

Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) 2016-2020

Background and context

Turkey is an upper middle-income country with well-established institutions and extensive public services, a G20 member, a founding member of the OECD and a European Union (EU) candidate member state. Turkey borders Bulgaria and Greece to the north, Georgia and Armenia to the east, and Iran, Iraq and Syria to the south connecting Asia and the Middle East with Europe.

With a fairly steady population growth rate¹, Turkey reached 82 million in 2018 with 50.2% being male, 49.8% being female² and 23.4% children aged 0-14 years³. Turkey is also home to the largest registered refugee population in the world. Starting in 2011, the Syrian conflict triggered an influx of a growing number of Syrian refugees, who according to the national legislation are under temporary protection, alongside refugees coming from other countries⁴. At the end of 2018, Turkey was hosting an estimated 4 million refugees of which 3.6 million were Syrians. Almost half of them are children⁵. As of the end of 2018, approximately 4% of the Syrian refugees⁶ live in temporary accommodation centers, while the rest reside among Turkish communities.

Due to its geographic location, Turkey is a transit country for refugees and migrants from different countries moving towards Europe. A peak in migration into/towards Europe in 2015-16 led to the signature of the EU-Turkey Statement in 2016, which contributed to a significant reduction in the flow of irregular migration from Turkey to Europe and an increase in the provision of international support for refugees.

The political and security situation has been dynamic in the last few years. Since 2015, Turkey has witnessed a series of terrorist attacks although with decreasing frequency in more recent years. In 2016, an attempted coup-d'état was followed by a declaration of a state of emergency, which remained in force until mid-2018. In 2017, a referendum approved changes to the constitution, shifting Turkey from a parliamentary to a presidential system, all of which came into effect after the presidential and parliamentary elections in June 2018.

Turkey's economic and social development performance has generally been encouraging. Its macroeconomic and fiscal situation from 2000 onwards has been relatively stable. It has recovered from the economic crisis in 2008-09⁷, and the unemployment rate has been stable between 10 and 11% from 2014 until 2018⁸. The country has implemented broad reforms, expanded access to public services, and it

¹ Please refer to: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/255454/-population-growth-in-turkey/>

² Turkish Statistical Institute, February 2019.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Directorate General for Migration Management, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/temporary-protection_915_1024_4748_icerik

⁵ <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113>

⁶ Directorate General for Migration Management, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/temporary-protection_915_1024_4748_icerik

⁷ Development achievements have been slowing down since 2018. *Country Snapshot*, The World Bank in Turkey, October 2018.

⁸ Economist Intelligence Unit Report.

has harmonized a sizable number of laws and regulations within the framework of the EU accession process⁹. Between 2002 and 2015 absolute poverty more than halved, and extreme poverty fell even faster.¹⁰ In 2018, some of the economic indicators have shown somewhat worsening trends. Like Turkey, upper middle-income countries face many challenges in spite of their economic growth. These include women, men and youth participate equally in the economy; promoting an environmentally sustainable economic growth; modernizing public administrations and services; boosting resilience amid crisis and disaster. In general, inequity persists, most notably, between regions where specific characteristics relating to family size and composition, socio-economic background and level of education correlate with poverty levels.¹² Different groups of people face different deprivations in the areas of health, education, social, labour and child protection. Among the most at risk of being left behind are low income families, informal workers, persons with disabilities, refugees and migrants, Roma, vulnerable children, adolescents, youth women and LGBTI. According to the Global Gender Gap report, Turkey has made progress on closing its gender gap in “economic participation and opportunity” and “educational attainment”, but the “political empowerment” gender gap has widened¹³.

The Government of Turkey has led the refugee response in Turkey and shouldered the bulk of the financial burden. According to its latest estimates, the Government of Turkey has invested more than USD 33 billion in hosting Syrians under temporary protection. The United Nations Country Team and other actors continued to support national efforts to respond to the Syria refugee crisis within the framework of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan.

