# Annex A: Terms of Reference

Location: Home based (remotely)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Job Title: International Consultant for External Evaluation of the Project

Expected Duration of Assignment: Up to 40 working days within a 4 months period (December 2020-March 2021)

**1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:**

In 2016 UNDP Georgia rolled out the multi-year project “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia” (PAR Project), funded by the UK Government.  The project addresses a complementary, but distinct, set of specific, predetermined needs in three crucial areas of the ongoing Public Administration Reform (PAR) - Policy Development and Cooperation; Civil Service and Human Resource Management, and Service Delivery, as stipulated by the PAR Reform Roadmap 2020. The initiative intends to sustain, support, and build key institutions and processes required for advancing Public Administration Reform by offering consultancy, capacity building, technical assistance, etc.

The project aims to support the Government of Georgia to increase the level of professionalism, independence and credibility of the civil service, develop a whole-of-government approaches in national level policy making and further improve service delivery, by introducing the unified system of professional development, coaching and strategic policy planning, monitoring and evaluation practices, mediation and dispute-settlement mechanisms, staff performance evaluations across the civil service, development of unified principles for service design and delivery, etc.

The expected project impact contributes directly to the overall UN Partnership for Sustainable Development priority, which foresees that by 2020, *expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels.*

**The targeted outcomes of the project are as follows:**

**Outcome 1:** Government of Georgia ensures enhanced participatory policy making and coordination between its institutions in PAR implementation;

**Outcome 2:** Performance of Civil Service is more professional and effective;

**Outcome 3:** GoG delivers higher quality, (digitally) more accessible and inclusive services to citizens.

More specifically**,** under the Policy Development and Coordination pillar the project has been aiming at advancement of the policy making process in the country through enhancement of policy planning and coordination and introduction of strong mechanisms for government-wide monitoring and evaluation, coupled with strengthening the capacity of the policy units of the line ministries. National level policy planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are being strengthened through provision of hands-on assistance and consultancy support to the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) in the development and deployment of unified standards for whole-of-government policy planning and coordination along with necessary electronic tools for tracking and monitoring of government-wide programs, while at the same time strengthening public participation in policy making processes.

Through the Civil Service Reform pillar, the project has been supporting the national partners – Civil Service Bureau of Georgia (CSB) and the line ministries towards development of an increasingly professional, uniformly trained civil service that is protected from arbitrary decisions. This is being achieved by: interactive, tailor-made trainings to increase knowledge and awareness among civil servants about ongoing civil service reform and its implications; operationalization of unified training system for civil servants; introduction of staff performance appraisal systems based on effective international models and with due consideration of the local context; development of tools for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in civil service. Furthermore, the project has been supporting the CSB to build the capacity of civil servants and public officials on the new Law on Civil Service and new Anti-Corruption mechanisms thereby contributing to effective implementation of the Civil Service Reform in Georgia.

As part of Service Delivery pillar, the project has helped its primary national partners – the Public Service Development Agency (PSDA) and the Digital Governance Agency (DGA) in laying solid foundations for the creation of unified standards for public service design and delivery. These measures target the established discrepancies in the quality of public service delivery in Georgia, between various service provider agencies, but also between the national and local levels. Creation of the common service delivery standards and their subsequent implementation is intended to impact the overall quality of public services, and to also have a knock-on positive effect on the level of support to PAR among citizens and civil servants.

By introducing common standards of public service delivery, the project assists the Government of Georgia to further institutionalize the significant achievements made in service provision and ensure that they are sustainable, replicable and cover the ever-widening array of the government agencies. Supporting e-Governance development, increasing digitization of public services, coupled with enhancing the uptake of e-services is yet another component falling under the wider service delivery pillar of the project, which became even more critical amid the COVID-19 pandemic and associated restrictive measures prompting Government agencies to speed up the digitization of public services and reemphasize the “digital-by-default” principle by fully harnessing the technologies internally, within their organizations, as well as externally, when interacting with citizens.

The Civil Society Organizations’ (CSO) engagement component of the project cuts across its all three outcomes and aims at fostering engagement of CSOs and academia to provide evidence and practical solutions for enhancing policy planning, advancing civil service reform and improving public service delivery.

