



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT PROJECT II UNDP TANZANIA

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Job title:</b>         | Consultants for the mid-term evaluation of the Legislative Support Project |
| <b>Contract type:</b>     | Individual Contract (IC)   |
| <b>Contract duration:</b> | July – August 2019   |
| <b>Starting date:</b>     | July 2019  |
| <b>Duty Station:</b>      | Dodoma   |

#### 1. Background

---

The goal of the second phase of UNDP's Legislative Support Project (LSP II) is to build the capacity of the National Assembly of Tanzania to be an effective institution for the passing of quality legislation, approval of the annual national budget in a comprehensive manner, monitoring of the activities and expenditures of the Government of Tanzania, and to do all these things based on the inputs of all the citizens of Tanzania. The project also seeks to ensure that in undertaking the above, the National Assembly does so in an inclusive, participatory and collaborative manner through establishing tools and mechanisms for the engagement of civil society, professional associations and the public. Further, the project seeks to ensure the mainstreaming of gender in the functions and structures of the National Assembly, and the empowerment of women parliamentarians. The LSP II commenced in January 2017 and is financed by the embassies of Denmark, Ireland, United Kingdom (DFID), and Sweden, and UNDP Tanzania. The project is expected to run until December 2021 and has a projected budget of US\$12,765,600. It is implemented directly by the National Assembly under the National Implementation Modality (NIM), with the technical support of UNDP.

Specifically, the LSP II project seeks to achieve the following:

- Output 1: Increase the capacity of National Assembly to effectively scrutinise legislation and its implementation and to monitor government performance in a participatory manner
- Output 2: More effective parliamentary scrutiny of government budget and expenditure, including monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
- Output 3: Enhance the capacity of the National Assembly to engage citizens and represent their interests in the work of the parliament
- Output 4: The National Assembly is more effectively engaged in strategic leadership, transparency and external engagement
- Output 5: Gender is mainstreamed in all functions of the National Assembly

The LSP II was designed in response to the priorities outlined in the Country Programme Document for United Republic of Tanzania (2016-2021), the United Nations Development Assistance Plan for Tanzania II 2016-2021 (UNDAP II) and the National Five-Year Development Plan 2016/2017-2020/2021. The project contributes to the achievement of Outcome 2 of the Country Programme Document: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.

## **2. Objectives**

---

The overall purpose of the mid-term evaluation of project is to assess the programmatic progress towards the stated outcome by measuring the extent to which the project interventions achieved the intended outputs as well as capturing lessons learned, challenges faced, and best practices identified during implementation period including from a gender perspective. The specific objectives of the mid-term evaluation are to:

1. Assess performance in relation to the original work programme as stated in the project document and assess to what extent that has evolved in view of demand from the beneficiaries and environment;
2. Assess the relevance of the project with regards to consistency, ownership, quality of the technical assistance, and complementarity of the project with other initiatives
3. Determine the effectiveness of the project in achievement of results, highlighting reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results and factors contributing/hindering achievement of the results;
4. Assess the sustainability of the project including the participation of partners and other stakeholders in planning and implementation of interventions, as well as assessing the measures taken to ensure that activities initiated by the project will be completed and continued after the project's closure;
5. Assess risk management and mitigation measures taken by project staff to ensure progress on the work programme;
6. Derive lessons learned and areas for improvement for the remaining project activities, and
7. Provide recommendations and identify best practices that may be used in the future programming.

The evaluation including its recommendations will be used by UNDP to inform future programming and direction.

## **3. Scope of Work and Expected Output**

---

The expected output for the consultant's assignment is to provide a holistic, impartial and credible review of the activities implemented by the project from January 2017 to June 2019. To achieve the stated objective, the consultant(s) will have the following responsibilities:

### **Inception Phase**

1. Conduct a comprehensive desk review of the project documentation after an initial briefing by the LSP team;

2. Draft an Inception Report, including evaluation questionnaire, proposed methodology, and work plan with agreed deliverables and timeframes;
3. Provide a Final Inception Report, which incorporates feedback received from UNDP and the National Assembly.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