The UN is present in Turkey with 12 UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes that together constitute the United Nations Country Team (UNCT). These entities include: Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO); International Labour Organisation (ILO); International Organisation for Migration (IOM); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA); United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF); United Nations Information Centre (UNIC); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women); World Food Programme (WFP); the World Health Organisation (WHO); and the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office.

The United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS)¹⁴ for 2016 – 2020 is the guiding document that frames the cooperation between the Government of Turkey and the UNCT for the mentioned period. It was signed in November 2015 and it is now entering the final stage of implementation. The UNDCS is the object of this evaluation.

Object of the Evaluation

The 2016-2020 UNDCS was formulated in 2015 through a consultative process that involved the UN system and major stakeholders under the leadership of the Government of Turkey. It emphasizes the importance of national ownership and establishes a partnership model designed to cooperate with Turkey in achieving its national development priorities and the internationally agreed development goals.

⁹ Country Snapshot, The World Bank in Turkey, October 2018

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² According to the Turkish Statistical Institute, the relative poverty rates was 26.3 among households with children compared to 6.8 for households without. Please refer to <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/HbPrint.do?id=27597>.

¹³ World Economic Forum, The Global Gender Gap Report 2018, http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf

¹⁴ The terminology ‘United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy’ has been adopted in agreement between the Government of Turkey and the United Nations Country Team in Turkey. It is equivalent to the United Nations Development Cooperation Framework (UNDAF).

The 2016-20 UNDCS takes into account the significant socio-economic progress that Turkey has made as an upper-middle income country (UMIC) with a good level of institutional capacity. In consideration of this, the UNDCS is particularly focused on areas of cooperation that can contribute to reaching the groups of the population that have not yet fully benefitted from the progress made by the country. It is characterized by a gender sensitive and human rights-based approach with a focus on the most vulnerable and on building resilience. Although the UNDCS was formulated before the Agenda 2030 was adopted, this general approach is aligned with the ‘Leaving No One Behind’ principle of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The 2016-2020 UNDCS is a medium to large-size operation, which includes development and humanitarian response aspects. It is composed of four strategic areas of cooperation¹⁵ and eight outcomes summarized as follows:

Pillars	Outcomes
1) Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development	Outcome 1.1: By 2020, relevant government institutions operate in an improved legal and policy framework, and institutional capacity and accountability mechanisms assure a more enabling (competitive, inclusive and innovative) environment for sustainable, job-rich growth and development for all women and men.
	Outcome 1.2: By 2020, all underserved population groups have more equitable and improved access to integrated, sustainable and gender sensitive quality services (e.g. health, education, decent employment, and social protection systems)
	Outcome 1.3: By 2020, improved implementation of more effective policies and practices for all men and women on sustainable environment, climate change, biodiversity by national, local authorities and stakeholders, including resilience of the system/communities to disasters.
2) Democratic Governance and Human Rights	Outcome 2.1: By 2020, central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights, and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems, with the full participation of civil society, including the most vulnerable.
3) Gender and Women’s Empowerment	Outcome 3.1: Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020
	Outcome 3.2: Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms (on prevention and protection) to promote gender equality and reduce all forms of Sexual and Gender Based Violence by 2020.
4) Migration and International Protection	Outcome 4.1 By 2020, Government institutions provide improved and sustainable multi-sectoral services to people under international protection based on the rights and entitlements as stipulated in the Law on Foreigners and International Protection and Temporary Protection Regulation.
	Outcome 4.2: By 2020, central/local administrations and civil society effectively manage migration with a particular focus on vulnerable migrants and people under international protection.

Under each outcome, the UNCT defines outputs in the Joint Work Plans (JWPs) that are prepared every year by the Results Groups (RGs), that have been established to ensure the effective and coordinated implementation of the UNDCS. Currently, there are 5 RGs:

¹⁵ Please refer to the 2016-2020 UNDCS available here: http://www.un.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/UNDCS-FInal-_2016_-1.pdf

- Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development RG that oversees the implementation of Outcome 1.1 and 1.3;
- Social Inclusion RG that oversees the implementation of Outcome 1.2;
- Democratic Governance and Human Rights RG that oversees the implementation of Outcome 2.1;
- Gender and Women’s Empowerment RG oversees the implementation of Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2;
- Migration and International Protection RG oversees the implementation of Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2.

