

Thematic Programme Evaluation

Path to Economic Recovery: Facilitating Decent Jobs in the Gaza Strip

Terms of Reference

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Path to Economic Recovery: Facilitating Decent Jobs in the Gaza Strip	
Atlas ID	Award ID: PAL10-00116171; Output ID: PAL10-00119089, PAL10-120609, PAL10-116580	
Corporate outcome and output	UNDAF (2018-2022): Outcome 3.2: Palestinians have greater access to decent productive jobs PPF Output 3.3: Access of youth, women and rural communities to skills and financing for economic empowerment and entrepreneurship improved	
Country	State of Palestine	
Region	Gaza Strip	
Date project document signed	January 2019	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	01 January 2019	31 December 2022
Project budget	US\$ 8,600,000 USD?	
	US\$ 4,782,677.00 (until 31 March 2021) with the following breakdown:	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	Government of Norway (Phase I):	US\$ 1,280,912.00
	Government of Norway (Phase II):	US\$ 501,765.00
	Government of Japan:	US\$ 1,787,000.00
	Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation (Phase III):	US\$ 1,213,000.00
Funding source	Government of Norway, Government of Japan and Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation (SDC)	
Implementing party¹	UNDP/PAPP is responsible for implementation of the project, where partnerships established with local NGOs/entities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Gaza Cultural Development Group (GCDG);- Palestinian Fund for Employment and Social Protection for Workers (PFESP);- Cooperative Agriculture Association Beit Hanoun (CAAB);- Democracy and Workers' Rights Center Society (DWRC);- The Society of Women Graduates (SWG);- Job creation program (JCP);- Palestinian Federation Industries (PFI).	

1. Background and context

The Palestinian economy has been suffering from decades of restricted access to national resources, geographic fragmentation, and severe restrictions on movement of people and

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

goods due to the occupation and the blockade on Gaza. Experiencing a two-year fiscal crisis due to the Government of Israel's (GoI) reductions on the transfer of the Government of Palestine's (GoP) owned revenues, the economic contraction is expected to result in an at least estimated 40% fall of government revenues; this adversely affects social protection measures, including cash transfers to vulnerable households and salaries/ pensions of government workers.

With nearly 53% of the Gaza population living in poverty (compared to 14% in the West Bank)², families have been suffering loss of income and higher living costs. The rate of participation in the workforce in Gaza during the second quarter of 2020 was 34.5% (15% among females across Palestine), - a drop of roughly 11% compared to the previous quarter. According to the figures, some 42,900 people in Gaza lost their source of income since the end of March 2020. The Ministry of Social Development estimates that at least 53,000 families have fallen into poverty in recent weeks, where the World Bank estimates that the share of poor households in Palestine is expected to increase to 30% in the West Bank and 64% in Gaza on account of COVID-19.³ According to the PCBS, the labour market is considered the most affected sector during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic since the beginning of March 2020, as the Palestinian government has taken several measures in addition to an emergency plan to limit the outbreak of the pandemic.⁴

The outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated an already fragile and economic landscape. The number of affected population in Gaza has dramatically increased since August 2020 with detection of first cases in the community that led to local lockdown of all social and economic premises for several weeks, resulting in excessive reduction in available number of jobs and income to MSMEs. Health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is not yet controlled in Gaza (over 65,000 positive cases and 600 deaths as of 30 March 2021)⁵ during the past four months of the pandemic, vulnerabilities are deepening, and the potential long-term impact is dire - especially for impoverished Palestinians who are living in rural areas and working in the services and wholesale/retail, and productive sectors.

1.1. Programme Introduction

The *Path to Economic Recovery: Facilitating Decent Jobs in the Gaza Strip* is a programme with the overall objective to ensure Palestinians have greater access to decent productive jobs. The programme should be seen as part of UNDP's larger work of preserving the gains across SDGs adopting 'leave no one behind' principle. The programme is, therefore, one of several interventions implemented by UNDP to build the resilience of the Palestinian people.

UNDP's transformative resilience approach is to link short-term dignified jobs to longer-term sustainable employment. Hence, the programme is implemented at different levels and through different tactics designed to stimulate the Gazan economy and lead to further employment creation. This through the combination of short, medium and long-term job creation initiatives along with support to existing enterprises and incubation of new enterprises.

