**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE REGIONAL PROGRAMMES FOR EUROPE AND THE CIS MADE THROUGH THE FUNDING FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY**

Type of Contract: IC (International Consultant)

Languages Required: English

Duration: 1 August 2019 – 30 November 2019 (approximately 55 working days)

Location: home-based with a mission to Turkey (Istanbul and Ankara)

**1. Background and context**

UNDP’s Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS was relocated to Istanbul in 2015 after the ‘Agreement concerning the establishment of the UNDP Regional Service Centre for Europe and the CIS in Istanbul’, which was signed in September 2013. Following this agreement, Turkey and UNDP also signed the Third-Party Cost Sharing agreement for implementation of UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS. Article III of the Agreement states that Regional Center will submit a final report summarizing Programme’s projects and impact. Article V on Evaluation also underlines that the partners will jointly agree on the key elements of an evaluation exercise to be conducted in line with UNDP’s Evaluation Policy.

In line with this agreement, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub will commission a regional programme evaluation covering the period between 2014-2019. This period includes the Regional Programme (2014-2017) and first one and a half years of the Regional Programme 2018-2021). The scope of the evaluation will cover the results and impacts achieved with the Turkish contribution and will review progress of both Regional Programmes (2014-2017 and 2018-2021). This evaluation will make use of the existing reports including independent mid-term evaluation ‘UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (2014-2017): Midterm Outcome Evaluation’ conducted in 2016 as well as relevant findings of the Global Evaluation of the Strategic Plan, Global and Regional Programmes completed in August 2017 by the Independent Evaluation Office.

Since its inception, UNDP has been extending support to groups of countries at regional and sub-regional levels in addition to its global and country-level operations through the regional programmes. These regional programmes have a clear programme structure with results and resources framework, and their programme cycle is aligned with the overall programmatic framework and planned results of the Strategic Plan. The Regional Programme Document for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RPD for ECIS) for 2014-2017 was followed by the Regional Programme for 2018-2021. The Regional Programmes are approved by the Executive Board.

Both of the RPDs build on the successes and lessons learned of the previous RPD. All regional activities are aligned with the overall programmatic framework and planned results of the UNDP Strategic Plan. The RPD also reflects the global sustainable development agenda and leverages United Nations intergovernmental policy processes such as the Millennium Development Goals and the Agenda 2030/Sustainable Development Goals.

The Regional Programme is directly executed by UNDP, with oversight of the programme delegated to the Regional Director of the Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RBEC). The Regional Center (hereinafter referred to as the Istanbul Regional Hub) Manager, under the supervision of the Deputy Regional Director, is responsible for ensuring effective management and monitoring of the regional projects. The Advisory Board (consisting of resident representatives and senior management of central headquarter bureaux) provide overall guidance to the regional programme and help to validate its relevance vis-à-vis country and global activities.[[1]](#footnote-2)

The programme is implemented through regional and subregional projects and initiatives, activities with country-level components. Regional programming strengthens country level coordination by working with UNDP country offices, based on agreed work plans and the participation of advisory teams.

The evaluation of the contribution from the Government of Turkey to the results of the Regional Programmes will primarily rely on information generated from reports, through internal systems and tools and will benefit from feedback received from partners/beneficiaries as needed. The objective of this evaluation will be to assess performance, identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for the next cooperation period to efficiently leverage the Turkish contribution and maximize the development impact of ongoing and new interventions of the Regional Programme.

**Regional Context**

The region covered by the RBEC regional programme - a total of 17 countries and one territory[[2]](#footnote-3) in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) - represents a diverse group of countries, including countries seeking EU integration. The region comprises middle-income countries with relatively high levels of human development[[3]](#footnote-4). While many of the countries of Europe and Central Asia inherited relatively equal distributions of income and broad access to social services, virtually every country in the region is facing challenges in reconciling economic and social progress with environmental sustainability, often aggravated by slow progress in reforming state institutions and private sector development. Problems of inequality and vulnerability are present and growing.

In some countries of the region, up to 50 per cent of the workforce (particularly youth) are either long-term unemployed or engaged in precarious, informal employment[[4]](#footnote-5). On the one hand, the human development index for 13 programme countries has reached the ‘high’ or ‘very high’ human development category. On the other, several countries report levels of poverty exceeding the global $3.10 per day threshold.

