# Terms of Reference

(Abridged version)

# Position: Evaluator/International Consultant

**Location:** home based **(remote)**

**Additional Category:** Crisis Prevention and Recovery (CPR)

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** Consultant

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

**Starting Date:** April 1st - May 31st, 2021

# Duration of Assignment: 2 months, with up to 20 working days 1/ Background and context

|  |
| --- |
| PROJECT INFORMATION |
| **Project name** | Horizons Project - Strengthening Community Resilience in Abkhazia |
| **Project Atlas ID** | 00100478 |
| **Country** | Georgia |
| **Project geographic area** | Abkhazia |
| **Project dates** | Start: 20-Jun-2016, End: 18-Jun-21 |
| **Project budget:** | 7,550,000USD |
| **Project expenditure as of 31-Dec- 2020:** | 6,412,346.49 |
| Funding Source | USAID |
| **Implementing party** | UNDP (jointly with UNICEF) |

UNDP in partnership with United Nation Children’s FUND (UNICEF) and with the financial support from USAID launched a 5-year Horizons Project (hereinafter, the project) covering the period from June 2016 till June 2021. The overall purpose of the project is to expand opportunities for dialogue and confidence building between the youth, professional groups, and civil society organizations located in Abkhazia and across the Administrative Boundary Line (ABL) in Georgia. Target groups are women of reproductive age and children, with focus on reducing disparities across regional, ethnic and income level groups; young people with focus on reducing disparities across regional, ethnic and income level and behavioral risk groups; health professionals (doctors and nurses), key population affected by HIV/AIDS, etc. Another target group is 6–21- year-old youth of all communities in Abkhazia, especially children living in rural areas as well as teachers, principals, students and parents. Target groups within business education and vocational training are students of VET schools and students of ASU as well as general population from age 18 above, interested in developing their entrepreneurial skills and starting up income generation activities on their own.

# 2/ Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

UNDP seeks to conduct a decentralized independent final evaluation of the Horizons project. The final evaluation is largely a management tool to provide project teams and stakeholders with an account of results achieved, assess project progress against initial plans, project document and cost-sharing agreement, highlight important lessons learnt, demonstrate sustainability of the results and ownership of the project by the beneficiaries. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the efficacy of the project design, relevance of the project outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the project’s approach, and sustainability of the Horizons project.

The purpose of the evaluation is to study the demand in targeted communities for similar initiatives, analyse the implementation of the project in 2016-2020 against the planned results and its contributions to the development of community revitalization and resilience in Abkhazia, draw conclusions and lessons learned as well as recommendations for follow-up interventions. The evaluation will highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices and provide recommendations for similar initiatives to be implemented in future.

The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of HORIZONS project from 2016 to 2021 under its four expected outputs:

1. *Improved access to quality health services for vulnerable populations;*
2. *Improved access to quality education, skills development and social participation opportunities for children and youth;*
3. *Enhanced dialogue across respective youth and professional groups;*
4. *Enhanced Business Development Skills and Access to Vocational Trainings for Young People.*

# 3/ Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

*The DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance, OECD (1991) are the general basis for the evaluation: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The evaluation will be guided by the following UNDP-DAC criteria:*

# Relevance

The degree to which Horizons project provided relevant response to current needs and evolved to take account of changing circumstances:

 To what extent did the project contribute to the outcomes and outputs of UNDP Country Programme Document, the SDGs and the UNDP Strategic Plan?

 To what extent did Horizons project provide integrative space for local minorities, all ethnic groups, women, disabled and economically vulnerable population?

 To what extent was Horizons adapted to the local volatile environment?

# Effectiveness

The degree to which Horizons project has succeeded in achieving its stated objectives/results:

 To what extent were the project outputs and outcomes achieved? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes?

 In which areas does the Horizons project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?

 Has the project impacted the target beneficiaries and how?

 In which areas has the project encountered challenges? What have been the constraining factors and how they could be overcome?

 What, if any, alternative/additional strategies would have been more effective in achieving Horizons project objectives?

 To what extent did the project take conflict sensitive and flexible approach to navigate the local volatile environment and effectively support local civil society?

 To what extent has the project contributed to engagement of youth?

 To what extent the project adapted to new operational environment in response to COVID-19 pandemic?

 To what extent project established effective synergies and complementarities with relevant projects funded by other donors, in particular, UNDP, (COBERM, ENPARD, CSSP), UNICEF as well as, UN Women, UNHCR interventions

# Efficiency

The degree to which Horizons project had been cost-efficient in the process of transforming inputs into outputs and outcomes:

 To what extent was the management structure of Horizons project outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?

 To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?

 To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?

 To what extent did the local sensitivities affect the efficiency of the Horizons project implementation? To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by the project ensure effective and efficient the project management?

# Sustainability

The extent to which the changes (and benefits) brought about by Horizons project can be expected to last after project completion:

 What are (if any) social, financial or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of the project outputs?