Predictably, the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the planned activities of the project starting from March 2020, as the virus-related restrictions interfered with the scheduled trainings, workshops and forums. The project team together with the partner agencies moved to online collaboration platforms to keep up with the plans. By the end of 2020 while the restrictions still apply, the project is on track with the planned activities as the workshops and trainings have been moved online. Apart from adapting to the new working modalities, the PAR project also responded to some of the urgent needs identified by the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) while still remaining within the overall broader scope of the project, by fine-tuning its CSO and Emerging Needs’ components to offer emergency support to partner agencies and to foster collaborative initiatives between the government and civil society.

**2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives**

The main objective of the final external evaluation is to assess the efficacy of the project design and structure, relevance of the project outcomes and outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of assistance, and sustainability of interventions. The evaluation must include an analysis of how PAR interventions address Human Rights and Gender Equality (HR and GE) principles[[1]](#footnote-1).

The project underwent the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) covering the period from the project’s initiation in 2016 through the end of December 2018. Given the project’s designated end date of March 2021, MTE allowed to track the progress achieved through 2018 and chart out the next steps in the process. The final evaluation is expected to cover the full cycle of the project (2016-2021) covering all three key pillars of Policy Planning and Coordination, Civil Service Reform and Public Service Delivery and focusing more on the period after the MTE was conducted (2019-2021). However, considering the specific context of PAR, where the results take longer to materialize, some of the MTE findings might need to be revisited and validated.

The international consultant will be tasked to perform the final evaluation of the Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR Project) in Georgia outcomes with corresponding outputs as set out in the Results Framework of the project. The evaluation also aims to inform decision-making on the continuation and designing of the subsequent phase of the project through a methodologically sound, credible, impartial and independent assessment of the achievements and shortcomings of the project, as well as lessons learned and recommendations for future interventions.

The specific objectives of this final evaluation are:

* To evaluate the achievements against the project’s objectives and expected outcomes;
* To identify strengths and weaknesses in design and implementation;
* To assess the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the project in terms of achieved outputs and results and its contribution to Country Program Document (CPD) outcome;
* To identify lessons learned and good practices;
* To provide recommendations for future phase of the project.

The scope of work for consultancy will include, but may not be limited to:

* Complete a desk review of all project-related documents including the project document, budgetary documents, reports, and internal evaluations;
* Elaborate an evaluation matrix using evaluation criteria/questions provided below as a basis to develop the evaluation questions (and, where needed, sub-questions), the data sources required to answer the questions, the data collection and data analysis methods;
* Conduct meetings/interviews with current team members, along with the counterparts at the Government of Georgia, donors and key partners, and the UNDP Country Office;
* Facilitate a workshop with PAR project team and key partners on project outcomes and outputs, conducted activities, and the likelihood of achieving an impact;
* Collect quantitative data, including retrieving public information from government agencies (if needed), necessary for the evaluation;
* Analyse data in accordance with the evaluation objectives per component, and in a broader context: against the project's objectives and project’s impact;
* Analyse the project’s contribution to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – Goal 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions;
* Assess and – as relevant - Incorporate the findings of Evaluation of Civic Innovation and Research Grants including Grants in response to Covid-19, commissioned separately within the PAR project into the final evaluation of the project;

Assess the project strategy for knowledge transfer, identify encountered risks and ’lessons learned’; assess the potential for continuation or up scaling of UNDP’s work in respective area and develop recommendations incorporating project experience for future programming likely to lead to improvements, adjustments to the implementation approach, and alternatives as required in the context of future phase of the project;

* Prepare a draft evaluation report providing descriptive overviews, laying out the evidence, analysing project’s contribution based on evaluation criteria and SDGs, providing conclusions and recommendations;
* Finalize the evaluation report based on solicited feedback from UNDP team and the key project stakeholders;
* Present the document to the national partners, project donors and the other key stakeholders, as needed through a dissemination workshop.

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

The incumbent will be tasked to conduct the evaluation as per UNDP Evaluation Policy[[2]](#footnote-2), as well as OECD/DAC criteria and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of PAR efforts in all three pillars of the project. Evaluation should consider using participatory approach and use HR and GE lenses during data collection, data analysis and evaluation process. The following are guiding questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria to be used as a basis and further elaborated by the consultant in the evaluation inception phase.

