**Annexes**

# Annex I: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub has commissioned a mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the regional programme, covering the period 2018-2020.

## MTE’s Purpose

The MTE’s purpose was to review progress against the planned milestones of UNDP’s Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS under the Strategic Plan 2018-2021. It was informed by and built on “*The Evaluation of The Government of Turkey’s Contribution to UNDP’s Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS*”. It also made use of existing reports, including the independent mid-term evaluation “*UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (2014-2017): Midterm Outcome Evaluation*” conducted in 2016, as well as relevant findings of the Global Evaluation of the Strategic Plan, by the Independent Evaluation Office which is currently under completion. The MTE guided the Regional Programme in its final year of implementation and informed the design of the next Regional Programme (2022-2025).

The MTE’s objectives were to:

* Assess the progress of the Regional Programme implementation and identify gaps in achieving planned development results in the region.
* Provide RBEC Management with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through Regional Programme support and partnerships with other key players during the last three years.
* Adjust implementation through introducing corrective measures, help capture innovations, sustain and scale-up successful approaches that work in the implementation of the current programme and facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels.
* Provide inputs to other relevant evaluations and regional reports with quantitative and qualitative results achieved through the Regional Programme.
* Ensure that country level support through the Regional Programme is risk informed.
* Contribute to the validation/refinement of the theory of change underlying the Regional Programme.
* Assess the Regional Programme interventions effectiveness in mainstreaming gender in development efforts as well as application of right-based approaches in the region and provide concrete recommended actions, as required.
* Review and suggest adjustments to the Regional Programme results framework to better capture results at regional level.
* Assess the effects of the Covis-19 pandemic on the Regional Programme and identify opportunities for engagement with partners governments in areas which have emerged as priority ones in the wake of the pandemic.

## MTE’s Scope and Methodology

The MTE was conducted by an independent consultant and covered the 2018-2020 period. The MTE was informed by, built on, and expanded from the evaluation of the Turkish contribution. The assessment was forward-looking, giving specific programmatic recommendations for the final year of the Regional Programme and for the design of the successor Regional Programme Document, 2022-2025.

Key issues on which the MTE focused on were:

* Programme design and its effectiveness in achieving stated objectives.
* Assessment of key financial aspects, including planned and realized budgets, financing, etc.
* The programme’s effectiveness in building the capacity of local institutions and strengthening policy framework to encourage sustainable development.
* Strengths and weaknesses of programme implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of programme outcomes including its exit strategy.
* The MTE also focused on issues that have been to the fore of public policy by Covid and included topics such as digitization and green economic recovery.
* Recommendations, lessons learned, best practices that may be used further in the programme or in future interventions.

The MTE applied the OECD DAC criteria[[1]](#footnote-1) and definitions and has followed norms and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group. It was guided by the requirements set forth in UNDP’s evaluation toolkit, and in particular the “*Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results*”.[[2]](#footnote-2) The methodology was based on mixed methods and involved the use of commonly applied evaluation tools such as documentary review, interviews, information triangulation, analysis and synthesis.

A participatory approach was taken for the collection of data, formulation of recommendations and identification of lessons learned. MTE activities were organized according to the following stages: i) planning; ii) data collection; and, iii) data analysis and reporting. The figure below shows MTE’s three stages and key activities.

Figure : MTE Stages

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1: MTE Steps** |
| I. Planning* Development of the ToR (by the Istanbul Regional Hub)
* Start-up teleconference and finalization of work plan
* Collection and revision of programme documents
* Elaboration and submission of inception report
 |
| II. Data Collection* Further collection of programme related documents (home based)
* Interviews with key stakeholders
 |
| III. Data analysis and reporting* In-depth analysis and interpretation of data collected
* Follow-up interviews
* Development of draft MTE report
* Circulation of draft report with IRH team
* Integration of comments and submission of final report
 |

Table 1 further details the main activities that were undertaken by the team under each stage.

MTE Planning

The planning and preparation phase included the development of the ToR by the IRH Team and the design of the MTE framework which is presented in this report.

Data Collection

The MTE has primarily relied on information generated from reports, through internal systems and tools and benefited from feedback received from partners/beneficiaries as needed. It has also relied on the evaluation of the Government of Turkey’s Contribution to UNDP’s Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS for 2014-2019, which was conducted at the end of 2019. The evaluation also benefited from the experience of the evaluator with a number of evaluations of UNDP programmes and projects in the region.

* ***Desk Review*** - The data collection process involved a comprehensive desk review of programme documents, online surveys and semi-structured interviews with stakeholders and partners (see Table 2 for a list of data sources). The evaluator analyzed relevant documents, programme documents and progress reports, as well as country development policies and strategies. Documents from similar and complementary initiatives, as well as reports on the specific context of the programme were part of the analysis. Internal surveys of the IRH assessing the demand from COs were particularly informative for the MTE.

