TERMS OF REFERENCE

Multi Country Evaluation of Local Governance Projects in Kiribati and Tuvalu

Introduction

Decentralization and local governance is one of the key service lines that guides UNDP's Programmatic interventions at the country level. Given the existence of a variety of local governments' structures and systems in the majority of the Pacific Island Countries, this service line provides the basis for country level support to local governments under the broader framework of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcome area of good governance and human rights. This TOR provides the following information to prospective applicants: (i) brief contextual background of the local governance projects in Kiribati and Tuvalu; (ii) purpose and scope of work; (iii) expected outputs; (iv) institutional arrangements, duration of work, duty station and report format and associated requirements.

Project description

Kiribati – Strengthening Decentralized Governance in Kiribati (SDGIK)

The Republic of Kiribati is an egalitarian society where culture and religion exerts considerable amount of influence on both formal and informal (tradition) governance system and structures. It comprised of 33 atolls and reefs and shares many of the development constraints, risks and limitations facing Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Apart from their small size other factors including scant opportunity for economic diversification, few livelihood options constant emigration of youth and professionals to urban centres, and threats due to geography and climate such as scattered and remote islands, limited arable land, insufficient fresh water sources and vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change. These factors have placed enormous challenges on the financial and administrative abilities of central and local governments to deliver goods and services to the outer islands communities. Local Governance is provided by 23 Island Councils in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1984.

In an attempt to address the well-documented lack of services on the outer Islands, Government strategy to date as articulated in the National Development Strategies 2004-2007 is geared towards promoting the upgrading of Outer Island governance systems, support for commercial production of goods and services in rural areas and provision of

appropriate Outer Island infrastructure. On the basis of the above national strategic policy focus and the legal framework of Local government Act, UNDP in partnership with the Government of Kiribati has been providing support to local governments. This began on 22 October 2004 when the Government of Kiribati and UNDP endorsed the Strengthening Decentralized Governance in Kiribati (SDGIK) Project document, paving ways for the mobilization of required resource inputs for the delivery of outputs and outcomes in accordance with the project's multi-year results and resources framework.

The SDGIK project aims to achieve the following key outputs:
- (i)   island/ward level profiles with MDG indicators developed;
- (ii)   a development and funding framework for the outer islands developed;
- (iii)   local governance reformed;
- (iv)   local governance systems reformed and capacity developed to support the reform;
- (v)   a model for improving ICT to outer islands developed, trialed and evaluated;
- (vi)   partnership between Island councils, Communities, NGOs, private sector and central government facilitated;
- (vii)   civic awareness conducted and communities mobilized for advocacy and participation.

It is envisaged that this project would support outer islands local governments to achieve an outcome where budgeting processes at the sub-national levels have been reformed to more effectively incorporate community level perspectives, participation and needs; and that local authority and communities and outer islands and urban areas involved in planning and management of development activities, including the provision of public services and adequately equipped to tackle development issues.

By December 2007, the project was able to implement all major activities that fall under five of seven key output areas. As the project is coming to its close within the first 3 months of 2008, it was decided in the October 2007 Tripartite project review meeting that outputs 2 and 5 will not be implemented. Funds that were allocated to these outputs have been realigned to support the completion of outstanding activities that are directly related to the five implemented outputs. A remarkable achievement was the completion of a island profiles. These profiles contain relevant data across different sectors for each island and they uphold the culture of Kiribati particularly the three pillars of Kiribati's bestowment of blessing – *Te Mauri* (Health, wellbeing, greetings*), Te Raoi (*Peace*) and Te Tabomo (*Prosperity*). The profiles also provide up to date and contextual data to enhance evidence based decision making at the village, islands council and national levels. It also provide baseline information that could be used to measure the social and economic status of the people in the islands.

