



Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes

Services/Work Description:	Evaluation of two Projects – (I) Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response 2020-2021, and (II) Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan 2017-2020
Project/Programme Title:	Evaluation of UNDP/ANAMA Mine Action Projects 2017-2021
Consultancy Title:	Project Evaluator
Duty Station:	Baku, Azerbaijan
Duration:	35 consultancy days
Expected start date:	23 August, 2021

1. BACKGROUND

Between 2017 and 2021, UNDP has supported a number of mine action projects and activities in collaboration with the ANAMA. This document outlines a consultancy for the evaluation of two of these projects:

- Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020-2021)
- Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an International Centre for Mine Action (2017-2020)

I. Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020-2021)

Humanitarian Mine Action allows affected communities safe access to basic services including schools and health services, and other socioeconomic infrastructure to reduce dependency on humanitarian aid and restart livelihoods. This CERF funding focuses on assisting and working with the national mine agency (ANAMA) to ensure safe environment for rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated alongside the Line of Contact. The survey and clearance of explosive remnants of war in areas shelled during the recent armed hostilities will reduce the vulnerability of IDP returnee communities as well as in residential compounds. The project will aim at identifying and destroying unexploded ordnance and other explosive devices in conflict-affected residential areas, health and educational facilities, agricultural fields, farms, factory yards, roadsides, forest and other parts of existing infrastructure, based on UN Humanitarian assessment and Government priorities. The project covers survey (identification of the location of explosive devices), removal and destruction of found unexploded ordnance (UXO) and other explosive devices. In addition, the project will provide explosive ordnance risk education to affected communities to reduce the likelihood of accident occurring.'



The objectives of the action are stated as:

‘Ensuring safe environment for living and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated alongside the Line of Contact’

This is to be achieved through the delivery of outputs and activities under 2 results:

Result 1 EOD Clearance: Emergency Response Teams are trained, equipped and deployed

- Procurement of PPE and mine detectors
- Transportation/lodging/food/DSA
- Salaries for emergency response teams

Result 2 EORE risk education

- EORE provided to affected communities
- EORE training sessions undertaken in schools and related institutions
- Warning and educational material booklets for adults and children

II. Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an International Centre for Mine Action (2017-2020)

The history of cooperation between UNDP and ANAMA dates back to year 1999 with the first phase of Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme. The current project document represents the Phase V of the Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme.

The objectives of the action are stated as:

The immediate objective of the current phase is to continue to support ANAMA, for a period of 3 more years (2017-2019), in its formation of a fully sustainable national institution to be able to oversee all aspects of mine/UXO action programme. The project aims to support the institutional capacity of Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action. UNDP’s short-term strategy is to continue to provide ANAMA with technical, advisory, financial, networking and promotional support so that it can sustain, and further develop, its capacity. UNDP’s areas of interest, in terms of building the institutional capacity of ANAMA should focus on its ability to effectively undertake the following tasks: mine/Unexploded Ordinance clearance, international networking and support to other mine-affected countries. Project will also look to the possibility and undertake all possible actions required to continue transformation of ANAMA to the International Center for Mine Action.

This is to be achieved through the delivery of outputs and activities under 5 core results:

Result 1. Mine Clearance Operations are prioritized and continued to maximize socio economic impact.

Under this activity it is planned to achieve the Improvements in physical capital through:

- Clearance of land suitable for Irrigation systems
- Clearance of land for Road construction
- Clearance of land for Water and sanitation systems: More households with access to safe water sources;
- Clearance of land for resettlement of IDPs according to the Government priorities.



Result 2. Unexploded Ordinance clearance operations are sustained to ensure safe livelihoods for population living close to contaminated land

'This activity will help to clear **explosive remnants of** (bombs, shells, grenades, cluster munition, etc.) that did not explode when they were employed and still pose a risk of detonation, sometimes many decades after they were used or discarded.'

- Clearance of UXOs in former munition stores left over from the Soviet Army
- House Clearance operations for communities and individuals that are most affected by UXO

Result 3 Networking and certification support is provided to further promote ANAMA as an International Mine Action Center

- International Conference on Mine Action organized in Azerbaijan for the potential service recipients to get familiar with current ANAMA premises, facilities and training capacity
- Assessment mission organized for the certification of ANAMA to enable its participation in UNMAS projects worldwide
- Support in mine clearance and trainings is provided to other mine affected countries

Result 4 Infrastructure for maintenance and implementation of the demining operations and UXO clearance is upgraded

- Procurement of relevant equipment

Result 5 Gender sensitive approach on mine action is introduced

- ToT training for ANAMA staff to create the pool of trainers on gender sensitive approach to working with affected populations
- Development of training manual for ToT to be used by ANAMA staff for future trainings

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

The final evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the two project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Proposals.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information.

The evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, project team, government counterpart (ANAMA) and other key stakeholders.

The evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.



The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project as presented in the proposals. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objective.

UNDP may continue to support EORE and mobile EOD teams in future. The recommendation section of the evaluation should pay special attention to better inform such future activities in order to extract good practice and direction to inform continued mobile EOD or EORE work

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation will follow the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability, Impact, and Gender Equality will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the evaluator and agreed with UNDP.

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How relevant were the overall design and approaches of the project? • To what extent the project was able to address the needs of the target groups in the changed context? • To what extent are the objectives of the project design (inputs, activities, outputs and their indicators) and its theory of change logical and coherent? Does the project contribute to the outcome and output of the CPD? • To what extent has the project been able to adapt to the needs of the different target groups (including tackling the gender equality and social inclusion aspects)?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the project activities were delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity and timing? • What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outputs? • What were the lessons and how were feedback/learning incorporated in the subsequent process of planning and implementation? • How effective has the project been in enhancing the capacity of the communities and government to create enabling environment for the response? • To what extent the project interventions were effective?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How efficiently were the resources including human, material and financial resources used to achieve the above results in a timely manner? • To what extent was the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results? • To what extent has the project implementation strategy and its execution been efficient and cost-effective?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the project interventions contribute towards sustaining the results achieved by the project? • What are the plans or approaches of the government to ensure that the initiatives will be continued after the project ends? • What could be potential new areas of work and innovative measures for sustaining the results?



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have lessons learned been documented by the project on a continual basis to inform the project for needful change? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability of the project?
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the project initiatives indicate that intended impact will be achieved in the future?
Gender equality and social inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the project approach was effective in promoting gender equality and social inclusion - particularly focusing on the marginalized and the poor through technology transfer, reconstruction action, planning and training? To what extent has the project promoted positive changes of women and marginalised group? Were there any unintended effects?

4. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Inception report	Evaluator will review the existing documentation and will provide working plan for the evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation takes place	Evaluator submits to the UNDP CO
2	Evaluation conducted	Meetings, interviews, and Presentation of Initial Findings	End of the data gathering	Evaluator presents to project management and UNDP CO
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the data gathering phase of the evaluation	Sent to the UNDP CO, reviewed by Project Coordinating Unit
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the UNDP CO

4.1. Methodology

The evaluation will be guided by the updated UNDP evaluation guidelines on its global practices. It is expected that the evaluator will conduct an extensive project related document review, based on which prepare a draft workplan with detailed evaluation methodology proposed such as qualitative/quantitative/mixed methods. At the next stage, the evaluator should conduct field assessment applying methodologies as per the inception report. It is expected that the evaluator will organize a validation / debriefing meeting with relevant key government counterparts and UNDP, to test the assumptions, findings, and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, future improvement in possible continuation and / or replication. The list of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator is following:

- Government-UNDP-ANAMA Project Document (2017-2020)
- UNDP CERF Proposal 22 Jan 2021
- Project Document 15.02.2021
- Project related Financial Reports
- ECHO project documentation concerning EOD teams (2021-2023)



The following documents will also be available:

- Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
- UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
- Minutes of any relevant Meetings

5. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator 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 its data. The evaluator 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.

The evaluator is expected to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

6. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

- UNDP ensures the participation of key stakeholders and beneficiaries through meetings, discussions and sharing of evaluation report.
- UNDP Evaluation Owner (RR / DRR) as advisory body will provide a sounding board for the international evaluator while protecting his/her independence and ensure UNDP's ownership of the report's findings and recommendations.
- UNDP Country Office will support the conduct of the evaluation, including provision of feedback to the inception report, participation in the validation meeting, provision and coordination for comments on the draft report, distribution of the final report, and initiation of the recommendations' implementation.
- UNDP Country Office will be responsible for facilitating the provision of the existing data / documents to the international evaluator and field data collection, including preparation of field assessment schedules and logistic coordination.
- Detailed arrangements including service days and schedule of payments will be defined in UNDP's contract with the recruited Individual Consultant.
- UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner will approve the final evaluation report.