Table : Data Sources

| **Evaluation tools**  | **Sources of information** |
| --- | --- |
| Documentation review (desk study) | General documentation | * UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
* Evaluation of the Turkish contribution
 |
| Programme documentation  | * UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States - RPD (2018-2021), Strategic Plan (2014-2017), Strategic Plan (2018-2021); all umbrella Regional Project Documents;
* Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan
* Annual Consultation Meeting Reports and any other reports as applicable;
* Regional knowledge products, knowledge management and innovation initiatives supported by the Regional Programme.
* Various reports produced by the IRH.
* Internal IRH surveys
 |
| UNDP Country Offices documents/papers | Including relevant policies, laws, strategies, etc. |
| Third party reports | including those of independent local research centres, IFIs, etc.  |
| Surveys and Interviews with COs and IRH teams/staff | These included: | * Interviews with CO Senior Management
* Interviews with IRH teams/staff
* Interviews with Selected COs
 |

* ***Semi-structured Interviews*** ***with Selected COs*** – To better capture the view from the beneficiary countries, the evaluation engaged six UNDP country offices representing for each sub-region (Kosovo in Western Balkans, Belarus, Georgia and Armenia in the South Caucasus and Western CIS, and Uzbekistan and Tajikistan in Central Asia). The key questions that guided the interviews with selected COs are shown in Annex V of this report.
* ***Semi-structured Interviews*** ***with IRH Teams*** – The evaluation also engaged each of the eight IRH teams.[[3]](#footnote-3) Depending on the availability of staff, some these interviews were organized with part of the team. The key questions that guided the interviews with IRH teams are shown in Annex IV of this report.

Data Analysis

Information obtained through the documentary review and interview process has been triangulated against available documented sources, and then synthesized using analytical judgement. The method of triangulation is shown in Figure 2 below.

Figure : Method of Triangulation

**Perceptions of CO staff**

**Perceptions of IRH staff**

 **Documentation**

**Results**

Figure 3 (below) shows the steps that will be taken for the analysis.

Figure : Steps in Analysis Process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Step 1.** Develop the results chain | **Step 2.** Assess the existing evidence on results | **Step 3.** Assess the alternative explanations | **Step 4.** Assemble the performance story | **Step 5** Seek out the additional evidence | **Step 6** Revise and strengthen the performance story |

The MTE was conducted on the basis of the standard criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability (see Annex II for a more detailed list of questions that were used for the analysis of information).

* ***Relevance:*** How relevant is the Regional Programme to the priority development challenges and emerging needs of the region? What changes should UNDP make in order to make its interventions more relevant?
* ***Effectiveness:*** To what extent has the Regional Programme contributed to the realization of the intended three outcomes as outlined in the Regional Programme Document?
* ***Efficiency:*** Has the Regional Programme made good use of its financial and human resources?
* ***Sustainability:*** To what extent are the results that the Regional Programme contributed to are sustainable? Did the Regional Programme create capacities for sustained results?

The MTE focused in particular on the way the Regional Programme was adapted to respond to the Covid crisis in 2020. Care was taken to understand how the IRH has adapted the Regional Programme to respond to the urgent needs of the COs and their partners at the height of the pandemic. The MTE also explored opportunities that are created for the regional programme as the economies of the region begin to open up and set out on the recovery path. Issues that have been accelerated by the pandemic and that have been brought to the fore of public policy were explored in more detail by the MTE.

The following key questions were addressed during the MTE:

* ***Context:*** How has UNDP’s operating environment shifted in the region since the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2018-20201 and the RPD? What strategic opportunities and risks are emerging as a result?
* ***Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Results:*** Is the Regional Programme on track to make its contribution to the Strategic Plan and support Country Offices in the region? What are the gaps left to achieve UNDP's targets in the region and is the pace good enough to do so? What are the underlying causes of underperformance, if any, and key drivers of success?
* ***Lessons Learned and Recommendations:*** What are the key thematic, operational and institutional lessons to be drawn? What are the main recommendations for the final year (2021) of the Regional Programme and for the design of the next Regional Programme Document (2022-2025)?

Additionally, the following ***cross-cutting issues*** were reviewed:

* ***Gender Equality:*** To what extent has the Regional Programme promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
* ***Human Rights:*** To what extent have the most disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the region?
* ***Innovation:*** How well did the Regional Programme integrate innovative solutions and solutions to emerging development trends and challenges into the interventions under the three Outcomes?
* ***Partnerships:*** How well did the Regional Programme nurture current partnerships and build new partnerships?
* ***Capacity development***: Did the Regional Programme adequately invest in, and focus on, regional and/or national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?
* ***Knowledge management:*** Were the knowledge products (reports, studies, policy briefs, etc.) delivered by the Regional Programme relevant to the needs of countries in the region?

Data on cross-cutting issues was collected from all sources used by the evaluation. Care was taken to use thoroughly existing data, especially information produced by the surveys and assessments that the IRH conducts regularly with COs. Also, cross-cutting issues were discussed in detail in the Focus Group Discussions with the IRH teams and the in-depth interviews with selected COs.

## MTE Limitations

All possible efforts were made to minimize the limitations emerged during the MTE process. A limitation identified at the time of the preparation of the inception report that proceeded to exist during this MTE was the inability of the evaluator to conduct field work and have in-person interviews with key stakeholders due to the Covid-19 pandemic. To mitigate this limitation, the evaluator focused on documentary evidence – especially project progress reports. Further, the evaluator made use of detailed questionnaires for interviews with key stakeholders and followed up with remote interviews. Full integrity of the data collection process was maintained by ensuring an anonymous and independent process.

## Structure of the MTE Report

The report begins with an introductory section that provides a description of the evaluation report and the regional context. The second chapter provides an overview of the regional programme. The third chapter presents the main findings of the report and consists of five parts. The first part assesses key aspects of programme conceptualization and understanding by stakeholders. Parts 2 to 5 present an assessment of the results achieved by the programme along the standard dimensions of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The fourth chapter provides an assessment of gender mainstreaming of the regional programme. The fifth chapter identifies key “lessons learned” drawn from the experience of the programme. The sixth chapter summarizes the main conclusions. The last (seventh) chapter provides a set of recommendations for the consideration of the IRH team and board. Additional information supporting the arguments made throughout the document is provided in annexes to the final report.