² PCBS (2017) Poverty profile in Palestine

³ World Bank (2020) [Palestinian Economy Struggles as Coronavirus Inflicts Losses](#)

⁴ PCBS (June 2020) [Labour Force Survey](#)

⁵ WHO [COVID-19 Dashboard in the oPt](#)

The programme is built on UNDP’s Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People (from now on just referred to as UNDP) engagement and collaboration with the key stakeholders, lessons learned from implementation of economic empowerment interventions and are taking advantage of the on-going activities related to building entrepreneurship skills, job creation and establishment of micro-businesses.

The programme has four overall outputs through which it strives to achieve the different interventions:

Output 1: Gazans have greater access to short-term dignified job opportunities in private and public sectors (including C4W initiatives and internship/ apprenticeship opportunities).

Output 2: Youth have improved capacities in technical and vocational education and training.

Output 3: Young entrepreneurs have greater access to medium- and long-term employment opportunities (particularly through e-works or electronic platforms to access opportunities outside of Gaza).

Output 4: SMEs have strengthened capacities in sustaining and growing their businesses in the market.

The current, ongoing interventions are mainly under output 1 and through the Cash for Work initiatives funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Representative Office of Japan and SDC. These initiatives strive to empower youth, women and marginalised groups in the Gaza Strip by supporting them to have greater access to decent productive jobs and contribute to sustainable and inclusive economic development.

Number of Beneficiaries per Donor’s contribution

Donor	Period / Year	Total
Norway	01 Dec 2019 - 30 Nov 2021	1,694
Japan	01 Mar 2020 - 31 Mar 2021	876
SDC	01 Sep 2020 - 30 Jun 2021	1,020
Total		3,590

Following the state of emergency declared in the State of Palestine in March 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the local authorities took protective measures to contain the virus, which led to significantly reduced activities in the education and economic sectors and further aggravated the already stretched health sector. The needs of the municipalities additionally increased dramatically, as they had taken on additional responsibilities such as sterilisation of facilities and public areas to prevent the spread of the virus. UNDP – in agreement with the

Norway Representative Office – therefore reprogrammed funds from original planned target sectors to address the urgent needs of the Ministry of Health (MoH) to hire more health workers, as well as municipality workers to carry out hygiene measures and disinfect roads and public facilities. On 31 March 2020 the Norwegian funded project was additionally reprogramme by reallocating the funds from output 2 to output 1. On the other hand, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UNDP signed an amendment in November 2020, allocating more funds to the programme and allowing UNDP to increase the target groups under the Norwegian funded project.

The current initiatives under output 1 focuses on people in the age category 18-60, who are unemployed or who are entering the labour market for the first time after completion of education. After the reprogramming, a total of 3,590 beneficiaries are expected to directly benefit from job opportunities during 2020-2021. As of these, 600 beneficiaries is planned to be recruited during the next two months (May and June 2021). The initiatives as until 19 April 2021 generated 293,970 working days, and at it is expected that they will have generated more than 400,000 working days by the end of the projects under the programme.

Throughout the interventions, 81 unemployed young graduates (40% Women) are engaged in upgrading the GIS within the municipalities, where the unemployed young graduates have received training and on-site coaching on collecting economic data (based on occupation code numbers following (ISIC) and converting them to a spatial computerized information layer associated with building code numbers. To date, spatial data of 18 out of the 25 Gaza municipalities has been digitised. On the other hand, given the scale and scope of the socio-economic impact of COVID-19, UNDP – with support from SDC – has been allocating additional investments for employment protection in the existing industrial factories, who have been affected by COVID-19. In total 725 workers (25% women) have benefited from two to three months wage subsidies.

Program approach

Output 1 of the programme is consistent with the Palestine National Policy Agenda 2017-2022⁶, National Priority 6: *Economic Independence* states that 'economic policy under occupation must strike a balance between measures that will create immediate jobs and those required to lay the groundwork for a competitive, independent economy in the post-occupation era.

UNDP's approach within the programme is to implement activities through partners who play a significant role in creating the organisational foundation necessary for the sustainability of the programme. In addition to technical assistance and capacity development, the programme provides indirect support to the stakeholders. The programme is designed to address human resources gaps that have been identified with regard to the health and Municipalities sector. UNDP worked in close collaboration with the Ministry of Labour (MoL) and Ministry of Health (MoH) for the placement of health workers in the MoH premises, based on the technical specialty required for the specific host health facility.