Tuvalu – Support to Local Governance for Enhanced Islands Development Programme

Tuvalu occupies a land area of just twenty-six square kilometers (2,600 hectares) on nine atolls in the Central Pacific just south of the equator. The atolls are spread over an Exclusive Economic Zone of 900,000 square kilometers. The total population size is about 10,000 with slightly more than 40 percent resident on the urbanized island of Funafuti. Tuvalu also shares many of the development constraints, risks and limitations

facing Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In Tuvalu, the Falekaupule are the traditional decision-making bodies of each of the eight island communities. On most islands, the Falekaupule is predominantly comprised of men over the age of 50, with some women who are *Matai* (Chief) and/or widowed participating in Falekaupule Assemblies and other meetings, with limited speaking and decision-making rights.

The need for special development focus on outer islands is keenly felt in Tuvalu. The outcomes of National Summit on Sustainable Development (NSSD) held in 2004 as well as Tuvalu National Sustainable Development Strategy the *Kakega* II provide comprehensive accounts of the challenges and development needs of outer islands. With the view to devolve powers to the local authorities to manage and plan their own administrative, financial and development initiatives, the national parliament passed the Falekaupule Act in 1997 after wide consultations that were supported by UNDP. This Act allows the local government or *Kaupule,* within the mandate of the *Falekaupule* or the traditional decision making body on each atoll, to design and implement each islands development programmes.

The primary strategy adopted in this project is directed towards improving central government's capacity to better meet its responsibilities for islands development and local governance. It is also to provide technical support and capacity building opportunities to the *falekaupules, kaupules,* local communities, women and youth as well as any other parties to better identify, develop, implement, backstop, monitor and evaluate development programmes. The support of the central government is pivotal for the success of development programmes in the outer islands as well as on Funafuti which contains the largest single proportion of the population with the Funafuti *Kaupule* sharing the biggest burden to support the local population.

Since 2004, the project aims to achieve the following outputs:
   (i)   Planning and Training Unit (PTU) established within MHARD.
   (ii)   Training programme conducted on project planning, including design, appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for MHARD, local government, NGO and other relevant agency staff on Funafuti. Training content should have included economic, social, legal and engineering issues and skills.
   (iii)   Training programme on project planning, including design, appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for all remaining island Falekaupules, *Kaupules* and their local stakeholders.
   (iv)   Training content to include economic, social, legal and engineering issues and skills.
   (v)   Policy and technical advice, legal advice, and engineering advice and support provided on on-going and on demand basis on all aspects of local governance and development initiatives for MHARD an all island councils.
   (vi)   Falekaupule Act and Primer Translated into Tuvaluan language.
   (vii)   ICT Strategy Developed for support to outer islands development, within the national ICT Strategies, programme and resource mobilization strategies formulated to implement strategies.

It is envisaged that following the implantation the activities and under respective outputs capacity of relevant central government as well as outer island governments is built to support accountable and participatory governance in the outer islands.

With implementation and completion of activities under each output relating to training and capacity building in the area of financial management, paralegal and project management training, it was observed (see Annual Project report 2006/2007) that the capacity of local government staff and local communities in particular and generally NGOs, private sector and local groups have been enhanced to carry out their participatory responsibilities in accordance with the Falekaupule Act 1997. Notable achievements include the translation, publication and distribution of the Falekaupule Act; and the update and compilation of the Falekaulpule Trust Fund Deeds which facilitate distribution of Falekaupule Trust Fund (FTF) money to outer islands. As the project is coming to its close in May 2008 and in view of the need to sustain the project benefits and achievements as well as addressing some of the capacity building gaps that have been identified in previous Annual and quarterly project review report, it is important that an evaluation is commissioned to inform the next phase of this project.

Purpose
The UNDP MCO Fiji is currently in the process of formulating the CPAP under the new CPD 2008-2012. In Kiribati and Tuvalu decentralization and local governance is a component of the proposed programmes for the next programme cycle which had been documented in the countries' Country Programme Action Plans (CPAP) concept notes and Results and Resources Frameworks (RRF). It therefore important that this evaluation generate useful information to enable UNDP, the respective National implementing Partners as well as development partners to use evidence based decision-making approach in determining the scope and focus of UNDP's intervention in the area of decentralization and local governance. Additionally, it is anticipated that this project evaluation should provide the basis for extracting lessons that could be incorporated in future local governance programmes in Kiribati and Tuvalu in particular and other Pacific Island counties in general.