# Annex II: EVALUATION’S TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant: Mid-term Evaluation of UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS 2018-2021**

**Type of Contract:** Individual Consultant Contract

**Languages Required:** English (Knowledge of Russian is an asset)

**Duration:** November 2020 – January 2021 (app. 55 working days over 3 months)

**Location:** Home based with possible travel to Istanbul if needed

1. **Background and Context**

The Regional Programme Document (RPD) for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) 2018-2021 was approved by the UNDP Executive Board in January 2018.[[4]](#footnote-4) The regional programme focused on regional public goods and common development challenges that are best addressed regionally or sub-regionally. Under the overall objective of accelerating achievement of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs in Europe and the CIS and closely aligned with UNDP’s Strategic Plan 2018-2021, the priorities of the regional programme are captured in the following three programme outcomes: (a) accelerating structural transformation for sustainable development through more effective governance systems; (b) addressing poverty and inequalities through more inclusive growth; and (c) building resilience to shocks and crises. The regional programme delivers on its priorities through (a) targeted regional, co-funded initiatives; (b) dedicated, high-quality programme and policy advisory services; and (c) a regional platform and impartial space for countries to address regional, sub-regional and transboundary issues.

The Regional Programme is directly implemented by UNDP, under programme oversight delegated to the Regional Director of the Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC). The Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) Manager, under the supervision of the Deputy Regional Director, is responsible for ensuring the effective management and monitoring of the regional projects. The Advisory Board (consisting of resident representatives from the region and senior management of central headquarter bureaus) provides overall guidance and quality assurance to the regional programme and help to validate its relevance vis-à-vis country and global activities. The programme is implemented through regional and sub-regional activities with country-level components.

Total financial resources for the RPD are estimated at $62.6 million over 2018-2021, including expected core resources of $4 million and $58.6 million of other or non-core resources. This midterm review is planned to take place in 2020 as per the RBEC Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for 2018-2021, and it will provide an opportunity to review progress against the planned milestones of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 and the regional programme. This evaluation is informed by and builds on “The Evaluation of The Government of Turkey’s Contribution to UNDP’s Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS for 2015-2019”. The mid-term evaluation is expected to guide the Regional Programme in its final year of implementation and to inform the design of the next Regional Programme (2022-2025).

1. **Description of Responsibilities**
	1. **Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Objectives**

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

* Assess the progress of the Regional Programme implementation and identify gaps in achieving planned development results in the region.
* Provide RBEC Management with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through Regional Programme support and partnerships with other key players during the last three years.
* Adjust implementation through introducing corrective measures, help capture innovations, sustain and scale-up successful approaches that work in the implementation of the current programme and facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels.
* Provide inputs to other relevant evaluations and regional reports with quantitative and qualitative results achieved through the Regional Programme.
* Ensure that country level support through the Regional Programme is risk informed.
* Contribute to the validation/refinement of the theory of change underlying the Regional Programme.
* Assess the Regional Programme interventions effectiveness in mainstreaming gender in development efforts as well as application of right-based approaches in the region and provide concrete recommended actions, as required.
* Review and suggest adjustments to the Regional Programme results framework to better capture results at regional level.

Scope and methodologies should be tailored to investigate the Regional Programme’s contribution to both development results and development effectiveness.

The present evaluation will cover the first half of the current regional programme cycle, i.e. 2018 and 2019, as well as 2020 to the extent feasible. The assessment should be forward-looking giving specific programmatic recommendations for the final year of the Regional Programme and for the design of the successor Regional Programme Document, 2022-2025.

* 1. **Evaluation Criteria and Key Guiding Questions**

The contribution of the Regional Programme to the outcomes will be assessed according to a set of evaluation criteria:

* ***Relevance:*** How relevant is the Regional Programme to the priority development challenges and emerging needs of the region? What changes should UNDP make in order to make its interventions more relevant?
* ***Effectiveness:*** To what extent has the Regional Programme contributed to the realization of the intended three outcomes as outlined in the Regional Programme Document?
* ***Efficiency:*** Has the Regional Programme made good use of its financial and human resources?
* ***Sustainability:*** To what extent are the results that the Regional Programme contributed to are sustainable? Did the Regional Programme create capacities for sustained results?

The following key questions should be addressed during the evaluation:

* ***Context:*** How has UNDP’s operating environment shifted in the region since the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2018-20201 and the RPD? What strategic opportunities and risks are emerging as a result?
* ***Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Results:*** Is the Regional Programme on track to make its contribution to the Strategic Plan and support Country Offices in the region? What are the gaps left to achieve UNDP's targets in the region and is the pace good enough to do so? What are the underlying causes of underperformance, if any, and key drivers of success?
* ***Lessons Learned and Recommendations:*** What are the key thematic, operational and institutional lessons to be drawn? What are the main recommendations for the final year (2021) of the Regional Programme and for the design of the next Regional Programme Document (2022-2025)?

Additionally, the following cross-cutting issues should be reviewed:

* ***Gender Equality:*** To what extent has the Regional Programme promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
* ***Human Rights:*** To what extent have the most disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the region?
* ***Innovation:*** How well did the Regional Programme integrate innovative solutions and solutions to emerging development trends and challenges into the interventions under the three Outcomes?
* ***Partnerships:*** How well did the Regional Programme nurture current partnerships and build new partnerships?
* ***Capacity development***: Did the Regional Programme adequately invest in, and focus on, regional and/or national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?
* ***Knowledge management:*** Were the knowledge products (reports, studies, policy briefs, etc.) delivered by the Regional Programme relevant to the needs of countries in the region?