**Relevance:**

* To what extent did project interventions address the needs of the targeted group/partner organizations?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to Covid-19 health crisis and the respective changes amid pandemic?

**Effectiveness and Results:**

* To what extent were the project’s intermediary outcomes achieved?
* What progress been made towards achievement of project outcomes? What has been the projects’ contribution to the observed change?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
* To what extent has the PAR Project partnership strategy been appropriate and effective including during the times of the health crisis of Covid-19?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? How these achievements can be used for future project designing and programming?
* In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome? Did the project identify these constraints/ failures early and stop activities?
* What, if any, alternative strategies could have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives or should be considered in the potential next phase of the project?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How much capability has been built and which areas can government now lead on independently?
* To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* What are the strengths and weaknesses in terms of project management, implementation and monitoring?
* Did the project have nay unintended consequences? If yes what were they?

**Efficiency:**

* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent has the 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? Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?
* To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Impact:**

* What impact did the PAR Project have on ongoing Public Administration Reform?
* What impact did the PAR Project have on the policy development and coordination; Performance of Civil Service and Service delivery?
* What Impact did the PAR Project have on Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) capacity building and engagement in PAR? Did government use the research, evidence and innovations carried out by civil society?
* What is the forecasted impact of the PAR Project on policy planning, advancing civil service reform and improving public service delivery?

**Sustainability:**

* Examine the political, organizational, human resource, and financial sustainability of PAR sub-projects/consultancies. What threats exist to sustainability, and how has the risk of these threats been mitigated/anticipated?
* Which of the PAR strategies/policy frameworks developed and supported through this programme are actively used? If not, why not?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* To what extent PAR Project has taken the necessary steps to transfer capacities and skills to its key partners? To what extent are these results long-lasting? How could transfer be strengthened?
* How, and to what extent did PAR Project’s design, implementation strategy/partnership foster ownership and capacity development? How could this be strengthened?

**Coordination:**

* To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies/UNDP, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?

**Gender and Inclusion:**

* To what extent and how has the project contributed to gender equality and the empowerment of women, and social inclusion/human rights been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? What are potential opportunities to strengthen contribution to gender equality in future?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women, and social inclusion? Were there any unintended effects?

**4. Methodology**

The consultant will work together with the project team in the preparation of a methodology to answer the key research questions outlined above, as well as any other pertinent questions that may arise to adequately assess the final picture. The incumbent must take into account [UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (2019)](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/) and relevant programmatic documents, which will be supplied to the consultant at the beginning of the assignment. As a result of this exercise the consultant will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as part of the evaluation inception report. The final methodology should be approved by UNDP.

Given the specific nature of the Public Administration Reform and the project targeting the given area, where results take longer to materialize, the consultant should adopt an integrated mixed-method approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to capture both the tangible and the unquantifiable impacts of the PAR Project and generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. The methodology should be robust enough to ensure high quality, triangulation of data sources, and verifiability of information. It is expected that the evaluation methodology will comprise of the following elements:

1. Secondary research:
   1. Document Review of all relevant project documentation: Project Document, Results Frameworks, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, Theory of Change, Annual/Semi-Annual/Quarterly Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project and other relevant knowledge products;
   2. Collect quantitative data, including retrieving public information from government agencies (if needed), necessary for the evaluation.
2. Primary research – aimed at forming new knowledge by collecting information through:
   1. Key informant interviews (KIIs), semi-structured interviews, stakeholder consultations and other participatory methods;
   2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and workshops with different Government and non‐government institutions, donors and external stakeholders;

Other quantitative data collection methods as required. Considering all the safety measures enforced by the Government of Georgia to stop the spread of the Covid-19 virus, most of the activities envisaged by the external evaluation methodology might have to be conducted remotely. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country by the time of the data collection, workshops and meetings are planned, the international consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conducts the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the UNDP’s commissioning unit (Governance Team Leader and M&E specialist).