Gender-based discrimination continues to restrict women’s economic opportunities. The gender employment gap, estimated at 30 per cent, and the gender pay gap, estimated at over 21 per cent, hinder women’s economic empowerment and reduce economic growth potential. At 0.279, the region has the lowest gender inequality index value in the world, but it lags when it comes to women’s political representation. Women’s employment rates vary by social status, age, and location. For instance, employment rates for Roma people in the Western Balkans are generally less than half of national levels, with particularly low rates for Roma women.

In countries affected by conflict, governance concerns are often exacerbated by human insecurity, weak social cohesion, ethnic, religious or other discrimination, and vulnerability to violent extremism. The region features considerable source, destination, and transit migration, displacements, and refugee movements, which pose humanitarian and development challenges as well as opportunities for national economies and local communities. Outward migration flows are some of the highest globally, with many countries in the region experiencing extensive ‘brain drain’ and depletion of human capital. Ratios of remittance flows to gross domestic product (GDP) in some countries in the region are among the highest in the world.

The countries of the region continue to face common governance challenges, including in areas such as fiscal decentralization and local governance; rule of law and accountability; access to information; responsive, corruption-free and merit-based public administration systems; and more equitable access to public services. Interest in innovative approaches to public service delivery that foster transparency, accountability, efficiency and meaningful civic participation and engagement is growing across the region.

The region faces energy-, environment-, and climate-related risks, including those associated with disasters and energy shortages. World Bank data indicates that primary energy intensity in the region is more than 20 per cent above the global average for middle-income countries, and is double levels obtained in the European Union. Since fossil fuels comprise more than 80 per cent of the energy balance, and since energy losses in processing or delivery reach as high as 60 per cent, ‘business as usual’ economic growth will result in sharp increases in greenhouse gas emissions. During the past 30 years, natural disasters in the region have inflicted damages in excess of $70 billion, 9 threatening development prospects. According to the 2016 regional human development report, unsustainable water and land management practices, particularly in the Aral Sea basin, continue to threaten household food and energy security, biodiversity, and other forms of natural capital.

**Key Programme Areas, Approach and Results**

As mentioned above, the evaluation scope will cover implementation progress within two cycles of Regional Programmes, i.e. 2014-2019. It should also be noted that the current Regional Programme builds on the achievements and lessons of the previous Regional Programme in terms of priorities and approaches.

Below is a short summary of both programme documents:

Following the framework of the Strategic Plan and priorities of the region, RBEC has selected four outcomes at the regional level for the programme cycle 2014-2017[[5]](#footnote-6) and has developed four umbrella programmes corresponding to these four outcomes as follows:

* + Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded (SP Outcome 1).
  + Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance (SP Outcome 2).
  + Outcome 3: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change (SP Outcome 5).
  + Outcome 4: Development debates and actions at all level prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles (SP Outcome 7).

The Outcomes of the Regional Programme (2018-2021)[[6]](#footnote-7) following the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 are as below:

* Outcome 1: Accelerating structural transformations through more effective governance systems
* Outcome 2: Addressing poverty and inequalities through more inclusive and sustainable development pathways
* Outcome 3: Building resilience to shocks and crises through enhanced prevention and risk-informed development

The regional work is also based on five mutually reinforcing ‘regionality’ principles which define the particular value added of regional or subregional approaches to addressing development challenges. They include promotion of regional public goods, management of cross-border externalities and spillovers and advancement of solutions to cross-border and transboundary development challenges, promotion of multi-country experiences and perspectives, and identification of key risks to development, promotion of experimentation and innovation, and generation and sharing of development knowledge, experience and expertise.

In implementing the Regional Programme, the Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) has been using a range of operational modalities of support, including implementation of global and regional initiatives, facilities and projects, development of knowledge products and the provision of advisory services.

Some of the account of the regional programme results can be found in the reports below:

1. ‘UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (2014-2017): Midterm Outcome Evaluation’: <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7150>
2. Reports on Turkey-UNDP partnerships: <http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/partnerships/partnership-with-turkey.html>

**2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives / Overall objective of the assignment and duties and responsibilities**

In June 2014, Turkey and UNDP signed the Cost Sharing agreement for implementation of UNDP Regional Program for Europe and the CIS with a duration of five years. The duration of the agreement will end in June 2019. Article III of the Agreement states that Regional Center will submit a final report summarizing Programme’s projects and impact. Article V on Evaluation also underlines that the partners will jointly agree on the key elements of an evaluation exercise to be conducted in line with UNDP’s Evaluation Policy.