⁶ <http://english.wafa.ps/page.aspx?id=5K70nZa53247725091a5K70nZ>

For the job creation initiatives UNDP has introduced a '3x6 approach.' This approach follows a model linking short-term temporary employments (**track A**) to savings generation, skill building, and business development (**track B**), while focusing on social cohesion and inclusion. Hence, track A focuses on emergency employment, while track B on local economic recovery. Such strategies have been widely implemented by other UNDP country offices in among others Jordan, Yemen, and Burundi. Currently the approach is being piloted within the Gaza youth and women empowerment project, and the initial signs have been very positive and could be replicated based on UNDP's experience in Economic Empowerment.

The initiatives under output 1 refers to track A. Either UNDP or the implementing partner (IP) has transferred monthly payments to beneficiaries according to the number of working days in a lump sum. Each beneficiary was paid between US\$270 - US\$510 per month and for 3-10 months. The beneficiaries were responsible for their transportation, lunches and communication. Insurance was covered as it is a requirement by MoL and ILO and included injuries during working hours but will not cover sickness. "Specialized service for employment" was paid to the IPs to cover the cost of the Personal Protection Equipment (PPEs), maintenance materials, equipment, insurance, tools, the communication needed for monitoring, transportation and some operational and administrative costs.

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of this thematic evaluation is to provide evidence and recommendations on the achievements and results of UNDP's short-term job creation initiatives under output 1 of the Path to Economic Recovery Programme against the results and resources framework and identifying factors that have hindered or facilitated the success of the programme so far. The main objective is to assess UNDP's approaches and strategies for enabling youth and the vulnerable people to have greater access to decent productive jobs on the basis of the short term employment initiatives. Hence, the evaluation should assess the likelihood of UNDP's 3x6 approach to combine track A and B, i.e. from the short-term employment to medium and longer-term job creation.

The evaluation should determine the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the initiatives under output 1 and determine the improved contribution to development. The evaluation should examine the contribution of the Programme to cross-cutting issues including human rights, gender equality, poverty reduction and inclusion of persons with disabilities (PwDs). The findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be used to adjust UNDP's approaches and strategies under the programme to link track A and B even stronger and ensure economic development.

The purpose of the evaluation will additionally be an assessment of the programme's results framework itself, where the findings and recommendations will be used for the following purposes: a) ensure alignment with the Transformative Resilience programmatic framework, b) enable potential revision on the framework to ensure the programme team is able to assess results and achievements the best way possible at the end of the project.

2.2. Scope of the Evaluation:

The evaluation should be conducted during the programme's implementation period and shall be finalized by end-June 2021.

Geographically the evaluation will cover the relevant locations in the Gaza Strip, where interventions are taking place.

The scope of the evaluation will focus on and be able to present and provide **actionable, evidence-based recommendations, best practices and lessons learned** of job creation interventions, including cash for work and other economic empowerment schemes, during the COVID-19 pandemic to inform the ongoing and future interventions under the programme. The main evaluation question to be answered is what effective strategies under the job creation initiatives in this specific context can strengthen the possibility for longer-term employment. In every stage of the evaluation, the following criteria will be used: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, coherence, equity and human rights issues.

2.3. Specific objectives

The objectives of the evaluation exercise will be to address the following basic issues:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the approaches and strategies used under the job creation initiatives to have greater access to decent productive jobs.
2. Assess to what extent the intervention has contributed to positive changes in the lives of beneficiaries? Short-term and likely longer-term.
3. Assess if there have been any unintended or negative changes that can be attributed to the intervention?
4. Are there any lessons learned/good practices identified thus far that could inform future similar interventions and strengthen the linkage between track A and B?
5. What had the direct and indirect beneficiaries' (men, women and children) access to, use of, and satisfaction with the goods and services delivered?
6. The evaluation will also cover how cross cutting issues such as gender equality and equity have been addressed and make recommendations for increased mainstreaming of these cross-cutting issues as required.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

3.1. Project evaluation sample questions

The purpose of the evaluation criteria is linked to the purpose of evaluation. Namely, to enable the determination of the merit, worth or significance of the programme, with focus on output

1. The evaluation should be conducted according to the six Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, the likely impact and sustainability). Each criterion is a different lens or perspective through which the intervention can be viewed. Together, they provide a more comprehensive picture of the intervention, the process of implementation, and the results.

The criteria play a normative role. Together they describe the desired attributes of interventions: All interventions should be relevant to the context, coherent with other interventions, achieve their objectives, deliver results in an efficient way, and have positive impacts that last. The criteria are used in the evaluation to a) support accountability, including the provision of information to the public; and b) support learning, through expert feedback on the interventions and generating lessons learned.