The evaluation team is expected to develop an evaluation matrix by identifying and incorporating additional issues and questions.

* 1. **Methodology**

The followings are suggested approach, and final design and methods for the evaluation will be determined in consultations among the IRH, the evaluator and agreed by the Inception Report.

* **Desk reviews**: The evaluation consultant will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:
	+ RPD (2018-2021), Strategic Plan (2018-2021); all relevant Regional Project Documents;
	+ Annual Work Plans and Budgets, Progress Reports for 2018, 2019 and 2020;
	+ RBEC Integrated Work Plans and Results-Oriented Annual Reports;
	+ Related documentation of selected regional projects contributing to the RPD results in Europe and the CIS region, including websites, articles and other relevant reports;
	+ Evaluation reports of regional projects, relevant thematic or donor-specific evaluation reports;
	+ Mid-term evaluation of UNDP’s Strategic Plan 2018-2021;
	+ Programme Advisory Board and other Meeting Reports pertaining to regional priority setting, annual work planning;
	+ Regional knowledge products, knowledge management and innovation initiatives supported by the RPD;
	+ Other relevant documents that inform analysis of the environment in which UNDP in the region operates.
* **Discussions with the relevant programme and project staff**: The evaluation consultant will be working and consulting the evaluation exercise with relevant teams on a continuous basis. Briefing and debriefing meetings with the Management Team will be conducted to inform the review and evaluation process and to share any preliminary findings and observations as necessary.
* **Stakeholder interviews and focus groups**: The evaluation consultant will conduct interviews with a representative sample of relevant stakeholders, including UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at Headquarters, Istanbul Regional Hub, and Country Offices, policy makers, beneficiary groups, donors and other development partners.

During the preparatory work, a set of representative projects will be identified by the evaluation consultant, based on the consultation with IRH Management.

* 1. **Evaluation Products / Expected Deliverables / Timeframe for the Evaluation Process**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Timeline*** | ***Tasks / Deliverables*** |
| 2nd week of November | * Orientation of the team members
* Desk review
 |
| 3rd Week of November | * Submission of the Inception Report
 |
| 4th Week of November –1st Week of January  | * Data collection and analysis
* Stakeholder interviews
* Report writing
 |
| 2nd week of January | * Presentation of preliminary results to the IRH
* Submission of the draft midterm evaluation report for comments (1 weeks)
 |
| 3rd Week of January  | * Finalization of the report by incorporating IRH and other stakeholders’ comments
* Submission of the revised report for final comments (1 week)
 |
| 4th Week of January  | * Submission of the final midterm evaluation report
 |

* 1. **Schedule of Payments Based on Expected Outputs**

The total number of days of work is estimated approximately 55 working days. The breakdown corresponds to the expected outputs and schedule of payments as follows:

10 % of payment upon submission of the inception report by the 3rd Week of November 2020.

30 % of payment upon submission of the draft report by the 2nd week of January 2021.

60 % of payment upon submission of the final report by the 4th Week of January 2021.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP IRH that the above reports are accepted.

* 1. **Duration**

The Contract will enter into effect upon signature by both parties, expected to come to an end by 31 January 2021. The international consultant is expected to start in the second week of November 2020.

* 1. **Travel requirements**

Subject to international travel conditions in view of the Covid-19 pandemic, the evaluation consultant may need to work remotely, if travel to Istanbul for this evaluation is not feasible. In such case, introduction to and interviews with the relevant stakeholders and IRH teams and personnel as well as data collection will be arranged virtually.

1. **Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies**

The mid-term review and evaluation will be carried out by one independent external consultant. The evaluation consultant is responsible for developing an evaluation design, undertaking data collection activities, and preparing the draft and final reports for submission to the Istanbul Regional Hub, as well as any supporting documents prepared during the evaluation.

 The evaluation consultant shall have prior experience in similar evaluations and should not have participated in the RPD 2018 - 2021 preparation and should not have conflict of interest with any project or activity of the Programme.

The evaluation consultant is expected to be an experienced evaluation expert, he/she should have substantive knowledge of one or more areas of the UNDP regional programme, and work experience in the region under evaluation. The consultant should have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice. He/she should also have proven drafting skills, excellent communication skills, and familiarity with UN/UNDP operations.

Qualifications Requirements for the Evaluation Consultant

* Advanced university degree in social science, monitoring and evaluation, or any other relevant field.
* At least 8 years relevant experience and proven track record with policy advice and programme/project development and implementation, , including at least 3 years’ experience in conducting evaluations and reviews for international organizations;
* Good knowledge of evaluation and assessment methods, demonstrated in professional working experience;
* Experience in similar assignments which require extensive consultations and interactions with national governments and senior government officials; and also with other stakeholders such as donors, regional organizations, CSOs, etc.;
* Good knowledge and technical understanding of the UN, and in particular UNDP programmes in the relevant thematic sectors of the RPD, good understanding of Europe and the CIS region in terms of its development programmes, development issues and other evolving environment;
* Experience on application of result-based approaches to evaluating programmes and projects.
* Strong analytical capability; openness to change and ability to receive and integrate feedback;
* Strong interpersonal skills and communication skills and ability to adhere to agreed timelines and to meet tight deadlines;
* Excellent report writing, presentation and editing skills in English (knowledge of Russian is an asset).
1. **Evaluation Ethics**

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

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

The RPD Midterm Evaluation consultant will work under the guidance of the Chief, Country Office Solutions and Programme Coordination, IRH and be supported by the Programme Support Unit.