 To what extent was the level of stakeholders’ ownership encouraged in order to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?

 To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow the communities and various groups to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?

 What could be done to strengthen existing strategies and sustainability?

# Due consideration of Cross-cutting issues:

**Human rights**

 To what extent have vulnerable groups, including the economically and physically challenged, women, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the project?

# Gender equality

 The extent to which gender considerations have been incorporated as a cross-cutting issue, in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project, including the ways Horizons project has supported the implementation of the UNSC Resolution 1325.

# Environment

 To what extent the project used eco-friendly approach when implementing its activities? Along with the DAC criteria, the evaluation team will consider the additional criteria of:

**Coherence, coordination and complementarity:** assessing the coherence of the project in the area of promotion of **the social and economic resilience of local communities**, as well as its complementary and synergies with other UNDP and UN projects.

# The final list of evaluation questions and tools to be proposed by the evaluator and agreed with UNDP in the Inception report.

**4/ Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

The evaluator will be required to use few different methods to ensure that data collection and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, such as: desk studies and literature review, quantitative data, individual interviews, questionnaires, and other approaches for data gathering and analysis. This approach will not only enable the final evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means, but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be developed and presented by the Evaluator in the Inception Report. While proposing the methodology, the Consultant should be guided by UNDP approach to project evaluations[[1]](#endnote-1).1

The methodology will be based on the following:

1/ A Comprehensive desk review of relevant background documents on Horizons project,

2/ Interviews with the relevant UNDP Country Office and the project staff, USAID representatives, INGOs, CSOs, and other partners and stakeholders on the ground. The Evaluator should prepare relevant questionnaire for individual online interviews.

3/ Interviews with the groups of beneficiaries affected by the outcomes of the project, such as training and educational courses participants.

The Consultant is particularly encouraged to use participatory methods to ensure that all partners and stakeholders are consulted as part of the evaluation process. The Consultant shall take measures to ensure data quality, reliability and validity of data collection tools and methods and their responsiveness to gender equality and human rights. In the process of data collection, the Consultant shall take measures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key information providers.

Considering that the evaluation will be conducted remotely (due to COVID related travel restrictions), the Evaluator should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conducts the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should also be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the UNDP’s commissioning unit (CPR Team Leader and M&E specialist).

# 5/ Evaluation products (deliverables)

The main products provided by the Evaluator should include:

* **Evaluation inception report (5-10 pages) –** prepared following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP and UNICEF (Horizons team) after the desk review and submitted prior to start of the interviews. The report should include the evaluation matrix outlining the evaluation criteria, questions, data sources, data-collection methods/tools, indicators, methods for data analysis. (Suggested content of Inception Report is attached at Annex 1)
* **Draft evaluation report (40-60 pages) –** addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report), as well quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines. It will be prepared and submitted for review by the UNDP (Suggested template of Evaluation Report attached as Annex 2).
* **Evaluation debriefing sessions – with the Horizons team and UNDP Country office** at the beginning and end of the interviews conducted.
* **Evaluation report audit trail -** Comments provided by UNDP and UNICEF, changes made by the evaluator in response to the draft report.
* **Final evaluation report –** Prepared taking into consideration the comments provided by the UNDP.

# The criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:

 The report has to be written in clear language (English)

 The Executive Summary should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

 The information in the report has to be complete, well-structured and well presented.

 The information in the report has to be reliable i.e. well documented and supported findings.

 The information in the report has to address priority or strategic information needs.

 The conclusions related to the implementation of the project should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, challenges and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically linked to the final 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 project beneficiaries and UNDP.

 Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable

 Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account.

# 6/ Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[2]](#footnote-1).2 Code of conduct is enclosed as Annex III and constitutes integral part of this TOR. 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.

# 7/ Timeframe for evaluation process and payment schedule:

It is expected that the evaluation will be conducted no later May 15th, 2021 within up to 20 working days with the following timeline for activities/deliverables:

# Until April 5, 2021

* + **Development of evaluation design** (including proposed Evaluation Questions (EQ), methodology and tools) and workplan.
		- Desk review of relevant documents.

# Until April 15, 2021

* + **Submission of the inception report**

**Until May 12, 2021**

* + **Preparation and submission of the draft Evaluation report to UNDP and UNICEF Country Office**
		- Meetings with key stakeholders, including the project staff, UNDP, UNICEF and USAID representatives (online consultations/interviews)
		- Interviews with implementing partners (Abkhazia), beneficiaries and other stakeholders, including representatives of international organizations, meetings with Horizons project staff in Abkhazia (online mode)
		- Debriefing with UNDP and USAID on preliminary findings (online mode).

# Until May 31, 2021

* + **Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP and UNICEF Country Office.**

 **Payment schedule:**

The payment of the fee will be processed in one instalment, after the completion of all activities and upon submission of all deliverables listed above.