7. GENERIC GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT²

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
- Title of UNDP supported project
 - UNDP project ID#
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report

² The Report length should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes).



- Geographic areas included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Acknowledgements

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (2-3 pages)

- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Summary (between 200-500 words)
- Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction (1-2 pages)

- Purpose of the Evaluation and objectives
- Structure of the Evaluation Report

3. Project Description and Background Context (2-5 pages)

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Project link to national priorities, UNSDCF priorities, and other programme and country specific plans
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites and context
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Evaluation approach

- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the evaluation, evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations to the final evaluation

5. Findings (max. 10 pages)

5.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

5.2 Progress Towards Results



Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline ⁴ Level	End-of-project Target	Achievement Rating ⁵	Traffic Light indicator ⁶	Justification for Rating
I. Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020-2021)						
Objective: Ensuring safe environment for living and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated alongside at Line of Contact						
Output 1	Indicator 1.1a EOD clearance;	558 mln sq.m				
	Indicator 1.1b UXO/mine	820,726				
	Indicator 1.2 Procurement of PPE and mine detectors	N/A	N/A			
	Indicator 1.3: Number of people received explosive ordnance risk education	130,826	600,000			
II. Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an International Centre for Mine Action (2017-2020)						
Output 1 Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an	Indicator 1.1 Sq.m of land cleared	448 mln sq.m	523 mln sq.m			
	Indicator 1.2 Number of training services provided by ANAMA to other mine affected countries	21	27			

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

⁶ Colour code this column only



International Centre for Mine Action.	Indicator 1.3 ANAMA passed through UNMAS certification (Y/N)	N	Y			
---------------------------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--

Table: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against Targets)

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations (3-5 pages)

5.1 Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the evaluation findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Specific recommendations that would promote efficiency and effectiveness of a possible follow-on project of two mobile EOD and marking teams operating over a 24 month period (see ECHO Project Proposal).

The evaluator should make no more than 15 recommendations total.



6. Annexes

- A. Project Evaluation ToR
- B. Evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- C. Evaluation Ratings
- D. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- E. Signed evaluation report clearance form
- F. List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited
- G. List of supporting documents reviewed

ANNEX A Project Evaluation ToR

ANNEX B Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			



ANNEX C: Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future



3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained



ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants⁷

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact 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.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____
(Date)

Signature: _____

⁷ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct



ANNEX E: Report Clearance Form

Final Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP Programme Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX F: List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited

ANNEX G: List of supporting documents reviewed

7. CONSULTANT EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

I. Academic Qualifications:

- Degree or other relevant postgraduate qualification
- A formal certificate concerning 'evaluations' would be an advantage

II. Years of experience:

- 5+ years of exposure to mine action operations and Explosive Ordnance Education
- 5+ years of 'evaluation' experience.
- Knowledge or exposure to mine action in the South Caucasus required
- Experience in different international settings an advantage

III. Language:

- High level of both oral and written English required with a proven track record of quality documents and publications.
- Fluency in Azerbaijani and Russian required.

IV. Competencies:

- Organized and able to work affectively to deadlines
- Clear and logical thinker
- Possess an ability for a balanced approach to tasks to ensure complete and fair assessments are undertaken
- Well-developed interpersonal skills
- Sound accounting and financial reporting approaches
- Sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders



- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards.
- Ability to analyze cross-cutting issues such as gender empowerment, social inclusion and others

8. PAYMENT MODALITY

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

- Lump sum payment shall be made once all deliverables are performed in due time and manner.
- The breakdown is necessary.
- Daily allowance for Baku/Azerbaijan is 157 USD, elsewhere is 108 USD.
- Total working days should be no more than 35 days.
- Only economy class is applied to international consultant travel.

The payment will be proceeded upon satisfactory submission of the deliverables and based on the following schedule:

#	Deliverable	Timing	Payment schedule
1	Inception report	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation takes place	10%
2	Evaluation conducted	End of the data gathering	
3	Draft Final Report	Within 2 weeks of the data gathering phase of the evaluation	30%
4	Final Report*	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	60%