1. **Application Submission Process and Criteria for Selection**

The selection process will be based on the roster of vetted experts.

1. **Evaluator Ethics**

The evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the ‘[UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations’](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Consultant Independence:

The consultant cannot have participated in the programme preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Regional Programme Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with Programme’s related activities.

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

The consultant is responsible for ensuring he/she has vaccinations/inoculations if travelling to certain countries as part of this assignment, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The consultant is also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

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

# Annex III: PROJECTS UNDER THE REGIONAL PROGRAMME

| **SHORT NAME** | **DURATION** | **STATUS** | **Outcome** | **Respective Team** | **Location** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|
| Czech-UNDP Cooperation | Jul 01, 2004 - Jun 30, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | ALB, BIH, TUR, SRB, MKA, ARM, AZB, BEL, GEO, UKR, KAZ, KGZ, TJK, TKM, UZB |
| Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Phase II 2007-2015 | May 14, 2007 - Mar 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 3 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | KAZ, TJK, TKM, UZB, KGZ |
| Regional Ozone Project  | Feb 26, 2013 - Jul 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | TUR, TJK, UKR, UZB, BEL |
| Official Development Assistance (ODA) | Apr 17, 2012 - Dec 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | ROM, TJK |
| Aid for Trade in Central Asia (AfT Phase III) | Apr 01, 2014 - Dec 31, 2019 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | TJK, KGZ, UZB |
| Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea II  | Jan 01, 2014 - Dec 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | GEO, UKR |
| New World: Inclusive Development Initiatives | Jun 01, 2014 - Mar 31, 2018 | financially closed | Global | Nature, Energy and Climate | TUR, UKR, KAZ, TJK, KGZ, UZB, PAK, LEBAENON, JORDAN, SOUTH AFR, ZIMBABWE |
| Sustainable Development Pathways in Europe and the CIS  | Jul 01, 2014 - Dec 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | whole region |
| Slovak Partnership | Jul 01, 2014 - Mar 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | MDA, MNE, UKR |
| Int Waters Large Marine Ecosystems | Oct 01, 2015 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| SEESAC 2015-21 Small Arms Control | Jan 01, 2015 - Jan 31, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 3 | Governance and Peacebuilding | ALB, BiH, KOS, MNE, MKA, SRB, MDA |
| Support for National Comms and Reports for UNFCCC | Apr 23, 2015 - Mar 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| GEF Int. Waters:Learning Exchange And Resources Network | Mar 09, 2016 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| Reducing Mercury Releases from Health Sector in Africa | Dec 09, 2015 - Dec 31, 2020 | operationally closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Africa |
| Elimination of Violence Against Women | Sep 01, 2015 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1- Global | N/A  | Saint Helena |
| Kura II: Advancing Water Management (Kura River Basin) | Sep 01, 2016 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | AZB, GEO |
| Nagoya Protocol | Jul 06, 2016 - Jun 23, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| Inclusive Labour Market Solutions  | Jun 01, 2016 - Aug 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | ALB, BIH, MNE, SRB, MKA, KOS |
| Knowledge Management in Russia | Sep 01, 2016 - Jun 30, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | ARM, BEL, CUBA, TJK, KGZ, TKM, MDA, UZB |
| Urban Resilience Network | Jan 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2019 | financially closed | Outcome 3 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | ALB, BIH, KOS, MNE, SRB, MKA |
| Public and Private Finance for Development | Jan 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2023 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | MNE, SRB, MDA, UKR, SVK |
| Management of the Nubian Sandstone Aquifer System | Jan 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Africa |
| Regional Roma Survey  | Feb 01, 2017 - Jul 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Sustainable Development | TUR, ALB, BIH, KOS, MKA, MNE, SRB |
| CBIT Global Coordination Platform  | Jun 01, 2017 - Mar 31, 2021 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| War Crimes and the Search for Missing Persons | Apr 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2018 | financially closed | Outcome 3 | Governance and Peacebuilding | BiH, MNE, SRB, CRO |
| Cooperation & Water Management in Dniester River Basin | May 01, 2017 - May 10, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | UKR, MDA |
| Enhancing Access to Climate Finance in the ECIS Region | Aug 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | SRB,ARM,AZB,MDA,KAZ,KGZ,TJK,TKM,UZB |
| Climate Change Education and Awareness - Climate Box | Sep 01, 2017 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | ARM, BEL, MDA, KAZ,KGZ,TJK,TKM,UZB |
| Aid for Trade in Central Asia (AfT Phase IV) | Jul 01, 2018 - Jun 30, 2022 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | KGZ, TJK, UZB |
| Sixth National Reports on Biodiversity in LAC  | Nov 25, 2017 - Jun 30, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Latin America |
| Sixth National Reports on Biodiversity in Asia | Nov 25, 2017 - Dec 31, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Asia |
| Sixth National Reports on Biological Diversity in LACII | Nov 25, 2017 - Jun 30, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Latin America |
| Sixth National Reports on Biodiversity in SeveralRegions | Nov 25, 2017 - Jun 30, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| PIMS4736: Regional SAP for Nubian SAS | Sep 01, 2018 - Aug 31, 2022 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Africa |
