

**TOR for INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT**

**ICPN/2021/**

**Project name:** UNDP Civil Society for Enhanced Democracy and Human Rights in Ukraine (CSDR)

**Post title:** International Consultant for Final Evaluation of the Civil Society for Enhanced Democracy and Human Rights in Ukraine project

**Country / Duty Station:** Home-based with 1 mission to Ukraine (approximately 6 days), will depend on the epidemiological situation

**Expected places of travel (if applicable):** Kyiv, (+other cities which will be specified during the inception phase)

**Starting date of assignment:** 1st November 2021

**Duration of assignment / or end date (if applicable):** 25 days within the time-frame of 1st November 2021 to 15 February 2022

**Supervisor’s name and functional post:** Evaluation manager

**Selection method:** Desk review

**Administrative arrangements**: The Consultant will submit deliverables to the evaluation manager, who will safeguard the quality and independence of the evaluation. The Consultant will be supported by the Evaluation Focal Team (EFT) comprising of representatives of UNDP Ukraine (UNDP Democratic Governance Analyst, CSDR Project Coordinator, and relevant project staff). The EFT will assist in providing the available documentation for the analysis and research, setting up the meetings with partners and external actors connecting the evaluation team with the regional partners and key stakeholders, arranging field visits, identifying key partners for interviews. Otherwise, the evaluation will be fully independent, and the evaluator will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the evaluation. Interpretation and translation services will be set up by the evaluator. Space/technical equipment will not be provided for this assignment.

**Payment arrangements**: Lump Sum (payments linked to deliverables).

**1.BACKGROUND**

The project “Civil Society for Enhanced Democracy and Human Rights in Ukraine” (2017-2022) funded by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs is a nation-scale 5-year initiative which runs from 1st April 2017 until 31st March 2022 with the total project budget is 4,280,822.00 USD. The project aims to strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations to promote democracy and build a constructive dialogue between the government and civil society organizations which is based on citizen participation at all levels in Ukraine. It will also help develop and strengthen human rights actors to promote and protect human rights in Ukraine, and to increase the level of youth civic engagement and youth participation in decision-making processes at all levels.

**The overall aim** for this programme is to raise the institutional capacity of civil society actors in the regions in the areas of democracy and human rights to increase their impact on the reform processes in the country through better coordination and networking and in order to contribute to more inclusive, democratic and rights-based governance.

The immediate objectives of the project are formulated as the three main **components** for project implementation as defined below:

1. Strengthening CSOs as guardians and promoters of democracy and good governance in Ukraine.
2. Supporting human rights actors to promote and defend human rights in Ukraine.
3. Enhancing civic youth engagement and youth participation in decision-making.

The immediate objectives are based upon the experiences gained from the previous phase of the project and other UNDP interventions related to civil society development. (1) and (2) reflect the overall programme objective more closely while (3) recognises the leading role of youth and young volunteers in the process of advancing reforms and human rights in the country. The substance of each component is elaborated below.

Please find more information about the project in its Project Document at <https://open.undp.org/projects/00099967>.

The Project follows a human-rights-based approach to programming under which policies, processes and planned activities are anchored in the system of rights and corresponding obligations established by international law, and ensures gender-mainstreaming in all its components providing opportunities for equal participation of women and men in capacity building, advocacy and grant activities.

CSDR has gone through an independent mid-term programme review in 2019, and has effectively taken part in the overall, cross-country, programme-level effectiveness assessment done by the team of independent consultants engaged by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. The MTR was represented by by Julian Brett (Team Leader) and Katerina Stolyarenko (Ukraine civil society and M&E expert).