In line with this requirement, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub will commission a regional program evaluation to cover the period 2014-2019. This period includes the Regional Programme (2014-2017) and Regional Programme for (2018-2021) up to date. The scope of the evaluation will cover the results and impacts achieved with the Turkish contribution and will review results of both Regional Programmes (2014-2017 and 2018-2021).

While the evaluation is primarily to inform the donor about the results of the cooperation between Turkey and UNDP, as any evaluation exercise, it will also be a learning opportunity to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programme interventions funded by the Government of Turkey. Therefore it will be a valuable input for Government of Turkey and UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS in planning and implementing their cooperation.

As such, this evaluation will mainly cover the aspects of the Regional Programme funded through the contribution from the Government of Turkey. In terms of regional programming, this would mean the results produced mainly by the Umbrella Projects (4 umbrella projects in RPD (2014-2017) and 3 umbrella projects in RPD (2018-2021) corresponding to respective outcomes in the Regional Programme Documents. The review will also include assessment of the regional initiatives, such as Catalytic and Scaling Up Facility, Regional Impact Investment Facility and other initiatives.

The objectives of this exercise are to:

* Provide RBEC Management and Government of Turkey with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved with the contribution of the Government of Turkey to the regional programme implementation.
* Capture innovations, sustain and scale-up successful approaches that work in the implementation of the current initiatives and facilitate learning to inform current and future programming and adjust implementation introducing corrective measures if needed.
* Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions achieved with the work funded through the contribution from the Government of Turkey. Also assess how the intervention strengthened the application of rights-based approaches and mainstreaming gender in development efforts.

**3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

This evaluation will aim at responding to the questions below for the totality of the period covered by the Turkish contribution for the two segments of the Regional Programme:

**Relevance**

* To what extent is UNDP support provided through Turkish contribution relevant to the achievement of the SDGs in the region/Europe and CIS?
* To what extent did the Turkish funds contribute to gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive approaches?
* To what extent is UNDP programming with Turkish funds a reflection of strategic considerations, including the role of an emerging donor in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?

**Effectiveness**

* What have been the key results and changes attained through the Turkish contribution? Which are the ones with a strong scaling up potential? How has delivery of the Turkish funding contributed to outcome-level progress?
* Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome?
* To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national and regional partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?
* To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
* To what extent have triangular and South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the results attained?

**Efficiency**

* To what extent were the activities funded by the Turkish contribution delivered on time?
* To what extent were partnership modalities employed for Turkish contribution conducive to the delivery of the regional programme?
* To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
* To what extent did the governance arrangements and processes ensure efficient use of the Turkish contribution?

**Sustainability**

* To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the regional programme outputs achieved with Turkish funding?
* To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
* To what extent do partnerships exist with other regional and national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

**Human rights**

* To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the regional programme interventions funded by the Turkish contribution?

**Gender equality**

* To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the regional initiatives?
* Is the gender marker data assigned to the relevant outputs representative of reality?

In addition to the evaluation questions above, the Evaluation team will seek lessons learned from programme implementation so far as well as some key information that would be relevant for the Government of Turkey, as the second largest donor (largest bilateral donor) of the Regional Programme, e.g. for assessing the use of its future contributions and communicating on its contribution to UNDP.

**4. Methodology**

4.1. Data collection and analysis

The Evaluation methodology will consist of Desk reviews, discussions with relevant IRH teams as well as beneficiary representatives of the Regional Programme, i.e. selected country office staff/their beneficiaries and other stakeholders as applicable.