Objectives
The objective of this consultancy is to undertake individual evaluation of local governance projects currently being supported by UNDP in Kiribati and Tuvalu. More precisely the consultant is expected to:
- Assess the projects' accomplishments to date and its contributions towards the achievement of outcomes, , including any constraints on its effectiveness, and any unintended outcomes

- Assess the direct and indirect effects of the project on intended beneficiaries and broader socio-economic, political, MDG and gender dimensions.

- Assess the appropriateness of the project design particularly as it relates to the achievement of project objectives, its linkages with the government's national strategic plans, policy on decentralization and problems it intends to address.

- Assesses the management and implementation arrangement of the project,

including financial and human resource management, monitoring and oversight as well as the risks and risk management strategies in terms of their contribution to the delivery of project results in accordance with the project Results and Resources Framework (RRF)

- Identify key factors which have contributed to the program's successes and failures

- Document the lessons learned in the design, delivery, management and monitoring of the project that will add value to second phase of local governance projects in Kiribati and Tuvalu

- Recommend options for the continuation, conclusion or modification of this program, including programmatic areas and management structure.

- Identify and suggest possible outputs and activities for the next phase of the project(s), and incorporate them into UNDP´s Results and Resources Framework.

Scope of work
In order to accomplish the above objectives, the consultant will:
- Undertake a briefing with the UNDP Multi Country Office Team prior to commencement of the evaluation process;
- Be briefed by local teams in Tuvalu and Kiribati prior to commencing any in-country consultations;
- Undertake a literature review, considering in particular, relevant documentation and credible sources (list, including some reading materials will be forwarded to successful consultant prior to in country visits);
- Review local governance project document for Tuvalu and Kiribati;
- Review any other relevant documents, including, government policy documents, national development plans, relevant academic papers, and the projects' Annual and quarterly progress reports.
- Consult with key national stakeholders, including those in outer islands. The following people must be consulted at a minimum.
    o Local government Departments in Kiribati and Tuvalu (implementing partners);
    o Visit, observe and conduct interviews with island councilors and community members in two outer islands both in Kiribati and Tuvalu.
    o Civil society representatives and media;
    o Women representatives in outer islands;
    o Consult with donor community in Kiribati
- Consult with project staff. The following staff must be consulted at a minimum:
    o MCO Development services and Governance team;
    o Local Governance project Coordinators/Managers in Kiribati and Tuvalu;

- Other organisations involved in Local governance support activities, including Governance Team of the UNDP Pacific Centre, UN organisations and Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF).
- At the end of country visit the consultant is expected to meet and present the initial results with key informants for debriefing to validate initial findings in terms of facts and interpretations.

Expected Outputs, timelines and milestones

The main output of this consultancy will be two project evaluation reports with detailed accounts of recommendation and proposed outputs, activities and costs for phase II of local governance projects in Kiribati and Tuvalu respectively. The project evaluation reports shall be drafted in accordance with the following format (see Attached). The Consultancy shall follow the following schedule and milestones of deliverables:

Deliverable	Dates[1]	Days	Responsible party
Consultant recruited	1st week of January 2008		UNDP MCO
Review of project document and relevant document carried out and completed	10 January 2008	4	Consultant
Briefing & interviews with UNDP programme staff, UN agencies and CLGF and preparation for in country mission	16 January 2008	2	Consultant
TUVALU – In country travel, visits to project sites, including interviews and observations completed	18 January 2008	15	Consultant
Inception report for Tuvalu Evaluation completed and submitted to UNDP MCO Governance Team Leader.	1 January 2008		Consultant
Debriefing with MCO, and write up time	4 February 2008	1	Consultant
KIRIBATI – In country travel, visits to project sites including interviews and observation completed	5 February 2008	15	Consultant
Inception report for Kiribati Evaluation completed and submitted to UNDP MCO Governance Team Leader	19 February 2008		Consultant Report reviewed by UNDP
First draft evaluation reports including proposed activities and costs for phase II of project for Kiribati and Tuvalu drafted and submitted to UNDP Multi-Country Office	22 February 2008	3	Consultant
First feedback from UNDP MCO formulated and forwarded to consultant.	27 February 2008		UNDP MCO
Consultant to incorporate feedback and submit Final Draft evaluation report to UNDP MCO	29 February 2008	3	Consultant
Final feedback from UNDP MCO (and other key stakeholders) forwarded to consultant	26 March 2008		UNDP MCO
Consultant to incorporate feedback and submit Final evaluation report to UNDP MCO	2 April 2008	3	Consultant
		46	

---

[1] * Logistical difficulties may occur, and timeline may have to be revised accordingly

Copies of all work will be delivered in both hard copies as well as in electronic format. Reports produced and recommendations are the property of UNDP and cannot be reproduced without permission of same.

Management and Coordination Arrangement
The Consultant shall be reporting directly to the Governance Team Leader at the MCO who shall exercise oversight throughout the duration of the Consultancy engagement. Upon the request of the UNDP MCO, the Pacific Centre through the Regional Governance Adviser shall provide complementary technical oversight and guidance during the course of the consultancy. This will be undertaken through engagement with the consultant during in-country visits and or through comments on the draft reports submitted to UNDP.

Duty Station and duration of work
This evaluation requires the consultant to travel to Tuvalu and Kiribati as well as to Suva Fiji. While in Tuvalu and Kiribati the consultant is required to travel to projects sites in outer islands to observe and conduct interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders who will be jointly identified by National Project directors and UNDP. The total timeframe for this assignment is roughly 7 week, to be taken from January to February 2008.

Qualifications and experience

- Advanced University Degree in Political Science, Public Policy and Administration, Governance, International Development and/or Evaluation
- Familiarity with the characteristics of local government systems in the Pacific. Familiarity with systems in Kiribati and Tuvalu preferred.
- Proven experience in project evaluation and some experience in project formulation. Experience in managing decentralization projects preferred.
- Some experience of working within the United Nations Development Program preferred.

- Experience in gender analysis preferred;
- Strong conceptual and analytical skills;
- Good representational and liaison skills;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills;
- Excellent interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills; and
- Ability to meet deadlines;

Scope of Bid and Payment process
This consultancy will be undertaken using the Special Services Agreement (SSA) contracting modality where the contract price is a fixed output based price regardless of extension of time. In accordance with UNDP procurement guidelines prospective applicants are required to include in the computation of their contract price professional fees, travel and daily subsistence allowance. Following the identification of successful

applicant and preparations[2] of SSA contract, a proposed schedule of payment will be as follows:

- 20 percent to be paid upon signing of the contract

- 30 percent after Tuvalu Inception report is submitted

- 30 percent on receipt of first draft evaluation report; addressing MCO comments received at that time.

- 20 percent on receipt of the final evaluation report, addressing feedback from stakeholders on the draft report.

Application requirements
Applicants should send information on referees, an updated current CV and a cover letter setting out:
- How the applicant meets the selection criteria
- Evaluation approach and methodology
- Proposed costs for undertaking this consultancy

Applications are due by 10am Fiji time (+12GMT), Thursday 3 January 2008

Applications should be sent to registry.fj@undp.org.

Queries should be sent to Brian Lenga (brian.lenga@undp.org), with a copy to Helga-Bára Bragadóttir (helga.bragadottir@undp,org)

Annexes:

- Guidelines for Reviewing the Evaluation Report
- Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP

---

[2] Asístanse with regards to the calculation of flights costs and flight schedules for travel to Tuvalu, Kiribati and Fiji could be provided to applicants by MCO if requested.