The ongoing COVID-19 crisis is challenging people, households and countries in unprecedented ways. As of September 2021, Ukraine ranked 18th in the world by the number of recorded total cases of COVID-19 and 19th in the world by the number of deaths[[1]](#footnote-2)[1]. Containing the pandemic and protecting people remains the top priority. The COVID-19 pandemic has aggravated a range of social and economic challenges in Ukraine. Among other negative impacts of the pandemic is the increased number of cases of domestic violence in Ukraine. More than [40 percent](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fukraine.un.org%2Fen%2F102760-women-face-increased-workload-salary-cuts-and-domestic-violence-during-pandemic&data=04%7C01%7Coksana.kosenko%40undp.org%7C8b685bcca0cc4b86ae8a08d971f1dc93%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637666105865795308%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Ii6hwQtGuR91EKiazTtl9HFd%2BQPnH2%2FwWfQ5DHwiYKY%3D&reserved=0) of those who faced domestic violence among the respondents said they had never experienced it before the lockdown, the reported cases increased by 30 percent. Therefore, during the pandemic, CSDR project in 2020-2021 supported the activities of the CSOs in safeguarding human rights and protecting vulnerable groups in Ukraine, including the initiatives of CSOs that address the domestic and gender-based violence issues.

As currently CSDR is in its phasing out stage, it is important to engage the independent evaluator to assess the extent to which project objectives were achieved and contribute to future programming, policymaking and overall organizational learning with a focus on lessons learnt and best practice.

**2. MAIN OBJECTIVE and scope OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

The major objective of the assignment is to conduct a final evaluation of five years of CSDR implementation to assess the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, summarize the key results, lessons learned and best practices with a view to contribute to future adaptation, programming, policymaking and overall organizational learning by outlining recommendations for the next phase of UNDP civil society development programme. The consultant should also evaluate the project’s COVID-19 related activities and effectiveness of budget allocations.

Identifying lessons learned and best practices are key elements of this evaluation, as UNDP would like to understand what has worked well, what hasn’t worked well, what is sustainable and what approaches, pathways and interventions are likely to have most impact and be effective to engage CSOs and rightsholders in the future.

3.**DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES/SCOPE OF WORK**

The Evaluator should make the analysis of the Project strategy, thematic priorities, the theory of change, the allocated resources and make the assessment of Projects key results / achievements (impact where possible, outcomes, outputs) against initial objectives taking into consideration the key findings and recommendations of the CSDR mid-term review.

The key product expected is a comprehensive evaluation report (*up to maximum 25-30 pages without annexes, single spacing, Myriad Pro font, size 11*) with key findings and a maximum of 7 key recommendations. The evaluation report should include, but is not limited to the following components:

* Introduction
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and method
* Development context and project background
* Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
* Recommendations, lessons learned and best practices for the future (including viable ideas on focus areas and work directions which could be sharpened and further enhanced in the next UNDP civil society support programme)
* Annexes: TOR, list of field visits and their agendas, list of people interviewed, documents reviewed, interview and focus group questions, etc.

In addition to a final evaluation report, a consultant shall develop an *executive summary* on the key findings, lessons learned and best practices and recommendations (no more than 5 pages long).

The evaluation at a minimum will cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. The Evaluator should also address how the Project applied the human rights-based approach and mainstream gender in development efforts.

Specifically, it will cover (but not be limited to) the following areas and questions:

**RELEVANCE**

The report will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

* Country context: How relevant was the project to the interventions target groups, including Government’s needs and priorities? To what extent was the project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, SDGs as well as UNDP Country Programme Document/United Nations Partnerships Framework? Is there a coherence with other donors interventions?
* Target groups: To what extent was the project relevant to address the needs of vulnerable groups and gender issues (both at project and stakeholder’s level)? To what extent did the initial theory of change for the project take those groups into consideration?
* Describe if CSDR was able to transform/adjust to fast changing political context taking into consideration risks/challenges mitigation strategy. The Evaluator can emphasize to what extent Project outputs have been achieved with involvement of government partners and have been adopted into national strategies, policies and/or legal codes.
* To what extent has the project contributed to CSO’s engagement, the empowerment of young men and women and the human rights-based approach?