1. Carry out interviews with UNDP and UN Women management and relevant staff, donors, beneficiaries and other relevant organizations;
2. Conduct an analysis that is gender-sensitive, covering the following topics:
  - a) Assess the project's progress towards attaining its objectives, envisaged outcomes and recommend measures for improvement, if needed;
  - b) Assess the targeting of project activities, including equal participation by men and women, as well as various categories of staff;
  - c) Determine the effectiveness of the project in achievement of results, highlighting reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results and factors contributing/hindering achievement of the results;
  - d) Evaluate the overall impact of the project and its contribution to the development of the National Assembly;
  - e) Evaluate the efficiency of project implementation for which the consultant(s) shall assess amongst others the following aspects: performance of the project in terms of timeliness, quantity and cost effectiveness of the activities undertaken including procurement of experts/facilitators, equipment, training programmes, etc.;
  - f) Review the responsibilities of project stakeholders, clarity of the roles and the level of coordination between the project team and stakeholders;
  - g) Identify and analyze the challenges and constraints, which confronted the project during the reviewed implementation period;
  - h) Evaluate the project's risk management and any mitigation measures taken by the project team;
  - i) Assess the prospects of the sustainability of the project outcomes with a specific focus on national and institutional capacity and ownership and recommend measures for its further improvement;
  - j) Review the Results and Resources Framework for assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation of project performance;
  - k) Derive lessons learned across the focus areas for the analysis and identify areas for improvement for the remaining project activities; and
  - l) Provide recommendations and identify best practices that may be used in the future programming.

### **Report writing**

- Develop and present the first draft Mid-term Evaluation Report with concrete findings and recommendations;
- Convene a debriefing meeting with UNDP on the preliminary findings, main recommendations and lessons learned; and
- Finalize the Mid-term Evaluation Report based on the feedback received at the debriefing meeting and, if needed, present the final report at a project Board meeting.

#### 4. Evaluation questions

---

The questions should cover the following key areas of evaluation criteria:

**a) Relevance:**

- To what extent is the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**b) Effectiveness:**

- To what extent does the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest and fewest achievements? Why and what have been the factors influencing progress? How can the project build on the achievements and improve on areas of limited progress?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**c) Efficiency:**

- To what extent has the project management structure as outlined in the project document been efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent do the M & E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**d) Sustainability:**

- To what extent will financial and other resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any financial, social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights - and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to the project design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

**Human rights:**

- To what extent have poor, physically challenged-, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the project?

**Gender mainstreaming:**

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?
- What are the factors contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment status.

**5. Methodology**

---

The evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determine causal links between the development challenges, the interventions that UNDP has supported and observe progress in accordance with the project outcome. The evaluation will be based on the findings and factual statements identified from the review of relevant documents including the project document, progress reports, bi/annual project reports, in addition to the technical reports produced by the project and different publications. These will be shared with the consultant(s) at the beginning of the assignment. The consultant is also expected to use face to face interviews with project beneficiaries, the leadership and management of the National Assembly, relevant UNDP officials and project donors, to collect relevant data for the evaluation report.

**5.1 Desk review of relevant documents:**

The evaluators will collect and review all relevant documentation and activity reports, past evaluation/ self-assessment reports, deliverables from project activities, e.g. published reports and training materials, client surveys on support services provided to Implementing Partners, if any, country office reports; vii) UNDP's corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications.

## **5.2 Interviews and focus group discussions:**

The evaluator will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including:

- i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers);
- ii) The leadership and management of the National Assembly
- iii) Relevant UNDP officials and donors in the country. This shall ensure that claims of implementation are verified, and that best practices and lessons learned are tracked and documented.

The consultant(s) is particularly encouraged to use participatory and collaborative methods to ensure that all stakeholder groups are consulted as part of the evaluation process. The consultant(s) should take measures to ensure data quality, reliability and validity of data collection tools and methods and their responsiveness to gender equality. The evaluation team should refer to the UNDP Evaluation Guide (2019) for the evaluation report template and quality standards.

The evaluation will visit select project sites, primarily the National Assembly in Dodoma to validate key tangible outputs and interventions. An estimated 10 days of field work in Dodoma should be expected.

## **5.3 Briefing and Debriefing sessions**

The Evaluator will hold briefing sessions with UNDP and with all key stakeholders who are familiar with the UNDP's work and support. These include the National Assembly. Debriefing sessions will be held with UNDP senior management and the LSP project staff.

