability
2.4. Data collection methods
2.5. Analytical approaches
2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings

Programme of work
3.1. Phases of work
3.2. Team composition and responsibilities
3.3. Management and logistic support
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3.4. Calendar of work

Annexes
1. Terms of reference of the evaluation
2. Evaluation matrix
3. Stakeholder map
4. Tentative outline of the main report
5. Interview checklists/protocols
6. Outcome model
7. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members (if any more than one)
8. Reference documents
9. Document map
10. Project list
11. Project mapping
12. Detailed work plan

Annex 3: Indicative Structure for final evaluation report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Section Description and comments</th>
<th>Description and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title and opening</td>
<td>Name of programme or theme being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of the organization to which the report is submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names and affiliations of the evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Acronyms &amp; Abbreviations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>This should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. Often, readers will only look at the executive summary. It should be prepared after the main text has been reviewed and agreed and should not be circulated with draft reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Introduction, Description of the intervention, Evaluation scope and objectives, Evaluation approach and methods</td>
<td>Introduce the rationale for the evaluation, including mandate, purpose and objectives, outline the main evaluation issues including the expected contribution at the outcome level, address evaluability and describe the methodology to be used. Refer to the outcome model and evaluation matrix, to be attached as annexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Development Challenge</td>
<td>In addition to providing a general overview of historical trends and development challenges, specifically address the development challenge in the rule of law sector. Explain how issues surrounding the promotion of access to justice is addressed by government, and how it is reflected in national policies and strategies. Also provide information on the activities of other development partners in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: UNDP Response</td>
<td>Against the background of Chapter 2, explain what the project has done in this area (purely descriptive,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 4: Data analysis, Findings, Contribution to Results

Against the background of Chapters 2-3, analyse findings without repeating information already provided. Also, minimize the need to mention additional factual information regarding projects and programmes (these should be described in Chapter 3). Focus on providing and analyzing evidence relating to the evaluation criteria. Preferably, structure the analysis on the basis of the main evaluation criteria:

- Relevance (of UNDP’s involvement and the project approach)
- Effectiveness (in contributing to the achievement of project outcomes, outputs)
- Efficiency (in delivering outputs)
- Sustainability (of the project outcomes, outputs)
- Gender considerations
- Social inclusion

In addressing the evaluation criteria, the narrative should respond to the corresponding questions identified in the evaluation matrix and provide a summary analysis of the findings. Partnerships play a key role in ensuring that primary stakeholders achieve outcomes. As such, all evaluation criteria should cover relevant aspects of partnership: i.e., how were they relevant; how effective were they in contributing to the achievement of project outcomes, outputs; how efficiently were they managed; and how sustainable are they?

Where appropriate, discuss cross-cutting themes separately using the main evaluation criteria.

*Do not allow the discussion to drift into conclusions and recommendations.*

### Chapter 5: Lessons Learned, Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions are judgements based on evidence provided in Chapter 4. They are pitched at a higher level and are informed by an overall, comparative understanding of all relevant issues, options and opportunities.

Do not provide new evidence or repeat evidence contained in earlier chapters.
Recommendations should be derived from the evidence contained in Chapter 4. They may also, but need not necessarily, relate to conclusions. In line with the nature of the evaluation, some recommendations may be more strategic in nature, while others may be more action-oriented.

Recommendations should be important and succinct. Please limit to 5-10.

Further, recommendations must to be specific regarding who, what, when, where and how they would be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ToR for the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• List persons interviewed, sites visited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• List documents reviewed (reports, publications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of the progress by outcomes and outputs, in relevance to the nationally defined goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stories worth telling (most significant changes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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