**EFFECTIVENESS**

* Did the intervention achieve the project objectives and what were the key outcomes and outputs?
* Assess the overall performance of the CSDR with reference to its respective project document, strategy, objectives and indicators, and identify key issues and constraints that affected the achievement of Project objectives. Were the planned objectives and outcomes achieved in the framework of the key project components? What are the results achieved beyond the logframe? To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality, empowerment of women?
* Assess the level of engagement of citizens/civil society at the local, sub-national and national levels in the course of project implementation.
* How have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How effective has the Project been in establishing national ownership?

**EFFICIENCY**

* Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
* Was the project management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate?
* Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results?
* To what extent has the project ensured value for money?
* To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
* To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?

**SUSTAINABILITY**

* To what extent are the project results (impact, if any, and outcomes) likely to contribute after the project ends? Define the areas, which produced the most sustainable results, and the most promising areas requiring further support in the course of future intervention.
* Is stakeholders’ engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalised after the project? Define which of the platforms, networks, relationships development in the framework of the project have the highest potential for further scaling up and/or replication.
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project results?
* To what extent were capacity-building initiatives for partner organizations adequate to ensure sustainability? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability? What should be phased out? And is there a best practice sustainability model which can be replicated into a future design?
* Identifying possible priority areas of engagement, offer recommendations for the next phase

**IMPACT**

* Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical changes for individuals, civil society groups and institutions related to the project?
* What difference has the project made to the beneficiaries, involved in the implementation of the initiatives, as well as indirect beneficiaries (target communities)?
* Has the Project contributed to gender equality, women’s empowerment and protection of human rights, social inclusion?

Focus and cross-cutting issues, such as HRBA and gender should be carefully evaluated and be integrated across the evaluation.

1. **METHODOLOGY AND PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS**

The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the CSDR Project. The Evaluator will compare planned outputs of the Project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the Project objectives.

The evaluation must provide evidence based and transparently obtained information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with CSOs, government counterparts, international partner organisations, UNDP Country Office and Project team.

An evaluation of Project performance will be carried out against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for Project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. It is suggested that the evaluation should use a mixed method approach – collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations.

The evaluator will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the Project which could be applied to future and other on-going UNDP interventions.

The conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, challenges and significant outcomes and outputs of the Project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to the terminal 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, UNDP and CSDR.

The evaluator should provide a proposed design, methodology of evaluation (methods, approaches to be used, evaluation criterion for assessment of each component to be proposed), detailed work plan and report structure to UNDP prior to the start of fieldwork; these documents and the list of CSOs to visit should be agreed with UNDP. While proposing the methodology, the Consultant should be guided by UNDP approach to evaluations[[2]](#footnote-3).

The evaluator is expected to develop and present detailed statement of evaluations methods/approaches in the inception report to show how each objective, evaluation criterion will be assessed.

The final evaluation methodology and approach (to be discussed and agreed with UNDP shall include, as a minimum, the following elements / sources of information:

* Desk research of CSDR primary documentation: the project document, monitoring reports, board meeting minutes, financial reports, M&E framework, work plans as well as CSDR Mid-Term Evaluation, CSO hubs Network development and impact assessment, assessment of youth initiatives and other relevant written records;
* Review of specific products including datasets, publications, audio visual materials, technical packages, consultancies reports and other materials and reports;
* Thematic interviews with UNDP and CSDR staff and consultants to provide in-depth briefing on the project, its results, context of partnerships with different stakeholders and other issues;
* Key informant interviews/focus groups with CSDR’s partners and end-beneficiaries broadly represented, women, men, youth etc. ):
	+ the government institutions (including but not limited to Ministry of Youth and Sports, Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers, etc.);
	+ the selected direct CSO beneficiaries, including small-scale organisations at the regional level, CSO hubs Network, the large-scale CSDR’s CSO beneficiaries in Kyiv in the thematic areas of democratization and human rights;
	+ Interviews with international development actors, such as the DMFA and USAID.
	+ Interviews with other key informants/experts

For each of these key informant interviews, the evaluator should first develop and present his/her ideas for the content and format of the interview forms (e.g. interview guides defining the structure of future interviews and key proposed questions to be asked) that will be applied to capture the information required, as well as the method to be used in administering them and tabulating the results.

