

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The United Nations Development Programme on behalf of its programme “Improving Rural Development in Georgia” is making a recruitment for the position of an International Consultant (Team Leader) in Rural Development.

**Post Title:** International Consultant (Team Leader) for Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of ENPARD III UNDP “Improving Rural Development in Georgia” Project

**Contract:** Individual Contract

**Duration:** Up to 20 working days for the period of 1 November 2020 – 31 January 2021

**Duty station:** Home based / Online

**Starting date:** 1 November 2020

**Supervisor:** UNDP Economic Development Team Leader

1. **Background and context**

The signing of the Association Agreement (AA) with EU in June 2014 (<http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-430_en.htm>) earmarked a new stage of cooperation between EU and Georgia. The AA aims to deepen political and economic relations between the EU and Georgia and to gradually integrate Georgia into the EU’s internal market. This entails, as one element, creating a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area between the EU and Georgia.

Article 333 of the Association Agreement (Cooperation between the Parties in the field of agriculture and rural development) provides with the clauses on ‘facilitating the mutual understanding of agricultural and rural development policies. Article 332 of the Association Agreement states that the “Parties shall cooperate to promote agricultural and rural development, in particular through progressive convergence of policies and legislation”. A National Rural Development Strategy elaboration process has been supported by FAO and UNDP and with UNDP’s support to Ajara Autonomous Republic of Georgia within the framework of EU supported European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD). Government of Georgia approved the first-ever National Rural Development Strategy (Programme) in December 2016, which provided country’s vision for the coming years (2017-2020) in key areas of rural development – growth and diversification of local economies, improvement of social and public services, increase of employment and sustainable use of national resources. The strategy represents a new approach to rural development in Georgia grounded on the European Union practice and the EU MS knowledge and experience in this field. It aims to support Georgia’s sustainable economic development through enhanced social-economic activities in rural areas and improved living condition of rural population.

The adoption of the national strategy was followed by the establishment of an Inter-Agency Coordination Council (hereinafter referred to as IACC) for Rural Development which is led by the Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia. The Ajara Rural Development Strategy approved by the Government of Autonomous Republic (A.R.) was followed by the establishment of the Rural Development Council of Ajara (hereinafter referred to as RDC) which is chaired by the head of A.R. Government.

Both Councils coordinate the implementation of rural development policies and promote cooperation and coordination between and among its members. The membership of IACC and RDC involves representatives from various state agencies/line ministries, grouped under the 3 pillars of the Rural Development Strategy: economic, environment and social. Thematic Working Groups were established to contribute to advances in knowledge about rural development and enable the Strategy and respective Action Plans to become more effective in terms of delivering sustainable rural development outcomes.

Due to structural and functional reorganization of the Government of Georgia, announced in November 2017 and implemented in December 2017, followed by the second wave of Government reshuffle announced by the newly-appointed Prime-Minister in June 2018 and finalized in September 2018 (changes in the Law of Georgia on the Structure, Authority and Rules of Operation of the Government of Georgia), the composition of the Inter-Agency Coordination Council (IACC) changed. Also, the counterpart Ministry was affected. The environment component of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Recourses Protection has been merged with the Ministry of Agriculture to form the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA). This change resulted in challenges in terms of reconstituting institutional arrangements and functional distribution, but the change also facilitates the cooperation with MEPA in relation to the implementation of the environmental component of the project *Improving Rural Development in Georgia* (IRDG) under the EU ENPARD III programme.

Project “Improving Rural Development in Georgia”, which is part of a wider 77.5 million EUR support program (ENPARD III), was launched in November 2018 with the end date of November 2022. The project budget is 10,083,200 EUR o/w 10,000,000.00 EUR is funded by the European Union and 83,200.00 EUR is co-financed by Ajara Government. UNDP is EU implementing partner of ENPARD III Programme in Georgia, including Ajara AR. The main objective of the given project is to assist the Georgian government in eradicating poverty, promoting sustainable and inclusive growth, and consolidating and improving democratic and economic governance.

In line with the Action Document for ENPARD III[[1]](#footnote-1), the expected **impact** of the project is to improve employment and living conditions as a result of better quality and quantity of available rural services for the rural population in Georgia

The expected **outcome** of the project is that more diverse rural services are delivered to population in more efficient, effective and sustainable manner. The project will be **complementary** to the "FAO support to Georgian agricultural sector under ENPARD III", which will deliver agricultural services to the rural population in the same target areas.