Information on expected results at output level are included in Annex 1.

The UNDCS is aligned with the national priorities defined by the Government of Turkey in the Tenth National Development Plan 2014-18¹⁶. The UNDCS outcomes contribute to the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and are connected to the Regional Refugee Response Plan (3RP), the bi-annual response plan that is revised annually for the response to the Syria refugee crisis.

The list of partners involved in the implementation of the UNDCS 2016-2020 will be provided during the inception phase. All partners convene in the UNDCS Joint Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Strategy and Budget Board (SBB) under the Presidency (until July 2018: Ministry of Development) and the UN Resident Coordinator. The SBB coordinates and oversees the development and implementation of the UNDCS from the Government’s side. The UNDCS is also implemented in collaboration with a large number of ministries and other government entities and central and local levels. Other partners include non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs) and universities.

Rationale of the Evaluation

Given the timing, the evaluation will be both formative and summative. It is intended to serve both an accountability and a learning function.

On one hand, the size of the funding invested by the UN in the implementation of the UNDCS is considerable. For this reason, the evaluation is commissioned to respond to accountability requirements and to provide an in-depth overview based on an independent assessment for the use of different stakeholders.

On the other hand, a forward-looking evaluation is beneficial at this point to take stock and learn from the work done in the first years of implementation of the UNDCS. From this point of view, the evaluation aims to inform the preparation of the next UNDCS.

The evaluation findings will be used by a broad range of stakeholders, including the Government of Turkey, the members of UNCT, partners from the civil society and academia and other development partners, donors, and the international and national community and beneficiaries.

Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- 1) Provide an independent assessment of the performance of the UNDCS 2016-2020 in both its development and humanitarian aspects as a package/portfolio. Performance should be assessed based on the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence/coordination, as well as based on the application of the UNDAF Programming Principles, including the Human Rights Based

¹⁶ http://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/The_Tenth_Development_Plan_2014-2018.pdf

Approach (including the principle of universality, linked with the SDG principle of Leaving No One Behind), gender equality, Results Based Management (RBM), capacity development, and environmental sustainability (including addressing climate change).

2) Assess the UN's strategic positioning and use of strategies given the evolving needs of rightsholders, government priorities, and the changing context in the country;

3) Identify good practices and draw lessons and forward-looking recommendations from 1) and 2) above.

Evaluation Scope

The evaluation will cover the totality of the 2016-2020 UNDCS portfolio as described in the Object of the Evaluation (above).

The evaluation will cover approximately three years and a half of UNDCS implementation from January 2016 to the time of the evaluation's field work.

The geographic scope will be national. Different components of the UNDCS have different geographic coverage. During inception phase, detailed information on the geographic scope of the various interventions under the UNDCS will be provided. For sampling purposes, the contractor must consider that the evaluation is at the strategic level and intends to look at the UNDCS as a portfolio of interventions rather than analysing in-depth every single programme component.

Evaluation Questions

The questions that provide direction for this evaluation, align with the previously stated evaluation objectives and the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and coherence/coordination. The evaluation questions are listed below.

Relevance

1. To what extent does the UNDCS contribute to and align with national development priorities (Tenth National Development Plan), the SDGs, and the key Conventions Turkey is signatory of?
2. To what extent has a human rights-based, a gender-sensitive approach been applied in the UNDCS design and implementation? To what extent is the 'leaving no one behind' principle relevantly embedded in the UNDCS? Does it take into account the particularities and specific interests of the vulnerable groups?
3. To what extent has the UN been able to maintain the relevance of its presence in the country and the relevance of the UNDCS considering the evolving programme environment?
4. To what extent was the UNDCS results matrix designed as a results-oriented, coherent, and focused framework that promotes and contributes to integrated approaches? Was it properly operationalized through the output and activity structure?
5. Are the UNDCS indicators relevant? To what extent did the design of the UNDCS results framework allow for consistent and comprehensive monitoring and reporting against the stated outcomes?