Debriefing session will be arranged for discussing the evaluation findings, results and recommendations.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, 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 government and 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.). No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

1. **DELIVERABLES:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable #** | **Task description** | **Timing** | **Payment breakdown** |
| Deliverable #1 | Conduct desk research of the CSDR Project core documentation (Project document, annual work plans and progress reports 2017-2021, project implementation plans, board meeting minutes, mid-term review mission report with annexes, Project studies and assessments, etc). The set of documents to be reviewed will be prepared by UNDP. Develop an evaluation methodology and strategy to collect the required information, plans and forms for the interview with partners and counterparts, as well as the questionnaire for a beneficiary satisfaction survey.**Output**: the inception report, including workplan and evaluation schedule (with detailed description of the methodology and evaluation matrix) is produced; annotated structure of the report is developed; a toolkit for gathering information (questionnaire and interview plans, a questionnaire for a beneficiary satisfaction survey) is designed. All documents are submitted to UNDP for final approval. | 4 days | 20% |
| Deliverable #2 | Conduct a number of meetings with selected Project stakeholders according to the agreed agenda (the preliminary list is defined in section 4 of this TOR).Make the analysis of grant and youth civic engagement programmes, achieved results (long and short term) and overall level of effectiveness. Collect feedback from partners.**Discuss observations, preliminary findings, lessons learned, best practices and early recommendations in a tri-angulation workshop with Project team and relevant UNDP CO staff** *(can be done on-line)***.** | 12 days  | 0% |
| Deliverable #3 | Produce a draft report of the evaluation with key findings and a maximum of 10-15 recommendations. The report should be evidence-based and cover all items detailed in the paragraph #2 of the present TOR with definition of the lessons learned and best practices.**Output**: draft of the report produced and submitted for UNDP comments (*UNDP review will take up to 10 days*). | 6 days  | 40% |
| Deliverable #4 | Collect, review and incorporate comments from UNDP into the final version of the evaluation report, produce audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed**Output**: Final evaluation report containing all required annexes indicated in the paragraph #3 of the present TOR, submitted to UNDP for final review and approval.  | 1 days | 35% |
| Deliverable #5 | Prepare a detailed PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation study (in English) and present the results during the meeting between UNDP/CSDR and DMFA, in Kyiv, Ukraine *(can be arranged online depending on the epidemiological situation. If travel occurs, UNDP will cover all related travel expenses)*.Should the simultaneous translation be needed for the presentation, it will be provided by UNDP. Consultations regarding UNDP expectations from the presentation will be held with the Contractor prior to the event.**Output:** PowerPoint presentation prepared and delivered during the joint meeting of interested parties (to cover major findings and lessons learned from the evaluation as defined in section 3 of this TOR, with diagrams/pictures, where applicable). | 2 days | 5% |

1. **monitoring/REPORTING requirements, Management arrangements**

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and the length of the assignment will be discussed with the evaluator prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of the assignment is 25 working days (1st November 2021 to 15 February 2022).

The final version of the comprehensive report with UNDP comments taken into consideration should be submitted to UNDP by 10 February 2021.

Evaluation manager will review and approve inception reports including evaluation questions and methodology, review and comment on evaluation report, circulate draft evaluation report, collect and consolidate comments and share with the Evaluator for finalization of the evaluation report. The satisfactory completion of each of the deliverables shall be subject to the endorsement of the UNDP Evaluation Manager.