On this basis, the **results framework** of the project is designed to ensure that the content of the RDS and RDAP, nation-wide and for Ajara region, remain relevant and that they are implemented, monitored and evaluated in the most relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable way.

In this respect, the project is expected to deliver the following **outputs**:

1. Improved governance for effective implementation of the Rural Development Strategy (RDS), Rural Development Action Plan (RDAP) and related programmes
2. Improved rural economic diversification, employment and services
3. Improved environment, sustainable management of natural resources and climate action
4. Improved rural development governance and economic diversification, environment, natural resources and climate action in Ajara autonomous region.

The project strives to achieve 4 outputs:

**Output 1/ Improved governance for effective implementation of the RDS, RDAP and related programmes**

The target results for this output are:

1.1: More relevant rural development strategies, plans and programmes adopted and implemented

1.2: Improved governance and coordination mechanisms for rural development

**Output 2/ Improved rural economic diversification, employment and services**

The target results for this output are:

2.1: Targeted interventions delivered in the 6 rural development areas supported by ENPARD for improved rural economic diversification, employment and services

2.2: Best practice models and innovative practices are shared across the target areas

**Output 3/ Improved environment, sustainable management of natural resources and climate action**

The target results for this output are:

3.1: Targeted interventions delivered in the 6 rural development areas supported by ENPARD for the environment, the protection and sustainable management of natural resources and climate action

3.2: Promotion and public awareness campaigns on sustainable management of natural resources, disaster risk management and use of renewable and alternative sources of energy

**Output 4/ Improved rural development governance and economic diversification, environment, natural resources and climate action in Ajara autonomous region**

The target results for this output are:

4.1: Improved governance for effective implementation of the RDS, RDAP and related programmes in Ajara AR

4.2: Improved rural economic diversification, employment and services in Ajara AR

4.3: Improved environment, sustainable management of natural resources and climate action in Ajara AR

UNDP is the leading development partner to key public institutions on National and Ajara AR levels, including Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia, Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ajara Government (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Council).

Additional information on the project can be accessed at <https://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/projects/ENPARD-3/>.

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

UNDP Georgia is looking for an International Consultant (Team Leader) to perform the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the project ENPARD III UNDP “Improving Rural Development in Georgia” (IRDG) project.

The overall purpose of the proposed assignment is to assess progress (and challenges), measure achievement of the project results, assess gaps and lessons learned and provide recommendations to guide implementation to date.

The specific objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) are:

* To review progress towards the project’s objectives and target results,
* To evaluate how much-delivered activities of the project will enable achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs,
* To identify strengths and weaknesses in design and implementation,
* To assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs,
* 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, ENPARD III results Indicators and EU Results Framework,
* To provide lessons learned and good practices,
* To provide recommendations on modifications to increase the likelihood of success (if necessary).

In parallel to this consultancy assignment, Mid-term review will be conducted with the goal to collect, analyse, and provide information on the current status of Improving Rural Development in Georgia in the Dimensions of 1. Evidenced Decisions; 2. EU Style ARD Governance; 3. Bottom-up; 4. Coordinated IACC Actions; 5. Diversification, employment, and services; 6. Forests; 7. Energy Efficiency (EE)/Renewable Energy (RE). The consultant will be required to incorporate preliminary findings of this review into its final consultancy deliverables.