Suggested evaluation questions are provided below. These guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with the UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

Relevance:

- To what extent is the programme in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the programme contribute to cover the needs of the services and productive sectors (public and private sectors)
- To what extent have the re-programming in collaboration with the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs / or the COVID-19 allocation fund been relevant to socio-economic response to the COVID-19 Pandemic?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects/ programmes considered in the design of the programme's job creation initiatives?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, considered during the design processes of the job creation initiatives?
- To what extent does the programme contribute to gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- To what extent is the selection of the implementing partners the most relevant to realize of the programme's objectives?
- To what extent is the programme flexible, adaptive and context-specific to adjust strategies over time, as circumstances evolve (e.g. conflict in Gaza, the COVID-19 pandemic) and the changing external environment?

Coherence

- To what extent is this intervention coherent with UNDP and other actors' intervention in the socio-economic recovery? This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort. e.g. MoL and UNRWA interventions, etc.

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the programme been effective in addressing urgent and priority interventions in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and has it contributed to filling certain gaps in provision of basic services?
- To what extent has the programme contributed to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities so far?
- To what extent are the programme's outputs – especially output 1 – achieved according to planned targets?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective so far?
- What factors is contributing to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

- In which areas does the programme have the greatest achievements so far? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the programme build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the programme have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies will be more effective in achieving the programme's objectives to have greater access to decent productive jobs?
- Are the programme's objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the implementation of activities related to job creation?
- To what extent are project management, oversight and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the programme's objectives?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equity and the empowerment of women?

Efficiency

- Has the programme delivered its expected results to date, including in terms of budget allocation and cost-efficiency of activities?
- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the programme 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 has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outputs/ outcomes as planned?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure efficient project management?
- To what extent are the UNDP partnership strategy within the project appropriate and effective?

Likely impact/Impact

- What are the effects of the intervention on recipients' lives? How likely is it that the intervention has an impact on the socio-economic conditions and livelihoods of the end beneficiaries and their families?
- Are there any unintended (positive or negative) effects on recipients and non-recipients of assistance?
- What is the possible gender-specific impact(s)? Is it likely that the intervention influences the gender context?

Sustainability

- To what extent do UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the communities?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the programme?

- To what extent have the selected IPs become able to lead job creation interventions beyond the programme duration?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equity and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the programme to date?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this programme representative of reality?
- To what extent has the programme promoted positive changes towards gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

Inclusion:

- To what extent has the programme considered the inclusion of the marginalized groups, especially PwDs in the programme activities?

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation should utilize a participatory and interactive approach using mixed method of data collection. Hence, the evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries. UNDP is strongly encouraging the use of virtual tools such as phone interviews and phone surveys, virtual Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and online and SMS-based surveys, among others, during this period of COVID-19 pandemic.

The evaluators should conduct a thorough document review of the project document, results framework, quality assurance reports, annual workplans, mid-year and annual reports. Additionally, pre-existing secondary data such as administrative datasets and previous survey datasets can be used to answer some evaluation questions. The evaluators should also utilise semi-structured interviews with direct beneficiaries, employer supervisors and key stakeholders, including Ministry of Labour. The evaluators may also utilise semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders; focus group discussions with beneficiaries and stakeholders; surveys and questionnaires; field visits, where possible; output/outcome mapping, observational visits (if possible), group discussions; and data review and analysis of monitoring reports.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP and the evaluators in consultation with the stakeholders where applicable and to be shared with the UNDP focal point.

The consultant can add to all the above tools as it may be deemed necessary for obtaining informative data that can feed into the evaluation within the prescribed timeframe of the consultancy services.

4.1 DATA COLLECTION, REMOTE INTERVIEWS AND USE OF NATIONAL CONSULTANTS

Implementing evaluations during the COVID-19 crises requires careful consideration to planning the implementation of evaluations remotely (virtually), through remote data collection and the remote interviews of stakeholders. The following shall be taken into account:

- Due to travel restrictions, it is likely not to be possible to travel to Gaza Strip, and, therefore, the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes into account both the virtual and face to face evaluation , including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.
- If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.
- If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (Skype, zoom etc.). International consultant can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should bear any relevant responsibilities where safety is a key priority.
- A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, and stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

4.2 DESK REVIEW AND DATA COLLECTION

a) Desk Review

The evaluator shall agree with UNDP on clear methodologies for collecting evaluative evidence considering all constraints. The evaluator shall also ensure that the required data and documentation are collected prior to the start of the evaluation process to the extent possible. Approaches and methodologies should be outlined in the inception report of the evaluation.