| Energy Access SMEs Development Project | Jan 01, 2018 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | KGZ, TJK |
| Transformative Governance and Finance Facility II | Jan 01, 2018 - Dec 31, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Innovation  | ALB, KOS, MKA, SER, ARM, AZB, MDA, UKR, KAZ, KGZ, UZB |
| Dinaric Karst Aquifer System SAP – PPG  | Feb 10, 2018 - Jul 30, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Africa |
| Effective Governance Systems | Jan 02, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Governance and Peacebuilding | whole region |
| Sustainable Development Pathways | Jan 02, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | whole region |
| Resilience Building | Jan 01, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 3 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | whole region |
| Development Dialogues, Innovation and Partnerships | Jan 02, 2018 - Dec 31, 2022 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | whole region |
| Czech-UNDP Partnership for Sustainable Development Goals | May 01, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | BIH, GEO, MDA |
| Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa | Feb 01, 2018 - Nov 30, 2023 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global, RBA |
| Clean Rural Electrification for African Countries | May 01, 2018 - Mar 31, 2020 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global- Africa |
| Improving Env.Monitoring of the Black Sea, EMBLAS-Plus | Mar 05, 2018 - Mar 05, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | GEO, UKR |
| UNDP-Slovakia Partnership for Effective DevCoop for SDGs | Jun 18, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | ALB, BIH, KOS, MNE, MKA, SRB, MDA, TUR |
| KM and Capacity Building in Russia-UNDP Partnership, II | May 29, 2018 - Jun 30, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | SRB, ARM, KGZ, TJK, AZB, BEL, GEO, MDA, KAZ, TKM, UZB, CUBA, LAOS |
| Turkey- UNDP Partnership in Development | Jun 21, 2018 - Sep 30, 2020 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | RBA |
| RBEC Engagement Facility | Sep 01, 2018 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development/Management | KOS, MNE, UKR, TKM |
| Regional War Crimes | Nov 01, 2018 - Mar 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 3 | Governance and Peacebuilding | BIH, MNE, SRB |
| Inclusive Labour Market Solutions II | Jan 01, 2019 - May 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | ALB, BIH, KOS, MNE, MKA, SRB, TUR |
| EU4Climate | Jan 01, 2019 - Dec 31, 2022 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | ARM, AZB, BEL, GEO, MDA, UKR |
| Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency | Feb 14, 2019 - Dec 31, 2019 | financially closed | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| Youth, Unite and Volunteer | Nov 25, 2019 - Nov 24, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | N/A |
| High Altitude Glacio-Nival Systems | Jan 21, 2019 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | KAZ, TJK, TKM |
| Small Arms Control Roadmap Implementation | Apr 01, 2019 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 3 | Governance and Peacebuilding | ALB, BIH, KOS, MNE, MKA, SRB |
| Uranium Legacy Remediation in Central Asia. Phase II | May 15, 2019 - Dec 31, 2022 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | KGZ, TJK, UZB |
| DIKTAS-II SAP | Jun 01, 2019 - Feb 28, 2025 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | ALB, BIH, MNE |
| Nile Basin - Management of Surface and Groundwaters | Jul 01, 2019 - Jun 30, 2024 | proposal | Outcome | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |
| Integrated Climate-Resilient Transboundary Flood RM | Jul 15, 2019 - Dec 31, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | ALB, MNE, MKA |
| ISLANDS – Indian Ocean Child Project | Jul 14, 2019 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| Global CBIT II Phase A:Unified Support Platform-Paris Ag | May 01, 2020 - May 01, 2023 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| NGO Empowerment for Poverty Reduction | Jan 01, 2020 - Dec 31, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Innovation  | ALB, TUR, AZB, KGZ, TJK, TKM, KAZ, UZB |
| PPG IW:Learn 5 | Jan 01, 2020 - Sep 03, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | N/A |
| Polish Challenge Fund | Dec 30, 2019 - Apr 30, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | BEL, UKR |
| Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency | Jan 20, 2020 - Jun 30, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | Global |
| GEF IW:Learn V | Jan 01, 2021 - Dec 31, 2024 | proposal | Outcome | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |
| Glacio-Nival Systems | Oct 01, 2020 - Jul 30, 2024 | proposal | Outcome | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |
| Global CBIT Platform Phase II B for Article 13 of PA | Mar 01, 2021 - Feb 28, 2026 | proposal | Outcome | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |
| Development Services | Jul 24, 2020 - Dec 31, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Innovation  | TUR |
| Reintegration of Returnees in the Western Balkans | Oct 15, 2020 - Jun 30, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Sustainable Development | KGZ, TJK, UZB, ALB, BIH, KOS, MNE, MKA, SRB |
| RRRA in Fergana Valley and Afghanistan border areas | Nov 16, 2020 - Jul 16, 2021 | ongoing | Outcome 3 | Governance and Peacebuilding | KGZ, TJK, UZB |
| Climate Change and Resilience in Central Asia | Nov 30, 2020 - Dec 31, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Climate Change, Energy and DRR | KGZ, TJK, UZB |
| Mayors for Economic Growth Facility | Dec 16, 2020 - Dec 31, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Innovation  | ARM, AZB, BEL, GEO, MDA, UKR |
| EU4EMBLAS  | Apr 01, 2021 - Oct 01, 2024 | ongoing | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate | GEO, UKR |
| Polish-UNDP Partnership Innovative Solutions for SDGs  | May 01, 2021 - Sep 30, 2022  | ongoing | Outcome 2 | Partnerships | countries to be selected |
| PPG Dniester SAP  | Jun 01, 2021 - Jun 30, 2022  | proposal | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |
| PPG Black Sea LME  |  Jun 01, 2021 - Jun 30, 2022  | proposal | Outcome 1 | Nature, Energy and Climate |   |