Effectiveness

6. What progress has been made to meet the results defined in the UNDCS at outcome and output level? To what extent do these results contribute to the achievements of the SDGs? To what extent has the UN contributed to the progress (if any) towards planned results?
7. To what extent did the UNDCS interventions reach the groups that are left behind or at risk of being left behind in line with the overarching objective of the UNDCS?

8. What have been the challenges and opportunities (external or internal) that have hindered or facilitated progress towards the expected results? Which lessons learnt can be drawn?
9. Considering the specific context and needs, how effectively has the UN managed to operationalize the humanitarian - development nexus? What are the lessons learnt on this? Are there any lessons learnt in relation to the scope of activities along the continuum humanitarian-development included in the UNDCS?
10. To what extent is the UNDCS monitoring system, including monitoring tools, indicators and means of verification, suitable for effectively measuring progress towards the UNDCS Outcomes and Outputs in particular, and the SDGs more broadly?
11. To what extent do UN Interagency coordination mechanisms, including Results Groups, Working Groups, Joint Programmes and the RCO contribute to the achievement of UNDCS results? Are they effective to deliver results?
12. To what extent have human rights principles and gender equality been effectively streamlined in the implementation of the UNDCS?

Efficiency

13. Has the UNDCS generated timely results through the most efficient use of inputs including financial and human resources and partnerships?
14. To what extent are UN interagency coordination and joint programmes contributing to more integrated, joined-up, and efficient implementation of the UNDCS, including reduction of transaction cost?
15. How well has the UNDCS implementation been managed by the UNCT? To what extent did planned UN and partner contributions to the UNDCS materialize, and how did the UN ensure effective and efficient implementation in case of shortfalls in financial contributions and resource mobilization?

Sustainability

16. To what extent is the UNDCS designed and implemented with a view towards sustainability (institutional, social, financial, etc.) of the interventions? What are evidences that demonstrate improved institutional capacity and performance particularly among national institutions that were supported by and through the UNDCS?
17. To what extent are the results achieved with the contribution of the UNDCS likely to last and be sustained? To what extent do national stakeholders demonstrate commitment and ownership over the results?

Coherence/Coordination

18. In the UNDCS design phase and during the period of implementation, to what extent has the UN sought complementarity and synergy with interventions of other stakeholders?
19. To what extent have UN inter-agency coordination mechanisms, including joint programmes, contributed to increased UN coherence?

UNDAF Programming Principles.

20. To what extent have the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) been considered and mainstreamed in the UNDCS design and implementation?

Methodology

The evaluation will be guided by the “Norms and Standards” and the “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation” of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). It will be based on a non-experimental design, using mixed-methods combining qualitative and quantitative methods and triangulation of data to compile a robust and credible evidence base. Quantitative analysis will be largely based on secondary data and existing documentation, including, but not only, agency’s Country Programme Evaluations and thematic/outcome/programme evaluations (a preliminary list of information sources is provided in Annex 2). The UNDCS evaluation is expected to incorporate the findings from these evaluations to the best possible extent, focusing the primary data collection on the resulting gaps. The team will mostly be expected to generate qualitative primary data through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), that in some cases could take place in small homogeneous groups of informants. However, the UN welcomes the use of alternative data generating approaches that add further value in cases where – during the inception phase – it becomes clear that the use of secondary data and documentation is insufficient to answer the evaluation questions.

Since the evaluation questions are focused on strategic aspects that relate to the UNDCS as a portfolio of interventions and not on single interventions and considering that a number of evaluations and other documentation is going to provide secondary data related to beneficiaries at different levels, the great majority of KIIs is expected to take place with government and non-government actors, a selected number of UN staff and other stakeholders at central level in Ankara. If the need for interviews with stakeholders in other locations will be identified as a priority during inception phase, remote interviews or alternative solutions should be sought. Therefore, in principle the data collection work in the country is expected to take place in Ankara only. The UN estimates that approximately 50 key informant interviews or interviews with small groups of key informants will be required. This number should be considered as indicative only for the sake of the preparation of the proposal during the implementation process. It will have to be revised during the inception phase when a deeper analysis of the available information vis a vis the evaluation questions will be conducted.