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

1. Evaluate all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, contractors and UNDP implementing partners’ files, records, management, and clients’ responses and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.
2. Elaborate an evaluation matrix with evaluation criteria, the related evaluation questions (and, where needed, sub-questions), the data sources required to answer the questions, the data collection and data analysis methods.
3. Familiarize himself/herself with current standings of rural development Georgia and Ajara as well as with the latest developments and achievements within ENPARD III UNDP IRDG project.
4. Frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, and gender with the particular attention to the ENPARD III Results Indicators and EU Results Framework. The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, and other key stakeholders.
5. Analyze the key objectives of the project and assess to what extent these objectives will be attained.
6. Evaluate the overall scope ENPARD III UNDP IRDG project will contribute to the ultimate objective of rural development in Georgia and the Ajara Autonomous Republic, including ENPARD III Results Indicators and EU Results Framework.
7. Assess the effectiveness of ENPARD III UNDP IRDG project `s interventions in achieving its stated objectives and contributing to the relevant outcomes as stated in the project document, including ENPARD III Results Indicators and EU Results Framework.
8. Select the key stakeholders and hold discussions with them. Develop interview forms, questionnaires and other forms of communication tools for facilitating discussions and documenting stakeholders positioning towards ENPARD III UNDP IRDG project goals and results.
9. Evaluate/collate evidence of what has worked and what has not worked (and why) from ENPARD III UNDP IRDG project initiatives, as well as programming approaches and strategies yielding the most effective results in line with ENPARD III Results Indicators and EU Results Framework.
10. Identify and describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of the sustainability of project outputs.
11. The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons.
12. Recommend measures likely to lead to improvements, adjustments to the implementation approach, and alternatives as required in the context of an implementation framework.
13. Assess whether the project has an appropriate strategy for knowledge transfer and describe the results of this strategy to date.
14. Analyze the project’s contribution to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
15. Prepare a Draft MTE Report providing descriptive overviews, laying out the facts, outlining risks and lessons learned, and providing conclusions and recommendations.
16. Finalize an MTE Report based on solicited feedback from the UNDP team and key stakeholders.
17. Present the documents at a national consultation and donors.

During assignment period an International Consultant (Team Leader) is expected to be based at home and conduct overall MTE process online.

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

The incumbent will be tasked to conduct the evaluation as per UNDP Evaluation Policy[[2]](#footnote-2), focusing on seven areas of evaluation (evaluation criteria): relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and gender.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Relevance & Appropriateness:**  | * To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs, considering EU Results Framework?
* To what extent was the project in line with the European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development in Georgia, phase II (ENPARD Georgia III) modalities of complementary support?
* To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
* 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?
 |
| **Effectiveness** | * To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, ENPARD III results indicators and EU Results Framework?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* 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?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
* To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards the achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
 |
| **Efficiency** | * Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable? What is the cost-benefit ratio?
* To what extent have individual resources been used economically?
* Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?
* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent has UNDP’s project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supported the strategy been cost-effective?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
 |
| **Sustainability** | * Examine the political, organizational, human resource, and financial sustainability of the sub-project/consultancy. What threats to sustainability exist, and how has the risk of these threats been mitigated/anticipated?
* Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, ENPARD III results indicators and EU Results Framework?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholder’s ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
 |
| **Impact** | * What is the forecasted impact on the project beneficiaries?
* Is there evidence of long-lasting desired changes?
* Did the interventions contribute to reaching impact of project?
* What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those affected?
 |
| **Gender** | * To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
 |

1. **Methodology**

The International Consultant (Team Leader) 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 mid-term picture. The incumbent must take into account the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/>) and relevant programmatic documents, which will be supplied to the consultant at the beginning of the assignment. The final methodology should be approved by UNDP.

The study will utilize two major forms of research: background and primary.

1. Background research:
	1. Document Evaluation of all relevant project documentation: Project Document, Logical Framework, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, Theory of Change, Annual/Semi-Annual/Quarterly Reports and other relevant knowledge products.
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) with different Government and non‐government institutions, donors and external stakeholders;

The International Consultant (Team Leader) will develop a report with the assessment of the Project performance in close cooperation with UNDP and EU. UNDP Georgia will provide the consultant with a list of key stakeholders, draft schedule of the meetings and will facilitate communication of the consultant with EU, MEPA Georgia and Ajara Government and the Project Beneficiaries. UNDP will also support the consultant in arranging meeting, workshops, etc.

1. **Evaluation products (deliverables) and payments:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Deliverable**  | **% Of the Lump Sum** |
| November 30, 2020 | * Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan
 | 40% |
| January 31, 2020 | * A draft MTE report prepared per template provided in Annex 1 Mid-Term Evaluation report
* Final Mid-Term Evaluation report and presentation for the dissemination workshop.
 | 60% |

1. **Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The International Consultant (team leader) will work in cooperation with local Consultant (to be hired locally by the project) on this assignment.