**5. Deliverables**

* **Inception report** including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan, schedule of data collection, study instruments, report outline, etc.;
* **A draft of an evaluation report** with the following key chapters, but not limited to:

1. Executive Summary (brief description of the project, context and purpose of the evaluation, main conclusions, lessons learnt, recommendations for future programming, etc);
2. Introduction (purpose of the evaluation, key issues addressed, methodology of the evaluation, structure of the evaluation, etc);
3. The project and its implementation context (project start and its duration, problems/challenges’, the immediate and development objectives of the project, main stakeholders, results achieved, etc.);
4. Evaluation findings (assessment of project outcomes per evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness and results, efficiency, impact, sustainability), assessment of coordination and analysis through HR and GE lens, relevance and contribution to SDGs, etc.);
5. Recommendations and Lessons Learned (overview of project encountered risks and ’lessons learned’, recommendations incorporating project experience for future programming)

* **Final Evaluation Report** taking into account the initial comments from UNDP team and/or key partners as applicable.
* **Presentation** of the evaluation results on the dissemination workshop for the national partners, project donors and the other key stakeholders[[3]](#footnote-3).

*In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.*

*Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete due to circumstances beyond his/her control.*

**6. Required competencies**

Required Qualifications and competencies for International Consultant envisage the following:

**Education:**

* At least Master’s degree in Public Administration, Public Policy, Political Science, Management or related Social Science fields (minimum requirement).

**Experience**

* At least 10 years of professional experience in Projects’ Monitoring and Evaluation, preferably in governance (minimum requirement);
* Advanced knowledge of the public administration reform framework (minimum requirement);
* At least 15 projects on conducting baseline, mid-term and final evaluations, out of which at least 3 are in international setting (minimum requirement);
* Solid understanding of contemporary thinking related to development practices and public administration reform programmes, notably in the given region;
* Familiarity with the region (particularly Georgia), its overall governance features, development needs, and directions;
* Hands-on knowledge of evaluation methodologies and data collection methods;
* Hands-on knowledge on online collaboration platforms to be used for remote workshops and interviews and online data collection methods;
* Experience with the UN organization is an asset.

**Language:**

* Excellent command of written and spoken English.

**Corporate competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Understanding of the mandate and the role of UNDP would be an asset;
* Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

**Functional competencies:**

* Strong communication and analytical skills;
* Demonstrated skills in drafting reports;
* Ability to work under pressure with several tasks and various deadlines;
* Actively generates creative, practical approaches and solutions to overcome challenging situations;
* Excellent writing, presentation/public speaking skills;
* A pro-active approach to problem-solving;
* Computer literacy.

**Leadership and Self-Management skills:**

* Builds strong relationships with the working group and with the project partners; focuses on impact and results for the project partners and responds positively to feedback;
* Cooperates with the working group effectively and demonstrates strong conflict resolution skills;
* Consistently approaches work with energy, positivity and a constructive attitude;
* Demonstrates strong influencing and facilitation skills;
* Remains calm, in control and good humored under pressure;
* Demonstrates openness to change, new ideas, and ability to manage ambiguity;
* Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
* Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge and competencies;
* Is able to work independently and manage competing priorities.

**Conflict of interest:**

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

**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 the 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**

The International Consultant will work under the overall oversight of UNDP’s commissioning unit (Governance Team Leader and M&E specialist). PAR Project Manager will provide necessary information for the evaluation and will be the primary point of contact for the evaluator. The PAR project team will be responsible to share relevant documents, contact details and other necessary information with the evaluator.

The Consultant will report to the Governance Team Leader. UNDP M&E specialist will be assigned to oversee and support the overall evaluation process. The CO Senior Management will take responsibility for the approval of the evaluation report.

During the final evaluation, the evaluator is expected to interact with/interview the implementing partners of the “Supporting Public Administration Reform” project, including: Policy Planning and Coordination Department of Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG), Civil Service Bureau (CSB); Ministry of Justice – LEPL Public Service Development Agency (PSDA), LEPL Digital Governance Agency (DGA) and other line ministries, public agencies, donor agencies, consultants, civil society organizations and all other relevant stakeholders whose list and contact details will be provided to the International Consultant by the commencement of the contract.

In case the evaluation is conducted remotely or partially remotely, the PAR Project team will assist the international consultant with the planning of the online activities and workshops and ensure the stakeholder engagement.