b) Data Collection

In preparing for data collection, the Consultant is to consider the following:

- Validating the data in connection with beneficiaries and whether they have jobs in hand under job creation initiatives/programs with limited duration or obtained sustainable job opportunity. Identification of potential limiting factors to proper data collection activities will have to be documented taking into consideration the timeframe of the evaluation.
- Considering the use of a flexible team approach and taking into consideration the current status of COVID 19 in the Gaza Strip while following the principle of "do no harm" to ensure the safety of beneficiaries, stakeholders as well as the evaluation team.
- Planning for remote data collection through conducting remote interviews, evaluation questionnaires, etc.

- In line with the UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP's interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes.

c) Data Analysis

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on project indicators, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, beneficiaries' interviews, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

d) Accessibility to Beneficiaries and Partners

UNDP will provide the consultant with up to date beneficiaries, partners and stakeholder contact details, and the consultant is to:

- Inform interviewees in advance of the evaluation with clear purpose and overview of the evaluation, evaluation team and interview expectations. This will also save time during interviews.
- Ensure and explain the principle of full anonymity of all interviews.
- Share a list of questions with interviewees in advance to speed up the process and facilitate interviewee preparation.
- Consult with the interviewee on which virtual tool the interviewee is more comfortable with (Zoom, Skype, Teams, telephone etc.).

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

The consultant shall deliver the following key products:

- **Evaluation inception report:** The inception report will include a work plan and evaluation schedule. The plan should outline the overall strategies, actions and timeline of the evaluation. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix, which specifies both principal and specific evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, review and analysis methods. The inception report provides UNDP and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

- **Evaluation debriefing:** Following the desk review, data collection and field visits, the evaluator should provide UNDP with preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report for comments:** The evaluator will develop draft evaluation report in (30-40) pages in English, including the executive summary of not more than 3 pages describing key findings and recommendations. The report shall include an audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed. UNDP shall review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The evaluator will ensure that the report, to the extent possible, complies with the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports⁷.
- **Evaluation report audit trail:** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report** (addressing comments, questions and clarifications): the report should include detailed lessons learnt and the list of all people interviewed. The evaluator should keep an evaluation report audit trail of how comments have been addressed in response to the draft report.
- **Presentation of findings:** a presentation should be scheduled to inform UNDP about the evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations. Power point presentations will be developed to facilitate illustrations and discussions.

The evaluator should follow UNDP Standard templates for [inception report](#) and [evaluation report](#)

The evaluator will need to consider all the quality criteria required as per the [UNDP evaluation guidelines](#) and the [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](#)

1. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The consultancy firm (the evaluator) should have proven experience in implementing at least 3 similar assignments during the last 5 years and should be able to deploy specialized experts for carrying out this assignment. The evaluation team should provide their own computers, communications equipment and personal protective equipment as needed.

Interested firm should formulate an evaluation team and is encouraged to include both international and national evaluators. The team should include evaluator(s) together covering all the below specific skills, competencies and characteristics as minimum requirements for the evaluator(s). The exact team composition is up to the individual bidder.

⁷ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607>

Interested firm should provide details on the management structures and implementation, describing how evaluators will be operating remotely, such as international consultants.

The team shall contain, as a minimum, the following:

Lead evaluator: an expert with local economic development, a postgraduate degree in international development, economy or related fields with 10 years professional experience. The team leader should demonstrate the following:

- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations of international development programmes, particularly in the field of local economic development and local governance;
- Experience in mixed method data collection.
- Direct experience working with civil society and government institutions is an added advantage;
- Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting;
- Good knowledge of procedures governing the implementation and management of internationally funded projects and programs;
- Broad knowledge of socio-economic recovery and the economic development in Palestine, combined with good awareness of political implications.
- Demonstrated experience with implementation and/or evaluation of projects with partners, who have different interests or projects with political components.

Local economic development/ Expert:

- Have at least Master's degree or equivalent in economic, experience in project implementation, monitoring and evaluation (M&E);
- At least two years of experience in M&E, including data collection (qualitative and quantitative), analyzing data and results framework development;
- Demonstrated expertise and knowledge of Economic Recovery, especially with decent productive jobs and contribute to sustainable and inclusive economic development (Cash of Work projects);
- Demonstrated experience in interpretation from Arabic to English and vice-versa.