Evaluability and limitations

Overarching nature of the UNDCS evaluation. The overall general approach to the evaluation described above implies a synthesis approach largely based on analysis of secondary information, including Country Programme Evaluations and other evaluations conducted by individual UN Agencies. This approach has the advantage to avoid duplications and excessive burden on the key informants. On the other hand, a potential limitation is that it makes the UNDCS evaluation dependent on the quality and timely delivery of the full or preliminary results of the agency evaluations. The evaluation team will be provided with a mapping of the available evaluations as well as with access to the evaluation reports or preliminary findings. The evaluation team will also be put in contact with other evaluation teams as relevant.

Data availability and reliability. Due to restrictions in access to and generation of data in the country, data gaps exist especially in relation to the situation of vulnerable groups. This may pose some limitations to the evaluation, especially with regards to the relevance criterion.

Although data to measure achievements against UNDCS outcomes and outputs is somewhat available, it must be mentioned that the choice of the indicators at planning stage has faced limitations, because of the limited measurability. Qualitative indicators under some of the outcomes and outputs may also be difficult

to measure due to the fact that they are often not specific, or they lack reference to benchmarks. This will require the evaluation team to fill the gaps during the data collection phase.

Especially in relation to the outputs linked with the humanitarian response, the monitoring system and the quality of the data have evolved and improved progressively. Limitations may still persist particularly for the year 2016 and partly 2017, when the information management systems still required finetuning.

Evaluative framework. The main evaluative framework is the UNDCS narrative and its results and resource framework. The Joint Work Plans will also be used to complement this framework. In line with the Standard Operating Procedure in effect in 2016, implementation strategies for the UNDCS are described in further detail in the documentation of individual UN Agencies.

Evaluation Process

Inception Phase. The main objective of the inception phase will be to assess the evaluability vis-à-vis the planned evaluation focus as well as to define the details of the methodology, timeline and data collection tools to conduct the evaluation. This phase will include:

- Preliminary desk review of available sources (see Annex 2 for an indicative list of documents). The documentation made available to the evaluation team will include but may not be limited to: UNDCS planning documents, UN agency-specific planning documents linked to the UNDCS; programme monitoring data covering the timeframe of the evaluation; documentation related to the coordination mechanisms for the UNDCS; relevant studies, reports or similar documents related to topics addressed by the UNDCS; policies, strategies and normative guidance that has informed the development of the UNDCS; relevant national policies and strategy documents.
- Discussions with the Evaluation Management Task Force and the Evaluation Management Group (see Evaluation Management, below) to: a) understand the spirit of the evaluation questions and refine them; b) understand relevant contextual factors and finetune the methodology accordingly; c) understand the chronology of external and internal events during the UNDCS period under evaluation and establish an events timeline; d) if necessary, reconstruct and validate the theory of change for the UNDCS.
- Preparation of the inception report. The evaluation team will have to submit an inception report aligned with the UNEG Norms and Standards. The Inception Report will be subject to quality assurance performed by the evaluation manager, a review conducted by UN stakeholders, and an ethical review. The approval of the inception report marks the completion of the inception phase. It must include:
 - Methodology, including: evaluation matrix, data collection tools, identification of key informants;
 - Analysis of risks related to ethical issues and identification of mitigating measures. The inception report must be in line with the UNEG guidelines on ethics in evaluation. The inception report will be submitted for ethical review before proceeding with the next phase. The ethical review will be based on UNICEF's Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis (to be shared during inception phase).
 - Work-plan detailing the work schedule;
 - Outline of the final report (see indicative outline below).

Data Collection Phase. Following the inception phase, a mission to Turkey by the evaluation team will take place to conduct the qualitative data collection and verify the information available in secondary sources. At the end of the mission, the evaluation team will present its preliminary observations and findings to the Evaluation Reference Group and to other UN staff as relevant.