**9. Timeframe for the evaluation process**

The consultancy is expected to be carried out in 40 working days over a period of 4 months from December - March 2021. The timeline for submission of specific deliverables is the following:

| **Deliverables** | **Duration (working days)** | **Due dates** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1/ Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan (suggested content in Annex 1) | 7 working days | Within 2 weeks upon signing the contract |
| 2/ Draft Evaluation Report prepared and accepted (suggested template in Annex 2) | 30 working days | Within 2,5 months upon submission of Inception report |
| 3/ Final Evaluation report and presentation for the dissemination workshops | 3 working days | Within 2 weeks after receiving the comments from UNDP. |

The timeline of the activities will be detailed in the inception report including flexibility and delays in the timeframe for the evaluation, with additional time for implementing evaluation virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19.

**10. Payment modality:**

The payment will be made through four instalments upon satisfactory submission and approval of the deliverables:

1. Deliverable 1– 30% of the of the consultancy;
2. Deliverable 2 – 30% of the of the consultancy;
3. Deliverable 3 – 40% of the of the consultancy.

**Annex 1**

**Inception report**

**(Suggested content)**

1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. Evaluation objective, purpose and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. Evaluation criteria and questions. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. Evaluability analysis. Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. Cross-cutting issues. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. Evaluation matrix. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites or scheduling online meetings, interviews and workshops amid COVID-19 restrictions.
10. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019) and ensuring quality and usability. The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in Annex 3.

**Annex 2**

**Evaluation Report Template**

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:

* Name of the evaluation intervention.
* Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
* Countries of the evaluation intervention.
* Names and organizations of evaluators.
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
* Acknowledgements.

1. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluationreports on second page (as one page):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project/outcome Information** | | |
| **Project/outcome title** |  | |
| **Atlas ID** |  | |
| **Corporate outcome and output** |  | |
| **Country** |  | |
| **Region** |  | |
| **Date project document signed** |  | |
| **Project dates** | Start | Planned end |
|  |  |
| **Project budget** |  | |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** |  | |
| **Funding source** |  | |
| **Implementing party[[4]](#footnote-4)** |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Information** | | |
| **Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)** |  |  |
| **Final/midterm review/other** |  |  |
| **Period under evaluation** | Start | End |
|  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
| **Evaluator email address** |  |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | Start | Completion |
|  |  |

1. **Table of contents,** including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**
3. **Executive summary (four-page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages thatshould:

* Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
* Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
* Include the evaluators’ quality standards and assurance ratings.

1. **Introduction**

* Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
* Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
* Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

1. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logicand assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:

* Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
* Explain the **expected results model or results framework**, **implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
* Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other **programme or country-specific** **plans and goals.**
* Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant** **changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, andexplain 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).

1. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of theevaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

* **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, forexample, 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 evaluationusers 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 performancestandards used.[[5]](#footnote-5) The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
* **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. Thereport should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

1. **Evaluation approach and methods.[[6]](#footnote-6)** The evaluation report should describe in detail theselected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders’ groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

* **Evaluation approach.**
* **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) aswell as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
* **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size andcharacteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
* **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collectdata, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
* **Performance standards:[[7]](#footnote-7)** the standard or measure that will be used to evaluateperformance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
* **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of bothmen and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
* **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentialityof informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).[[8]](#footnote-8)
* **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, thebackground and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
* **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed asto their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

1. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collectedto answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
2. **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.
3. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknessesand 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.
4. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasiblerecommendations 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.
5. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should includediscussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.
6. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report userwith supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

* TOR for the evaluation.
* Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
* List of supporting documents reviewed.
* Project or programme results model or results framework.
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
* Code of conduct signed by evaluators.