## **6. Evaluation Team - Required Skills and Experience**

---

The outcome evaluation will be undertaken by two (2) external evaluators comprising of an Evaluation Team Leader and an Evaluator. The Evaluation Team Leader will be hired as an international consultant, while the Evaluator will be hired as a national consultant.

### **6.1 International Consultant – The Team Leader**

#### **Required Competencies**

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Ability to conduct strategic planning, results-based management and reporting
- Ability to actively seek to improve programmes/services, offer new and different options to solve problems
- Excellent oral and written communication skills
- Ability to establish and maintain good working relationships in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-disciplinary environment

#### **Education**

- At least a master's degree in Law, Political Science, Development Studies or other Social Sciences.

### **Experience**

- Minimum 10 years work experience in or with parliamentary and inter-parliamentary institutions as a researcher, member of Parliament or senior government or parliamentary official
- Minimum 5 years' experience in evaluating parliamentary strengthening and other capacity building programmes involving governmental and inter-governmental institutions
- Experience in designing, developing and implementing monitoring and evaluation frameworks
- Demonstrable track record of producing high quality and analytical reports and publications
- Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agencies, particularly UNDP, is desirable.

### **Language Skills**

- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (required)
- Working knowledge of Kiswahili (desirable)

## **6.2 National Consultant – The Evaluator**

### **Required Competencies**

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Ability to conduct strategic planning, results-based management and reporting
- Ability to actively seek to improve programmes/services, offer new and different options to solve problems
- Excellent oral and written communication skills
- Ability to establish and maintain good working relationships in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-disciplinary environment

### **Education**

- At least a master's degree in Law, Political Science, Development Studies or other Social Sciences

### **Experience**

- Minimum 5 years programme management work experience in governmental, parliamentary institutions or civil society organisations
- Minimum 3 years' experience in evaluating capacity building programmes involving governmental and inter-governmental institutions
- Demonstrable knowledge of Tanzania's constitutional and legal framework, and system of governance
- Experience in undertaking programme and project monitoring and evaluation
- Demonstrable track record of producing high quality and analytical reports
- Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agencies, is an added advantage.

### **Language Skills**

- Written and oral communication skills in English (required)
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (required)

## **7. Evaluation Ethics**

---

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and they must sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. Evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the outcomes and programmes under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 4.

## **8. Deliverables and Timeframe**

---

The expected duration of the assignment is 22 working days over a period of 8 weeks starting June 2019.

| <b>Deliverables</b>   | <b>Estimated Number of Days</b> |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Desk review of project's documents and the preparation of the Inception report (Deliverable 1)  | 5                               |
| Submitting the Evaluation Inception Report and meetings with the UNDP to receive feedback on the inception report (Deliverable 2)   | 2                               |
| Interviews with the project team, stakeholders (Board members, MPs, parliamentary staff, donors, government officials, CSOs, including field visit to Dodoma); and preparation and submission of the draft MTR report (Deliverable 3) | 10                              |
| Preparation and submission of the final MTR report following the written feedback of UNDP on the draft report (Deliverable 4)   | 5                               |

While UNDP will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting up interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Contact details will be provided by UNDP staff upon request. Planned travels and associated costs should be included in the financial proposal and included in the Inception Report and agreed with UNDP.

## **9. Fees and Payments**

---

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expression of interest in USD for the Evaluation Team Leader and TZS for the National Consultant. Financial proposals should include all expected local and national travel costs within Tanzania, including DSA. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP Country Office of planned deliverables, based on the following:

- Payment 1: 15% upon confirmation by UNDP of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 1 and 2
- Payment 2: 35% upon confirmation by UNDP of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 3
- Payment 3: 50% upon confirmation by UNDP of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 4



## 10. Evaluation Criteria

---

| Criteria  | Weight    |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Technical Proposal</b>   | <b>70</b> |
| Extensive practical experience in or with parliamentary and inter-parliamentary institutions as a researcher, member of Parliament or senior government or parliamentary official.                                  | 30        |
| Sound track records in managing successful impact evaluations preferably within the technical area of the TOR (projects related to parliamentary processes, legislative support or other relevant governance areas) | 25        |
| The technical proposal should demonstrate a sound understanding of the TORs and must adequately describe the mentioned approach, methodology and timeline of the assignment.  | 15        |
| <b>Financial Proposal</b>   | <b>30</b> |