1. **Desk Reviews**: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation including but not necessarily limited to the below:
   1. RPD (2014-2017), RPD (2018-2021), Strategic Plan (2014-2017), Strategic Plan (2018-2021); all umbrella Regional Project Documents;
   2. UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (2014-2017): Midterm Outcome Evaluation
   3. Final Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan, Global Programme and Regional Programmes (2014-2017)
   4. Annual Work plans and progress reports of the activities funded through the Turkish contribution including websites, articles and other relevant reports
   5. Annual Turkey-UNDP Partnership Reports, Annual Consultation Meeting Reports and any other reports as applicable;
   6. Regional knowledge products, knowledge management and innovation initiatives supported by the Turkish contribution.
   7. Other relevant documents that may inform this evaluation.[[7]](#footnote-8)
2. **Discussions with the relevant staff**: The evaluation team members will be working and consulting the evaluation exercise with relevant teams on continuous basis. Debriefing meetings with the Management Team of Istanbul Regional Hub will also be carried out to inform on the review and evaluation processes as well as share any preliminary observations as necessary.
3. **Stakeholder interviews and focus groups**: The evaluation team will conduct interviews with representative sample of relevant stakeholders, including UNDP staff (managers and team leaders, programme/project officers) at headquarters, Istanbul Regional Hub, and Country Offices, policy makers, beneficiary groups, donors and other development partners. All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries. The team will review the proposed questions above **develop evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and use these questions for different stakeholders to be interviewed. The evaluation team may also offer UNDP any extra tools (e.g. observational visits, group discussions etc. to strengthen the evaluation).

To ensure maximum validity and reliability of data (quality) the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

4.2. Review and evaluation process

Inception: Once the evaluation team has been selected, he/she will receive an orientation and briefing by respective IRH staff. Evaluation team will first conduct a desk review of relevant materials as per the schedule provided below in Section 9. A set of key UNDP documents and programme information will be provided by various teams of IRH for this purpose.

The evaluation team, will discuss with relevant IRH staff the approach to the evaluation, further continue desk review, conduct consultations with teams and collect more data and documentation pertaining to the regional programme. The team will then prepare and submit the first deliverable - inception report - that will contain the proposed schedule of tasks, final evaluation design, with any additional methodological and process related decisions made during the mission that may not have been addressed in this description and if, applicable, develop any data collection instruments required. The inception report has to be accepted by the IRH Management.

Following this, the Evaluation team will visit Istanbul Regional Hub, perform evaluation and prepare the evaluation report as stipulated in the requirements and present the draft to the IRH. The dates of the mission will be planned to advance to ensure full participation of relevant IRH staff for validation of the results. One week will be provided to the IRH to collect comments from the relevant staff and then one week to the Evaluation Team to finalize the report.

The evaluation team will then complete data collection and analysis for evaluation of the outcomes and reconvene in the Istanbul Regional Hub for one week. The Evaluation Team will present during a debriefing session the results of the evaluation including findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations and then submit a draft Evaluation report. This first draft will be reviewed by the Istanbul Regional Hub for comments. Based on the comments received within two weeks, the team will revise and finalize the report, while recording any changes made in an audit trail.

**5. Evaluation products (deliverables)**

* **Evaluation inception report (max 10 pages, excluding annexes).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the Istanbul Regional Hub visit. *This inception report will be prepared in line with the guidance provided on page 22 of the* [*UNDP Evaluation Guidelines*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-4.pdf) *.*
* **Draft evaluation report (max.40 pages).** The evaluation team will present the draft report to IRH for validation and preliminary feedback. Relevant teams in the IRH and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluation team within 2 weeks, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria.

**Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report will be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.

* **Final evaluation report (max.40 pages)** Coveringall aspects of theTerms of Reference, responding all the questions and comments by UNDP IRH. The Evaluation report should be prepared in line with the template provided as Annex 3 in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines[[8]](#footnote-9).

**Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group.** A presentation briefing on the evaluation exercise and the main findings.

**7. Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**8. Implementation arrangements**

UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub

The IRH QA and Coordination Team will support the Istanbul Regional Hub Manager in coordinating the overall evaluation exercise and ensuring liaison within the Regional Bureau, the Regional Hub, other Bureaus at headquarters, Country Offices etc. The QA and Coordination Team will also ensure that an appropriate quality assurance mechanism exists during the evaluation. The Senior Programme Coordinator will serve as the Evaluation Manager of this exercise.

The Team Leaders responsible and working for each of the outcome will ensure that the Evaluator is provided with sufficient reference materials and methodological guidance. They will also identify selected regional projects and activities to be reviewed and be consulted on case studies to be used in the analysis. The Team Leaders will also ensure that assigned programme staff extend necessary support to the Evaluator.

The Evaluation Team

A team will consist of one independent external consultant to carry out the exercise, with the overall responsibility to lead and coordinate the drafting and finalization of the deliverables; The evaluator will undertake data collection and analysis activities and prepare designated parts of the reports.

**Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, the evaluator will deliver a preliminary debriefing on evaluation findings.

**9. Time frame for the evaluation process**

A tentative schedule of activities and travel plans are provided below. Estimated number of working days for the Evaluator is app. 55 days. The timeline will be adjusted and concrete dates finalized during the inception process.

Payments for deliverables will be made in 3 installments, upon submission of required deliverables and their acceptance by the Supervisor/Certifying Officer(s) as per the schedule below. All deliverables should be submitted to UNDP by the Consultant in English.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Timeline and number of working days*** | ***Deliverable*** |
| **Installment 1 – 30% and travel costs (tentatively by 25 August)** | |
| Week 1-2 (10 days) | * Orientation of the evaluation consultant * Desk review * Initial calls/meetings with relevant members to help shape the methodology and evaluation design, and prepare the inception report |
| Week 3 (3 days) 19 Aug | * Drafting and Submission of the final Inception Report |
| Week 3-4 | * Review and comments on Inception Report by the IRH |
| Week 4-5 (5 days) | * Revision and finalization of the Inception Report * Data collection and analysis on the outcomes and selected projects |
| **Installment 2 – 50% (tentatively by 7 October)** | |
| Week 6-7 (6 days)  26-30 Aug | * One week/7 work days mission to IRH and Ankara (1-2 days in Ankara to meet with Turkish partners and the Turkey CO) to have discussions with senior management, IRH and CO teams, and arrange questionnaires for the stakeholder interviews etc if needed. |
| Week 7-8 (12 days) | * Stakeholder interviews, Review and analysis of data collected |
| Week 9-10 (10 days) | * Preparation of the draft evaluation report |
| **Installment 3 – 20% (tentatively by 20 November)** | |
| End of Week 10 | * Evaluation Manager receives the draft report to provide comments or validation |
| Weeks 11-12 | * Evaluation Manager works on the draft report to provide comments or validation |
| End of Week 12 | * UNDP sends comments (audit trail) to the evaluator |
| Week 13 (7 days) | * Revision of the draft report and Submission of the second version of the draft evaluation report including an Executive Summary for IRH and Turkish Government review |
| Week 14-15 | * Review of IRH and Turkish Government and preparation of comments |
| End of Week 16 | * IRH sends comments (audit trail) to the evaluator |
| Week 17 (2 days) | * Revision of the report and finalization |
| End Week 17 | * Submission of the final report |

**10. Competencies and Qualifications**

**Competencies:**

Corporate competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity adaptability.
* Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

Functional Competencies:

* Ability to work under pressure, tight deadlines and stressful situations;
* Strong analytical skills;
* Capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice,
* Ability to lead a group of multicultural and multidisciplinary experts
* Strong communication and organizational skills, excellent human relations, coordination, planning and team work skills;
* Proven drafting skills,
* Excellent communication skills

**Qualifications**

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent external consultant. The expert should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising and aspect of the intervention that is subject of the evaluation.

Education

* Master’s degree in policy or public administration, or economics

Experience

* At least seven years of experience in conducting evaluations.
* Experience in conducting evaluations in the Europe and CIS region or internationally.
* Working experience in one or more areas of the UNDP regional programme (e.g. sustainable development, governance and peacebuilding, climate change, disaster risk reduction)
* Experience working with multicultural and multidisciplinary experts for an evaluation of complex development programmes.
* Working experience with UN/UNDP operations.

Language skills: English. Knowledge of Russian is an asset.

The Evaluator will be hired following the UNDP rules and regulations.

***Payments*** *will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

1. P.24 of the [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Programme countries include: Albania; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Belarus; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Georgia; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Moldova; Montenegro; Serbia including Kosovo – United Nations Administered Territory under Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999); North Macedonia, Tajikistan,; Turkey; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; and Uzbekistan [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan changed the classification from LIC to MIC in 2014 and 2015 respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. UNDP regional human development report: Progress at Risk, Inequalities and Human Development in Eastern Europe, Turkey, and Central Asia, 2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2018-2021](https://undocs.org/DP/RPD/REC/4) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The final list of documents will be finalized during the inception stage and throughout the Evaluation exercise. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Template can be found on page 54 - <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-4.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)