# Annex IV: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH IRH TEAMS

* Has the Regional Programme been well-structured (in terms of the three *umbrella projects* and other *regional initiatives*)?
* Has the Regional Programme covered adequately all development needs that are crucial in the region?
* What have been your team’s key activities and contributions under the Regional Programme in the acceleration of SDGs in the beneficiary countries? Have you cooperated with other UN agencies in this area?
* Has your team responded under the Regional Programme to requests for support by the COs?
* Has your team been staffed appropriately to deliver the Regional Programme?
* What are some key factors that have so far positively affected the achievement of Regional Programme results?
* What are some key factors that have so far negatively affected the achievement of Regional Programme results?
* How many regional projects has your team managed in the current Regional Programme?
* How did the Regional Programme respond to your CO’s and country’s needs emerging from the Covid-19 crisis?
* What have been the main sources of funding for the Regional Programme activities you have been involved in?
* What have been the main novelties/innovations your team has achieved under the Regional Programme (if any)?
* How closely has your team collaborated with other IRH teams in the delivery of the Regional Programme?
* What opportunities are there for closer collaboration between IRH teams under the Regional Programme? How could this collaboration be strengthened?
* Can you provide 2-3 development solutions piloted/supported by your team under the Regional Programme that have been taken to scale or replicated?
* What changes or recommendations would you propose for the current Regional Programme to support the realization of the regional outcomes for this cycle and the next one?

# Annex V: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH COUNTRY OFFICES

* Which of the following regionality principles has been relevant to the contributions of the Regional Programme to your CO and country? You may select multiple options, as applicable.
* Has the Regional Programme adequately supported/complemented UNDP’s country programme in support of your country’s development needs?
* Which aspect of the Regional Programme has been most useful to your CO? How would you describe the quality of the Regional Programme in support of your country programme?
* Which Regional Project managed by the IRH would you single out for the contributions it has brought to your CO? How would you describe the strengths and value of that particular project?
* What support has your CO received from the Regional Programme in the acceleration of SDGs in your country? Have other UN agencies been involved in this area? If so, how?
* What are the areas where the Regional Programme has been strong in its capacity and response? What are the areas where the Regional Programme has been weak in its capacity and response?
* What are some key factors that have enriched your relationship with the Regional Programme?
* What are some key factors that have challenged your relationship with the Regional Programme?
* How have the Regional Projects relevant to your CO responded to your country’s emerging needs from the Covid-19 crisis (if any)? Please, provide as much detail as you can.
* Has the Regional Programme been carried out in an efficient and timely fashion from the perspective of your CO?
* How closely have IRH teams collaborated with each other in jointly delivering the Regional Programme?
* Do you think that the Regional Programme should facilitate greater exchange of expertise across COs, where a significant amount of expertise resides? How can the Regional Programme facilitate greater exchange of expertise from other regional hubs to COs?
* Can you provide 2-3 innovative development solutions piloted/supported by the Regional Programme in your country that have been taken to scale or replicated?
* What changes or recommendations would you propose for the current regional programme to support the realization of the regional outcomes for this cycle and the next one?