**Annex 3**

**Evaluation Report Quality Assessment Requirements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are the evaluation report’s objectives, criteria, methodology and data sources fully described and are they appropriate given the subject being evaluated and the reasons for carrying out the evaluation?** | |
| **2.1** | **Is the evaluation report well-balanced and structured?**   * With sufficient but not excessive background information? * Is the report a reasonable length? * Are required annexes provided? |
| **2.2** | **Does the evaluation report clearly address the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR?** |
| **METHODOLOGY** | |
| **2.3** | **Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined?**  - Any changes from the proposed approach are detailed with reasons why |
| **2.4** | **Are the nature and extent of the role and involvement of stakeholders in the project/programme explained adequately?** |
| **2.5** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of relevance?** |
| **2.6** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of effectiveness?** |
| **2.7** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of efficiency?** |
| **2.8** | **Does the evaluation clearly assess the project’s/programme’s level of sustainability?** |
| **DATA COLLECTION** | |
| **2.9** | **Are data-collection methods and analysis clearly outlined?**   * Data sources clearly outlined (including triangulation methods)? * Data analysis approaches detailed?   Data-collection methods and tools explained? |
| **2.10** | **Is the data-collection approach and analysis adequate for the scope of the evaluation?**   * Comprehensive set of data sources (especially for triangulation) where appropriate? * Comprehensive set of quantitative and qualitative surveys, and analysis approaches where appropriate? * Clear presentation of data analysis and citation within the report? * Documented meetings and surveys with stakeholders and beneficiary groups, where appropriate? |
| **2.11** | **Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained?**   * Issues with access to data or verification of data sources? * Issues in availability of interviewees? * Outline how these constraints were addressed |
| **REPORT CONTENT** | |
| **2.12** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme strategy and/or UNDAF?** |
| **2.13** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to related national government strategies and plans in the sector/area of support?**  - Does the evaluation discuss how capacity development or the strengthening of national  capacities can be addressed? |
| **2.14** | **Does the evaluation detail project funding and provide funding data (especially for GEF)?**   * Variances between planned and actual expenditures assessed and explained?   Observations from financial audits completed for the project considered? |
| **2.15** | **Does the evaluation include an assessment of the project’s M&E design, implementation and overall quality?** |
| **2.16** | **Does the evaluation identify ways in which the programme/project has produced a catalytic role and has demonstrated: (a) the production of a public good; (b) demonstration; (c)**  **replication; and/or (d) scaling up (GEF evaluations)?** |
| **2.17** | **Are indicators in the results framework assessed individually, with final achievements noted?** |
| **Does the evaluation report address gender and other key cross-cutting issues?** | |
| **3.1** | **Are human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable group issues addressed where relevant?** |
| **3.2** | **Does the report discuss the poverty/environment nexus or sustainable livelihood issues, as relevant?** |
| **3.3** | **Does the report discuss disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant?** |
| **3.4** | **Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues as relevant?** |
| **3.5** | **Are the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women integrated in the evaluation’s scope and indicators as relevant?** |
| **3.6** | **Do the evaluation's criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how gender equality and the empowerment of women have been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention and the results achieved, as relevant?** |
| **3.7** | **Are a gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques selected?** |
| **3.8** | **Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations take aspects of gender equality and the empowerment of women into consideration?** |
| **3.9** | **Does the evaluation draw linkages to the Sustainable Development Goals and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated?** |
| **3.10** | **Does the terminal evaluation adequately address social and environmental safeguards, as relevant? (GEF evaluations)** |
| **Does the report clearly and concisely outline and support its findings, conclusions and recommendations?** | |
| **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS** | |
| **4.1** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of findings?** |
| **4.2** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of conclusions?** |
| **4.3** | **Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned?** |
| **4.4** | **Do the findings and conclusions relate directly to the objectives of the project/programme?**  - Are the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR? |
| **4.5** | **Are the findings and conclusions supported with data and interview sources?**  - Are constraints in access to data and interview sources detailed? |
| **4.6** | **Do the conclusions build on the findings of the evaluation?**  - Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and present a balanced picture of the strengths and limitations of the evaluation’s focus? |
| **4.7** | **Are risks discussed in the evaluation report?** |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS** | |
| **4.8** | **Are the recommendations clear, concise, realistic and actionable?**   * A number of recommendations are reasonable given the size and scope of the project/ programme   Recommendations link directly to findings and conclusions |
| **4.9** | **Are recommendations linked to country programme outcomes and strategies and actionable by the country office?**   * Is guidance given for implementation of the recommendations?   Do recommendations identify implementing roles (UNDP, government, programme, stakeholder, other)? |

## 

**Annex 4**

**Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

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. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. 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 in the course of 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.

1. UNEG, ‘Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations’, August 2014. The guidance outlines practical steps on how to prepare, conduct and use HR & GE responsive evaluations. Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2019/DP_2019_29_E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Workshops might be held online amid the COVID-19 restrictions, more than one workshop might be necessary to disseminate the report among various project partners and stakeholders. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)