REVIEWING THE EVALUATION REPORT

Description of the report

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programme, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

This note draws extensively from the **United Nations Evaluation Group Standards for Evaluation in the UN** complemented by guiding principles outlined above.

A good evaluation report must be guided by the criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness as defined below.

1. Utility: An evaluation report is useful when the report is:
    o Complete in providing information on the context for the evaluation to allow reader to decide on the value it will derive from the evaluation (i.e evaluability assessment, stakeholder involvement, evaluator or institutional credibility, alignment of evaluators with national institutions, bases for interpretation, budget, timing, national involvement and alignment).
    o The presentation of the evaluation process and findings are completed and well structured to provide ease in accessing information needed for decision-making, for assessing how justified conclusions are based on the linkages among the parts of the report.
    o the recommendations are clear and actionable
    o information is provided on expected plans for follow-through with the evaluation by key stakeholders

2. Credibility: An evaluation report is credible when there is professional rigor for objectivity, validity and reliability of the procedures and instruments used.
    o evaluators are competent professionals and valid in the yes of the users/stakeholders
    o There is accuracy and validity (programme content and contextual factors, instruments, information coverage/sampling, external validity or linkage with other development findings)
    o There is reliability or consistency in the information provided
    o The bases for making judgements are transparent and based on negotiated agreements

3. Relevance, appropriateness and added-value: A report is relevant, appropriate and adds value when information provided addressed a need and is not duplicative, addresses priority or strategic information needs, and is appropriate given institutional goals and filters, and that the conduct is aligned with national systems or lenses.
    o The purpose and incentives for use are clear
    o there is alignment with national and government demands

- o Harmonization and coherence within UN
- o Organizational lens: human development, human rights
- o Addresses organizational mandate
- o Advances knowledge or priorities for development (equity, capacity, cooperation and others)

The primary responsibility for preparing the evaluation report rests with the leader of the evaluation team. Those who commission the evaluation and those who are actually evaluated can also contribute with their inputs. Particularly, they should be involved in reviewing the draft report to check if there are any relevant factual errors or omissions, and to highlight any interpretation of the findings that they consider as incorrect. The evaluators should accept changes related to factual errors, but, in safeguarding the principle of independence, they should be free to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

To ensure compliance with the criteria noted, a quality assurance and enhancement system at country level needs to be established and made operational.

The following passage provides for each criterion, performance indicators which would provide the basis for assessing report quality in an objective and reliable manner.

EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY CRITERIA

4. Utility – Enhancing use and impact of information provided

4.1 The title page and opening pages provide key basic contextual information
- Title of the evaluation that includes a clear reference to the project / programme being evaluated
- Links to the evaluation plan (with information on strategic value, national involvement and alignment, timing, resources and financing)
- Links to UNDAF Outcomes and MYFF Goals
- Geographical coverage of the evaluation
- Name and organization of the evaluators and information in annex for assessment of competence and trustworthiness
- Name of the commissioning organization (e.g. UNDP country office X)
- Date when the evaluation report is completed
- Expected actions from the evaluation and dates for action
- Dates for stakeholder meetings and status of meetings
- Name of UNDP contact point for the evaluation (e.g. programme officer, evaluation specialist or focal point)

4.2 The information in the report is complete, well structured and well presented. The report should provide information on
- the purpose of the evaluation;
- exactly what was evaluated;
- how the evaluation was designed and conducted;
- what evidence was used in the evaluation;
- what conclusions were drawn;
- what recommendations were made;
- what lessons were distilled.

The main evaluation report should contain the following sections:

- Title Page
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Table of contents, including list of annexes
- Executive Summary
- Introduction: background and context of the programme
- Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
- Approach and methodology
- Findings
- Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons, generalizations, alternatives
- Proposed activities for second phase with estimated costs.
- Annexes

4.3 The report should be clear and easy to read with complementary graphics to enhance understanding
- The report should apply a plain, non-specialist language (see EO Publication Guide).
- Graphics, tables and illustrations should be used, when applicable, to enhance the presentation of information.
- The report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
- In the case of an outcome evaluation, the related projects should be listed in the annex, including timelines, implementation arrangements and budgets.