# Annex VI: KEY QUESTIONS DRIVING THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **Key Questions** |
| ***Relevance***Data Collection Instruments:* Interviews with COs
* Interviews with IRH staff/teams
* Interviews with IRH Management
 | * ***How relevant is the Regional Programme to the priority development challenges and emerging needs of the region? What changes should UNDP make in order to make its interventions more relevant?***
	1. To what extent do you think regional programme objectives were **aligned with country needs and priorities, policies or strategies**?
	2. How was the work conducted under this regional programme connected to the broader reform agenda under way in targeted countries? Was it integrated with the existing reform architecture? Please provide specific examples.
	3. To what extent were the **approaches taken by the regional programme** appropriate in terms of the programme **design and ‘focus**’?
	4. How coherent was the programme in terms of how it fit with the policies, programmes and programmes undertaken **by government counterparts in targeted countries**?
 |
| ***Effectiveness***Data Collection Instruments:* Interviews with COs
* Interviews with IRH staff/teams
* Interviews with IRH Management
 | * ***To what extent has the Regional Programme contributed to the realization of the intended three outcomes as outlined in the Regional Programme Document? Is the Regional Programme on track to make its contribution to the Strategic Plan and support Country Offices in the region? What are the gaps left to achieve UNDP's targets in the region and is the pace good enough to do so? What are the underlying causes of underperformance, if any, and key drivers of success?***
	1. To what extent has the regional programme (RP) **achieved its expected objectives**? Were all the planned programme outputs and outcomes achieved? What were the **key results achieved** (Please describe, in particular, what **“changes”** have been brought about by the programme)?
	2. Were there any key results not achieved and why? Were there any positive or negative unintended results?
	3. What was the quality of the deliverables?
	4. Do you think that all the strategies and plans that were supported will be implemented?
	5. What were the major **factors contributing** to the achievements of the regional programme? What were the **impeding factors**?
	6. **Partnerships**: Who were the partners in implementing the regional programme? In your view, how effective has UNDP been in using its partnerships?
	7. To what extent were government counterparts engaged and interested in programme activities? What roles did they play? Can you mention specific government actors and specific roles they played?
	8. UNDP’s role in **policy guidance**: What was the quality of upstream policy advisory services provided through this regional programme? To what extent was this programme able to affect policy change? If yes, can you mention some specific examples? What is the implication of such policy change to the country?
	9. In what ways can the RP strengthen its support to COs (what worked and what didn’t work; why)?
 |
| ***Efficiency***Data Collection Instruments:* Interviews with COs
* Interviews with IRH staff/teams
* Interviews with IRH Management
 | * ***Has the Regional Programme made good use of its financial and human resources?***
	1. **Managerial and operational efficiency**:
	2. Has the regional programme been implemented **within expected dates, costs estimates**? Explain **‘factors’** influencing the level of efficiency.
	3. Has the programme management taken prompt actions to solve implementation and other operational issues? What was **programme management structure** (incl. reporting structure; **oversight** responsibility)?
	4. How adequate were the Programme Management arrangements put in place at the start of the programme? Did the programme display effective adaptive management?
	5. What were the implications of the programme’s organizational structure for its results and delivery?
	6. **Programmatic efficiency:**
1. Were the financial resources and approaches envisaged appropriate to achieving planned objectives? Was there a ‘good’ mix of upstream and downstream efforts to maximize the results?
2. Were the resources focused on a set of activities that were expected to produce significant results (**prioritization**)? Has the programme achieved ‘value for money’?
3. Has the programme followed any known ‘best practices’?
4. Were there any efforts to ensure ‘synergies’ with other donor initiatives in the target countries? Explain results, and contributing factors.
	1. What could have been done to improve the overall efficiency of the programme?
 |
| ***Sustainability***Data Collection Instruments:* Interviews with COs
* Interviews with IRH staff/teams
* Interviews with IRH Management
 | * ***To what extent are the results that the Regional Programme contributed to are sustainable? Did the Regional Programme create capacities for sustained results?***
	1. To what extent are **regional** **programme benefits likely to be sustained**? What are the supporting/ impeding factors?
	2. What are the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of programme outcomes?
	3. What plans were put in place to ensure the continuity of the efforts (e.g., funding, technical capacity)? Has there been an **exit strategy** that describes these plans?
	4. Do you think that the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the programme benefits continue to flow?
	5. Would you want to see this programme extended in its current form or some other form?
	6. Do you think a programme like this would be useful in promoting the achievement of SDGs in the respective countries?
 |
| ***Context/Positioning***Data Collection Instruments:* Interviews with COs
* Interviews with IRH staff/teams
* Interviews with IRH Management
 | * ***How has UNDP’s operating environment shifted in the region since the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2018-20201 and the RPD? What strategic opportunities and risks are emerging as a result?***
	1. To what extent has the programme been **responsive** to meeting the needs of targeted countries?
1. How responsive was the programme to changes in development priorities in the sector?
2. To what extent has the programme been able to adapt its ongoing programme to take into account the changing realities and sensitivities in the targeted countries?
3. To what extent has UNDP been able to adjust its implementation approach specifically to respond to the challenges created by political and institutional changes?
	1. To what extent has the programme been able to **integrate the concept of sustainable development** (design, allocation of resources and implementation)? Examples?
	2. What **has been the comparative advantage of** UNDP, when compared to other actors?
* To what extent has UNDP been able to provide **technical guidance**, and knowledge?
* What are UNDP’s **comparative strengths**, vis-à-vis other partners, if any?
* To what extent do UNDP have the skills and expertise needed to support this area?
	1. To what extent has the programme been able to establish **partnerships and networks** with relevant partners and build strategic alliances in supporting key national priorities in the targeted countries?
	2. What do you think would be the **role of UNDP in helping planning for, implementing strategies to achieve and/or monitor progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals?**
 |
| ***Lessons Learned and Recommendations*** | * ***What are the key thematic, operational and institutional lessons to be drawn? What are the main recommendations for the final year (2021) of the Regional Programme and for the design of the next Regional Programme Document (2022-2025)?***
 |
| ***Gender Equality*** | * ***To what extent has the Regional Programme promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?***
 |
| ***Human Rights*** | * ***To what extent have the most disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the region?***
 |
| ***Innovation*** | * ***How well did the Regional Programme integrate innovative solutions and solutions to emerging development trends and challenges into the interventions under the three Outcomes?***
 |
| ***Partnerships*** | * ***How well did the Regional Programme nurture current partnerships and build new partnerships?***
 |
| ***Capacity development*** | * ***Did the Regional Programme adequately invest in, and focus on, regional and/or national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?***
 |
| ***Knowledge management*** | * ***Were the knowledge products (reports, studies, policy briefs, etc.) delivered by the Regional Programme relevant to the needs of countries in the region?***
 |
| ***COVID-19*** | * ***Has the Regional Programme been adapted to respond to the Covid-19 crisis throughout 2020? Against the backdrop of the Covid-19 pandemic, what opportunities do you see emerging for the Regional Programme?***
 |

1. Criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of development efforts. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/get_handbook.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The following teams were engaged in semi-structured interviews.

1. Climate & Disaster

2. Nature, Climate & Energy

3. Governance & Peace Building

4. Sustainable Development

5. Health & HIV

6. Gender Equality

7. Knowledge & Innovation

8. Partnerships [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2018-2021 [https://undocs.org/DP/RPD/REC/4](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fundocs.org%2FDP%2FRPD%2FREC%2F4&data=02%7C01%7Chazal.bolerek%40undp.org%7Cddb128ba64c541a7799408d7c5bc7401%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637195285501435344&sdata=W43qVTFK5zUjMLr24FFnT786FRMcFQK4kN0W3HRauNM%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)