For quality assurance, all deliverables will be approved by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative. Pending this approval, payment will be made accordingly.

# 8/ Implementation Arrangements

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

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

During the final evaluation, the evaluator is expected to interact with/interview the project beneficiaries, donor and UN agencies, consultants, civil society organizations and all other relevant stakeholders whose list and contact details will be provided to the Evaluator at the inception of the assignment.

Since the evaluation will be conducted remotely, the project team will assist the Evaluator with the planning of the online activities and interviews and ensure the stakeholder engagement.

# 9/ Required Qualifications and Competencies

**Education**:

Masters' degree in social sciences, international relations, political science, development studies, or other related domain; concentration in conflict prevention and peace studies is an asset.

# Experience:

* Substantive international experience (at least 7 years) in the field of conflict-sensitive development, civil society development, project management, conflict settlement;
* Prior experience in professional engagements in/for Abkhazia – provision of trainings, consultancy, evaluation;
* Five years of international experience in evaluating projects in the area of civil society development, conflict-sensitive development; more recent experience in evaluating USAID funded projects is considered an asset;
* Experience in supporting programmatic improvements in human rights field is preferable;
* Knowledge of USAID and United Nations system, practices, and procedures, including UNDP Programme modalities, particularly in conflict-affected areas;
* Previous experience in the facilitation/participation in peace processes and cross-conflict dialogue activities will be an asset for the position.

# Language Requirements:

Fluency in English, knowledge of Russian language is an asset.

# Competencies

## Interpersonal and communication skills:

* Strong communication skills and proven ability to collaborate with different actors (UNCT, Government, civil society, etc.);
* Flexibility, discretion, and tact;
* Excellent diplomatic skills and ability to work in very sensitive political environments;
* Experience in managing a multi-cultural team, proven conflict sensitivity.

## Professional skills:

* Good analysis and judgment;
* Teamwork, proven time management and results-orientation;
* Proactive in problem-solving and recommendation for conflict prevention and resolution;
* Strong ability in understanding and managing confidential and politically sensitive issues, in a responsible way.

## Technical aptitudes:

* Strong written and oral presentation skills of proposals, briefings, reports, strategies, etc.
* Ability to prepare clear and comprehensive written analytical reports under tight deadlines;
* Strong computer skills.

# 10/ Criteria for selection

The Vetted roster-monitoring and evaluation, peacebuilding, and community development was used as a pre- selection tool for identification of the most suitable candidates. Potential experts were identified by checking their P11 and if available their CV’s uploaded.

Applicants are requested to send their applications no later than March 3, 2021, to Horizons project manager - ivana.laginja@undp.org. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications containing a current and

complete CV in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact and a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (only daily fee, since it is foreseen for assignment to be conducted online).

# ANNEX I

**Suggested Content of Inception Report**

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

# ANNEX II

**Evaluation Report Template**

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability of results, for decision-making on policies and Programmes, and to strengthen organizational learning in order to improve the impact of activities. The report is concise, easy to understand and rigorous. The report explains the methodology followed, presents evidence-based findings as well as conclusions and recommendations.

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 descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ and ‘Ethical Standards for Evaluations’.3

The report should include the following:

**Title and opening pages—**Should provide the following basic information:

* + Name of the evaluation intervention
	+ Time frame of the evaluation and date of the reports
	+ Country of the evaluation intervention
	+ Name of the evaluator
	+ Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
	+ Acknowledgements

**Table of contents—**Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

# List of acronyms and abbreviations

**Executive summary—**A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

* + Briefly describe the intervention (the Programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
	+ Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
	+ Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
	+ Summarize principal findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**Introduction—**Should:

* + 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.
1. UNEG, ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’, 2005, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/>unegstandards; and UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008, available at [http://www.un-eval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.](http://www.un-eval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical%2Bguidelines)
	* 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 (the Programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
	* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

**Description of the intervention—** Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. 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 map 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. Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a Programme) 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 i**mplementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

**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 user s will make, the issues they will need to consider in ma king 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.4 The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.

1. The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

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.

**Evaluation approach and methods5—**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 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:

* 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 the 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.
* Performance standards6— 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 engagement—Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement

contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

* Ethical considerations— The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see

UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for E valuators’ for more information).7

* 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.

**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. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the

1. 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.
2. A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.
3. UNEG, ‘ Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 20 08. Available at http :/[/www.uneval.org/](http://www.uneval.org/) search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

**Findings and conclusions —** The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

Findings — Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and 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 Programme or Programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.

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.

**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. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the Programme exit strategy, if applicable.

**Lessons learned—**As ap propriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circum-stance (intervention, context outcomes, even a bout evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Les sons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

**Report annexes—**Suggested annexes should 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 List of supporting documents reviewed
* Programme results map or results framework
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
* Short biography of the evaluator and Code of conduct signed by evaluator.

# ANNEX III

**Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

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

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

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.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

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.

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.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)