Required Qualifications and competencies for International Consultant (Team Leader) envisage the following:

**Education:**

* At least Master’s degrees (or equivalent) in Economics, Agriculture/Rural, business, Sociology, Social Policy, Public Policy or Analysis, or related discipline; ***minimum requirement.***

**Experience**

* At least 10 years of practical experience in a similar professional role (i.e. Consultant/ Evaluator for the projects); ***minimum requirement***
* Experience of evaluation at least two projects related to agriculture and/or rural development; ***minimum requirement.***
* Demonstrated Working experience in areas of agriculture and/or rural development would be an asset.
* At least 15 projects on conducting baseline, mid-term and final evaluations, out of which at least 3 is in an international setting (minimum requirement).
* Familiarity with the region (particularly Georgia), its overall governance features, development needs, and directions.
* Knowledge of evaluation methodologies.
* Experience of working in Georgia and/or knowledge of the region’s context is an asset.
* Experience with the UN organization is an asset.
* Fluency in written and spoken English.

**Language:**

* Excellent command of written and spoken English

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Understanding 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 favoritism.

**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.
1. **Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The International Consultant (Team Leader) 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 it data. The International Consultant (Team Leader) 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.

1. **Implementation arrangements**

The International Consultant (Team Leader) will work under the direct supervision of the UNDP Economic Development Team Leader, UNDP M&E Specialist, the Project “Improving Rural Development in Georgia” Project Manager and Technical Team Leader.

The service provider will be directly responsible to, reporting to, seeking approval from, and obtaining certificate of acceptance of outputs from the above-mentioned persons. In addition, the respective IRDG team will be responsible to share relevant documents, contact details and other necessary information with the service provider.

During the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), the service provider is expected to interact with/interview the implementing partners of the “Improving Rural Development in Georgia” project, including: Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (including IACC Secretariat and the Department of Food Safety and Rural Development), Inter-Agency Coordination Council (IACC) Ajara Government (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Council) and other line ministries, public agencies, and civil society organizations (including LAGs, AMAGs), whose list and contact details will be provided to the service provider by the commencement of the contract.

1. **Time-frame for the evaluation process**

It is expected that the evaluation will be conducted no later than November-December 2020, over a period of 20 working days.

| **Task/Deliverable** | **Timeline (days)** |
| --- | --- |
| **1- Inception phase (up to 1 day)** |  |
| Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan | 1 day |
| **2- Research & Data Collection Phase (up to 11 days)** |  |
| Meeting with ENPARD Georgia Team (including Ajara team), UNDP | 2 days |
| Desk Evaluation of existing documents | 4 days |
| Interviews with partners, and key stakeholders (National/Ajara) | 5 days  |
| **3-** **Report Writing Phase** (up to 8 days) |  |
| Producing draft report and debriefing with UNDP and EU on preliminary findings, main recommendations, challenges, opportunities, lessons learned. | 4 days |
| Finalizing the evaluation report (home based)(refer to Annex 1 for proposed format) | 4 days |

**ANNEX 1**

**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 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
* Acknowledgments
1. **Table of contents**—Including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**
3. **Executive summary (4-page maximum)**; A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
* 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 the key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
* Including 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 the 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 logic and asses 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. The description 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, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
* Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
* Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, 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 the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives, and main questions.
* **Evaluation scope**; The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
* **Evaluation objectives**; The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
* **Evaluation criteria**; The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used.[[3]](#footnote-3) The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
* **Evaluation questions**; Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.
1. **Evaluation approach and methods[[4]](#footnote-4)**—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected 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), 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 and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 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 collect data, 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**[[5]](#footnote-5); The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
* **Stakeholder participation**; Stakeholders’ participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
* **Ethical considerations**; The measures are taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).[[6]](#footnote-6)
* **Background information on evaluators**—The composition of the evaluation team, the background 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**; Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.
1. **Data analysis**; The report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to 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 are 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 crosscutting issue questions.
3. **Conclusions;** Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
4. **Recommendations**—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address the 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 include discussion 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 the specific evidence presented in the report.
6. **Report annexes**—Suggested annexesshould include the following to provide the report user with 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 conductsigned by evaluators
1. *Action Document for ENPARD III, constituting the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128 (1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2102) I the following section concerning calls for proposals: 5.4.1 Grants; call for proposals “Support to development in disadvantaged rural regions of Georgia” (direct management)* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee) criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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. See Chapter 8 for more guidance on methodology. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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 thereport reader. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)