4.4 The executive summary of the report should be brief (maximum 2 pages) and contains key information needed by decision-makers. It should contain:

- Brief description of the programme,
- Evaluation purpose, questions and scope of evaluation.
- Key findings
- Conclusions
- Key recommendations.

- The executive summary should not include information that is not mentioned and substantiated in the main report.

4.5 The recommendations are relevant and realistic, with clear priorities for action.

- Recommendations should emerge logically from the evaluation's findings and conclusions.
- Recommendations should be relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and decisions to be made based on he evaluation
- Recommendation should be formulated in a clear and concise manner and be prioritized to the extent possible.

Credibility - accuracy, reliability, and objectivity

2.1. **The subject or programme being evaluated is clearly and accurately described**
- **The goals and objectives of the programme/subject are clearly described and the performance indicators presented**
- **The conceptual linkages or logic theory among programme strategy, the outputs and the outcomes should be described, explaining their relation to national priorities and goals.**
- **The context in which the programme existed is described so its likely influences in the program can be identified**
- **The level of implementation of the programme and major divergences between the original implementation plan or approach should be described and explained.**
- **The recipient / intended beneficiaries, the stake holders, the cost and the financing of the programmes/projects should be described**

2.2. **The report provides a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation**
- The objectives, scope and coverage of the evaluation should be explicit and its limitations should also be acknowledged.
- The original evaluation questions from the TORs should be made explicit as well as those that were added subsequently or during the evaluation and their rationale provided
- The results of an evaluability assessment is noted for its effects on defining the scope of the evaluation.(evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process[3].)*

2.3. **The methodology is fully described for its role in ensuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation**
Any description of the methodology should include the following in addressing the questions of the evaluation:
- The universe of data needed to answer the questions and the sources of this data

---

[3] Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System, para 7.2.

- The sampling procedure applied to ensure representativeness in collecting information from these sources (area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sampling)
- Procedures applied (including triangulation) to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected
- Bases for making judgements and interpretation of the findings including performance indicators or levels of statistical significance as warranted by available data.
- description of procedures for quantitative and qualitative analyses
- innovations in methodological approach and added vale e to development evaluation
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes
- how a human development and human rights perspective provided a lens for the evaluation and influenced the scope of the evaluation

1.4. The findings of the evaluation address the following in response to the key questions of the evaluation.
- cost efficiency, relevance,
- UNDP partnership strategy and the extent to which it contributed to greater effectiveness;
- External factors influencing progress towards the outcome;
- UNDP contribution to capacity development and institutional strengthening.

1.5 Conclusions are firmly based on evidence and analysis.
- **Conclusions are the judgement made by the evaluators. They should not repeat the findings but address the key issues that can be abstracted from them.**
- Conclusions are made based on the an agreed basis for making jugments of value of worth relative to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability
- Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the subject being evaluated, determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.

2.12. Annexes are complete and relevant

- the original Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- Details on the programme and its context in development
- Details of data and analyses;
- data collection instruments (copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.);
- evaluation plan

Relevance and Added Value

3.1. The purpose and context of the evaluation are described
- The reason(s) why the evaluation is being conducted should be explicitly stated.
- The justification for conducting the evaluation at this point in time should be summarised.

- Who requires the evaluative information should be made clear.
- The description of context should provide an understanding of the geographic, socioeconomic, political and cultural settings in which the evaluation took place

3.2. The report includes an assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender in particular, and human rights considerations are incorporated in the project or programme

The evaluation report should include a description of, *inter alia*:
- how a human development and human rights perspective was adopted in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated
- how issues of equity, marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups were addressed in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes
- How the evaluation used the human development and human rights lens in its defining the scope of the evaluation and in the methodology used

3.3 The report presents information on its relationship with other associated evaluations and indicates its added value to already existing information

ANNEX 2:

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 o 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.