## 11. Approval

---

This TOR is approved by:

Name: Amon Manyama

Designation: Head of Programme

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 12. Annexes

---

### ANNEX 1 - DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSULTED

- United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2016 – 2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document 2016 – 2021
- UNDP PME Handbook
- UNDP Evaluation Guide and addendum
- UNDG RBM Handbook
- UNDG Ethical Code of Conduct of Evaluators
- Legislative Support project (LSP) II project document
- LSP II reports (financial and narrative), activity concept notes, implementation reports, newsletter, various knowledge products etc.
- UNDP Annual reporting (ROAR) 2017 and 2019
- National Policies and Development Plans of Tanzania

NB; While the mentioned documents must be reviewed and consulted, it should not limit consultants from reviewing and consulting other documents which will be considered of help to ensure adequate and reliable information for the purpose of this assignment.

**ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX**

Evaluation matrices are useful tools for planning and conducting evaluations; helping to summarize and visually present an evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. In an evaluation matrix, the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods appropriate for each data source are presented, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated as shown.

| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key Questions | Specific Sub-Questions | Data Sources | Data collection Methods/Tools | Indicators/ Success Standard | Methods for Data Analysis |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                              |               |                        |              |                               |                              |                           |
|                              |               |                        |              |                               |                              |                           |

### ANNEX 3: EVALUATION REPORT TEMPLATE

The length of the report should not exceed 40 pages (Calibri 1,5 spacing) excluding annexes)

- 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.
  - Country of the evaluation intervention.
  - Names and organizations (as applicable) of evaluators.
  - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
  - Acknowledgements.
- Project information details to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports on second page as per the table below:

| PROJECT INFORMATION       |  |                    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>Project title</b>      | Legislative Support Project (LSP) II   |                    |
| <b>Atlas ID</b>           | Award 00095419, Project 0009425  |                    |
| <b>Corporate Outcome</b>  | Citizen Expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stringer systems of democratic governance   |                    |
| <b>Corporate Outputs</b>  | Output 1: Increase the capacity of National Assembly to effectively scrutinise legislation and its implementation and to monitor government performance in a participatory manner<br><br>Output 2: More effective parliamentary scrutiny of government budget and expenditure, including monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)<br><br>Output 3: Enhance the capacity of the National Assembly to engage citizens and represent their interests in the work of the parliament<br><br>Output 4: The National Assembly is more effectively engaged in strategic leadership, transparency and external engagement<br><br>Output 5: Gender is mainstreamed in all functions of the National Assembly |                    |
| <b>Country</b>            | Tanzania   |                    |
| <b>Project dates</b>      | <b>Start</b>   | <b>Planned end</b> |
|                           | 01 January 2017  | 30 June 2021       |
| <b>Project budget</b>     | USD 12,765,600   |                    |
| <b>Funding source</b>     | DFiD, Royal Danish Embassy, One Fund, Embassy of Ireland, TRAC   |                    |
| <b>Implementing party</b> | National Assembly Tanzania   |                    |

- Table of contents;
  - Including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary (four-page maximum). A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
  - 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.
- Introduction
  - Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated, 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.
- Description of the intervention, which will:
  - 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, UNDAP priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other programme or country-specific plans and goals. Evaluation scope and objectives
  - 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).
- Evaluation scope and objectives.

- Evaluation scope. The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
  - Evaluation objectives. The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
  - Evaluation criteria. The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the 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.
- Evaluation approach and methods
    - Data sources
    - Sample and sampling frame (if applicable)
    - Data collection procedures and instruments
    - Performance standards
    - Stakeholder engagement
    - Ethical considerations
    - Background information on evaluators
    - Major limitations of the methodology
- Data analysis
    - Describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.
    - Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
- Findings
    - 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.
- Conclusions
    - 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.

- 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.
  
- Lessons learned
  - The report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.
  
- Report annexes:
  - 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.
  - Other relevant information

#### ANNEX 4: ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNDP EVALUATIONS

##### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact during the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

##### **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>1</sup>**

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

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

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

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

Signed at \_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)