Reporting Phase. The evaluation team will prepare a draft evaluation report that will be subject to a quality assurance process based on UNEG Norms and Standards. The report should be no longer than 40-60 pages excluding annexes and should be in line with the following tentative outline:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Analysis of the context
- Key findings
- Conclusions and practical, actionable recommendations
- Annexes including:
 - Evaluation ToR
 - Evaluation matrix
 - Inception report (including gap and stakeholder analysis)
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field interviews
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Any other relevant material that supports evaluation findings and recommendations.

Management Response to the Evaluation. In line with the recently released UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Guidance, following receipt of the final evaluation report, the UNCT will conduct a management response to the evaluation and determine the actions to be taken to operationalize the evaluation recommendations.

Evaluation Process and Deliverables

The following is a tentative work-plan, based on the assumption that the evaluation will be conducted by a team of three (see the *Evaluation Management* Section). The purpose is to provide indications on the required time allocation. Contractor can propose alternative solutions in terms of team size and time allocation by providing a clear rationale:

TASKS		DELIVERABLES	LATEST DUE DATE	PERSON DAYS	PAYMENT SCHEDULE
INCEPTION PHASE					
1	Briefing with the Evaluation Management Group (remotely)	- Inception report - Data collection tools	31 January 2020	2 days	30%
2	Preliminary desk-review			3 days	
3	Preparation of methodology, evaluation matrix, data collection tools			6 days	
4	Translation, pre-testing and adjustment of data collection tools (all languages)			2 days	
5	Preparation of draft Inception Report			2 days	
6	Presentation to the Evaluation Management Group (remotely)			1 day	
7	Preparation of final Inception Report (incorporation of feedback)			2 days	
DATA COLLECTION PHASE					
8	In-depth desk review and secondary data analysis (partially in-country)	KII records	February 2020	9 days	30%
9	Data Collection (in-country)			15 days*	
10	Presentation of preliminary findings	Presentation	1 st week of March	1 day	
ANALYSIS AND REPORT WRITING PHASE					
11	Analysis	Draft report	Mid April 2020	15 days	40%
12	Preparation of draft evaluation report			10 days	
13	Presentation to ERSC	Presentation	Mid of May	2 days	
14	Preparation of final evaluation report	Final report	End of May	8 days	

*The in-country data collection period is thought to be 3 calendar weeks or 15 working days. The number of days for each expert involved in the data collection should be clearly mentioned in the financial proposal. While for the remaining activities in the above timeline, working days are considered as person/days.

Team Composition and Qualifications

The following was a proposition for the team composition that should be considered as indicative for the purposes of the bidding process. The contractor can propose alternative solutions, as long as all the qualifications and TOR requirements are met. A rationale for a different team composition should be provided in the technical proposal that the contractor will submit.

Team Leader. The team leader will be an international consultant (non Turkish national) and will be responsible for the overall delivery of the evaluation and the management of the evaluation team. S/he will have primary responsibility for designing the methodology, preparing the inception report as well as the draft and final evaluation reports in line with this ToR. This person should have at least 10 years of proven experience in leading development and humanitarian evaluations. Having conducted evaluations positively rated against the UNEG Standards by one of the adhering UN Agencies will be considered an asset. The Team Leader should, furthermore, have a strong development background with a solid understanding of the humanitarian aspects and of the humanitarian-development nexus. It is also a requirement that the Team Leader has expertise in UN strategic planning processes, including familiarity with key concepts/approaches such as RBM, HRBA, and gender equality. S/he should have an in-depth

understanding of the various strategies used by the UN in both development and humanitarian contexts and should have previous evaluation experience in an upper middle-income country. Exposure to the Turkey context and the Syria refugee crisis is going to be considered an asset.