The Consultant will be supported by the Evaluation Focal Team (EFT) comprising of representatives of UNDP Ukraine (UNDP Democratic Governance Analyst, CSDR Project Coordinator, and relevant project staff). The EFT will assist in providing the available documentation for the analysis and research, setting up the meetings with partners and external actors connecting the evaluation team with the regional partners and key stakeholders, arranging field visits, identifying key partners for interviews.

1. **Evaluation ethics, IMPARTIALITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'. Evaluators need to sign the Pledge of Ethical Conduct.

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.

The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultants must also agree to hold in trust and confidence any information or documents (“confidential information”) disclosed to them or discovered by them or prepared by them in the course of or as a result of the evaluation and agree that it shall be only used for the purposes of this evaluation and shall not be disclosed to any party without UNDP approval.

1. **EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS**
* *Education*: **Advanced University degree** (Master’s or PhD) in Monitoring and Evaluation, Public Administration, International development or related fields;
* *Relevant professional experience*: **At least, 7 years of international work experience** in the field of democratic governance, human rights and HRBA, rule of law, CSO support, gender, youth, and experience in participatory approaches and planning, and monitoring, evaluation and learning. Working experience in Eastern Europe region and CIS will be an asset;
* *Experience in evaluation:* **At least, 3 accomplished complex evaluations projects where the candidate was the author or co-author**, especially in democratic governance field. Proven experience in human rights, HRBA, gender and rule of law programming. (Reference to or copies of previously developed knowledge materials including analytical reports, project documents, research papers, case studies materials, etc. to be provided);
* *Proven knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies*, summary of a proposed evaluation methodology is to be provided (up to 2 pages).
* *Language proficiency*: Excellent English writing and communication skills; knowledge of Ukrainian and/or Russian would be an asset.
1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS**

Applicants shall submit the following documents:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [x]  | Letter of interest/proposal, providing brief methodology on how the work will be conducted and/or approached; |
| [x]  | Professional Resume CV and P11, including information about past experience in similar projects / assignments; |
| [x]  | Financial proposal (according to defined deliverables); |
| [x]  | Reference to or copies of previously developed knowledge materials including analytical reports, research papers, case studies materials, etc. (at least, 3 reports) |

1. **FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

[x] **Lump sum contract**

**The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in USD**, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

**Travel costs**

All envisaged travel costs will be paid separately according to UNDP rules and procedures and should not be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the Individual Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA**
* Educational background – **10** points max

*[10pts – PhD degree; 5 pts – Master’s degree];*

* Relevant professional experience – **15** points max

*[15 pts – 8+ years, including the experience in Eastern Europe; 10 pts – 8+ years; 5pts – 7 years];*

* Experience in conducting complex evaluations – **20** points max

*[5+ highly relevant evaluation projects - 20 pts; 3-5 highly relevant evaluation projects; 3 highly relevant evaluation projects - 10 pts]*

* Proven knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies- **20** points max

*[20 pts – highly relevant methodology; 15 pts – intermediate level of quality and relevance; 10 pts – acceptable quality and relevance of the methodology];*

* Languages proficiency – **5** points max

*[5 pts – English, Russian, Ukrainian; 3pts – only English];*

Maximum available technical score - 70 points.

1. **Evaluation method**

[x] **Cumulative analysis**

Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) having received the cumulative highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight: 70%

\* Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum 70% from the maximum available technical score (70 points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

The maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price proposal and will equal to 30. All other price proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula:

30 points [max points available for financial part] x [lowest of all evaluated offered prices among responsive offers] / [evaluated price].

The proposal obtaining the overall cumulatively highest score after adding the score of the technical proposal and the financial proposal will be considered as the most compliant offer and will be awarded a contract.

Prepared by:

Lesia Shyshko, Partnership and Coordination Officer, Team Leader a.i. Strategic Planning, Partnerships and RBM

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Cleared by:

Maryna Anokhina, Procurement Analyst

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by:

Manal Fouani, Deputy Resident Representative

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)