Both experts should ideally have the following competencies:

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Good knowledge of the UNDP Guidelines and Procedures will be considered an asset;
- Excellent English language writing;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrated experience in implementing evaluations remotely;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.

The evaluation team will not be limited to the above two main experts and the interested evaluator will include the rest of the needed team that matches with the proposed methodology.

2. EVALUATION ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. All members of the consulting team will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

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 the collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure the 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.

4. Implementation arrangements

The evaluator and evaluation team will start the evaluation process with an inception meeting with UNDP representatives by way of virtual communication. The consultant should submit an inception plan based on the meeting within 5 calendar days of the issuance of contract.

The evaluator and evaluation team will then undertake the review of documentation, interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders -field visits, preparation of an evaluation report including lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluator and evaluation team will submit the draft product to UNDP for comments and finalize the product within 5 calendar days after receiving the feedback.

In consultation with the evaluator and evaluation team and as requested, the M&E focal point of the evaluation from UNDP and the project staff will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project beneficiaries and stakeholders and facilitate contact where needed. UNDP's M&E focal point in coordination with the project staff will facilitate the evaluation process and assist in connecting the evaluator with the senior management, and key stakeholders. The project staff will also assist in organizing the site visits and meetings and help identify key stakeholders for interviews by the evaluator.

The evaluator will be in direct contact with the M&E focal point assigned as overall responsible for the finalization of the report. In the review processes the M&E focal point will include project staff for additional comments and consultation will be conducted with relevant key stakeholders. The M&E focal point is in charge of consolidate all feedback before revised to the consultant.

5. Time frame for the evaluation process

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the

commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time frame (e.g., workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion. At a minimum, the time breakdown for the following activities should be included:

- Desk review.
- Briefings of evaluators.
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report.
- In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires).
- Preparing the draft report.
- Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance).
- Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.
- Power Point presentations of the evaluation stages, methodologies, data collected, results of evaluation and lessons learned to be handed to UNDP.

In addition, the evaluators may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination. Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables should be included in the annexes of the TOR for the evaluation being commissioned. This section should also state the number of working days to be given to each member of the evaluation team and the period during which they will be engaged in the evaluation process (e.g., 30 working days over a period of three months).

Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF WORKING DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	Day of signing contract	UNDP Office or remote	UNDP Evaluation manager
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	Day of signing contract	Via email	UNDP Evaluation Manager
Initial review of shared documents	4 days	5 days after signing contract	Via email	Evaluation Team
Kick-off meeting where the consultant presents the suggested content of the inception report and main objectives of the evaluation	1 days	6 days after signing contract	UNDP Office or remote	Evaluation Team
UNDP's project staff and Evaluation Manager confirm the content of the inception report and the main objectives of the evaluation	1 day	1 day after shared content of inception report	Via email	UNDP Evaluation Manager and Project Team
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan, including the final list of stakeholders to be interviewed	6 days	7 days after approval of the content of the inception report	Home- based	Evaluation Team
Draft inception report submission (15 pages maximum)	-	7 days after approval of the content of the inception report	Via email	Evaluation team
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to inception report	2 days	2 days after the Evaluator team received comments from UNDP and stakeholders	Via email	UNDP Evaluation Manager, Project team and donor
Submission and approval of final inception report	-			
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	10 days	10 days after approval of inception report	In country	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1	11 days after approval of inception report	In country	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages)	10 days	10 days after conducted debriefing	Home- based	Evaluation team
Draft report submission	-	10 days after conducted debriefing	Via email	Evaluation team

Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	10 days after conducted debriefing	UNDP	Evaluation Manager, Project team and donor
Debriefing with UNDP and selected stakeholders	1 day	Five days after receiving the comments from UNDP and key stakeholders	Remotely UNDP	Evaluation team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	4 days	Five days after conducted debriefing	Home- based	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Five days after conducted debriefing	Home- based	Evaluation team
Estimated total days for the evaluation	40			

6. Annexes

Annex 1 - Code of conduct: Each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system'.

Annex 2: [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](#)

Annex 3: Key stakeholders and partners.

Annex 4: Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub questions	Data sources	Data-collection methods/tools	Indicators/ success standard	Methods for data analysis

Annex 6: [inception report standard template](#)

Annex 7: [evaluation report](#)

Annex 8: [UNDP evaluation guidelines](#)

Annex 9: [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](#)

Annex 10: [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](#)

the Annexes above include the links. Other Documents will be made available to the successful consultant within 3 calendar days of the issuance of contract.