Two Team Member(s). The two team members will contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology, to the preparation of the inception report as well as of the draft and final evaluation reports. They will largely contribute to the data collection and analysis phase. At least one of the team members should:

- Be a Turkish national and bring in the required insight from the perspective of Turkey's context (especially the socio-political and institutional context) and have knowledge of UN's mandate and experience of partnering with the Government of Turkey.
- Have proven experience in the development field in Turkey, while familiarity with the response to the Syria refugee crisis in Turkey is considered an asset.
- Be responsible for the translation of the data collection tools and during interviews conducted in Turkish.
- Have proven experience in planning, monitoring and evaluation processes based on RBM, HRBA and gender mainstreaming.
- Have at least 10 years' experience in the research field, especially qualitative data collection and analysis.
- Have at least 5 years' experience in analysing quantitative data.
- Have at least 5 years' experience in conducting evaluations. Having conducted evaluations with UN agencies adhering to the UN Evaluation Group is an asset.

Evaluation management

As per UNEG norms and standards, UNDAF evaluations should be participatory and involve all key stakeholders in order to bolster ownership over the evaluation findings. In line with these standards, the evaluation will involve the following groups of stakeholders:

The **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC)** will oversee the evaluation process and function as the decision-making organ for the UNDCS evaluation. The ESC approves the key evaluation deliverables, especially the final evaluation report and is responsible for the management response to the evaluation. It is composed by the UNCT and the Strategy and Budget Board under the Presidency.

The **Evaluation Management Group (EMG)** will provide strategic, methodological and substantive advice into the evaluation process as well as a peer review for the key outputs including the main report. It is composed by the members of the Monitoring for Strategic Results Working Group of the UNCT. The choice of the MfSR WG as EMG will allow to comply with UNEG standard 3: "Those responsible for the design, conduct and management of evaluation are required to have core competencies related to: knowledge of the United Nations System; knowledge of United Nations principles, values, goals and approaches, including human rights, gender equality, cultural values, the Sustainable Development Goals and results-based management".

Evaluation Management Task Force (EMTF): The EMTF will assume the day-to-day responsibilities for managing the evaluation process and serve as the focal point for ensuring the evaluation runs smoothly. The EMTF will be composed by a selected number (max 3 or 4) members of the Monitoring for Strategic Results (MfSR) WG. At a minimum, the EMTF will include:

- At least one staff from the RCO who will be responsible for: a) coordinating and following up on the contractual aspects; b) establishing and updating the electronic library for the evaluation; c) coordinating the logistical aspects during the in-country mission and the consultative processes with various stakeholders.
- At least one staff member from the agency chairing the MfSR WG (currently UNICEF) who will be responsible for: a) convening and liaising with the EMG and the ESC; b) the technical aspects of the evaluation management; c) the quality assurance process of all the deliverables during the evaluation management process (terms of reference, inception report, draft reports and final report).

The Evaluation Management Task Force will regularly report to the Evaluation Management Group.

Remarks and reservations:

The evaluation team must respect the confidentiality of the information handled during the assignment. Documents and information provided must be used only for the tasks related to these terms of reference. Members of the evaluation team may not use the data for their own research purposes, nor license the data to others, without the written consent of the UN in Turkey.

Payment Schedule:

The payment schedule is as follows:

TASKS		DELIVERABLES	PAYMENT SCHEDULE
INCEPTION PHASE			
1	Briefing with the Evaluation Management Group (remotely)	Inception report Data collection tools	30% <i>of Total Contract Amount</i>
2	Preliminary desk-review		
3	Preparation of methodology, evaluation matrix, data collection tools		
4	Translation, pre-testing and adjustment of data collection tools		
5	Preparation of draft Inception Report		
6	Presentation to the Evaluation Management Group (remotely)		
7	Preparation of final Inception Report (incorporation of feedback)		
DATA COLLECTION PHASE			
8	In-depth desk review and secondary data analysis (partially in-country)	KII records	30% <i>of Total Contract Amount</i>
9	Data Collection (in-country)		
10	Presentation of preliminary findings	Presentation	
ANALYSIS AND REPORT WRITING PHASE			
11	Analysis	Draft report	40% <i>of Total Contract Amount</i>
12	Preparation of draft evaluation report		
13	Presentation to ERSC	Presentation	
14	Preparation of final evaluation report	Final report	