

TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

Position: International Consultant for Mid-term Project Evaluation

Project Title: Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia

Type of appointment: Individual Contract (IC)

Contract Duration: Short-term consultancy up to 30 consultancy days in total during 1 September 2021 – 15 March 2022, with one mission of 5 days

Duty Station: Home Based with travels to Tbilisi, Georgia

1/ BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Due to the diverse and complex terrain of the Caucasus mountains, its significant influence and the influence of the Black Sea and Caspian Sea on the climate and weather of the region, Georgia is exposed to various climate-induced hazards including floods and flash floods, climate-induced geological hazards (including landslides, mudflow, debris flows), droughts, soil erosion, severe winds, hailstorms and avalanches. Furthermore, according to Georgia's the 2nd and the 3rd National Communications, the frequency, intensity and geographical spread of extreme hydro meteorological hazards will increase under climate change and may result in significant impacts on key sectors including agriculture, critical infrastructure (transportation networks, buildings, roads, water supply, energy installations), natural resources and eco-systems, glaciers and forests.

Consequently, to address the existing development challenges, UNDP designed a program aimed at reducing exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards reduced through a well-functioning nation-wide multi-hazard early warning system and risk-informed local action. The program encompasses three interrelated projects funded by SDC, under which the current position is being announced, Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Swedish Government (SIDA). The GCF funded interventions are targeting expansion of the hydro-meteorological network & modelling capacities and improving community resilience through implementation of EWS & risk reduction measures. The project will provide critical climate risk information that would enable the Government of Georgia to implement number of nation-wide transformative policies and actions for reducing exposure and vulnerability of the population to climate-induced hazards. The project will thus catalyse a paradigm shift in the national climate risk management, climate-proofed disaster risk reduction and early warning approaches. SIDA project will contribute to the public awareness raising and structural measure components.

The project Strengthening the Climate Adaptation Capacities in Georgia, funded by SDC, is contributing to an overall goal of reducing the exposure of Georgia's communities, livelihoods and infrastructure to climate-induced natural hazards through a well-functioning nation-wide Multi-Hazard Early Warning System (MHEWS) and risk-informed local action serving 1.7 Million ordinary Georgians currently at risk from climate-induced hazards. The impact hypothesis of the project is as follows: i. standardized and harmonized national multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology enables development of unified risk information on national level, ii. adequate Institutional and legal frameworks for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is in place and implemented to provide clear structure for development of risk information; iii. Enhanced long-term technical and human capacities of relevant agencies and institutions responsible for multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment provide adequate and sufficient risk information iv. Multi-hazard maps and risk profiles for 11 river basins in Georgia, which provides valuable information on existing multi-hazard risk both on national and local levels for further risk-informed development planning; v. Local (municipal) preparedness to multi-hazard risks is improved through enhanced capacities for risk-informed preparedness planning and existence of the risk-informed preparedness plans.

Issues to be addressed by the project and its goals and objectives are in line with SDG (Sustainable Development Goal) 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts and in particular, with its targets 13.1 through 13.3, calling for strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries (target 13.1), Integrating climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning (target 13.2) and improving education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning (target 13.3).

Scope of the project is national covering 11 river basins and 7 climate induced hazards: flood, drought, avalanche, windstorm, hailstorm, landslide and mudflow. Total budget USD 5,020,270.22 which is considered as co-financing to GCF funded project.

2/ Objective of the assignment

The objective of the assignment is to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project outputs (listed below) in terms of their Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability Gender, Theory of Change or Results Framework, and provide recommendations for any improvements. Additional focus will be placed on assessing the design and coherence of the project, including the design of the log frame matrix/project theory, the strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring and the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender mainstreaming) were applied.

The project outcome/outputs to be evaluated:

Outcome 1 - The Georgian authorities have the financial, technical and human capacities to establish a nation-wide multi-hazard hydro-meteorological risk monitoring, modelling and forecasting

- Output 1.1 Multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology is developed and institutionalized on the national level.
- Output 1.2 Institutional and legal frameworks are in place to roll-out the standardized hazard mapping and risk assessment methodology.
- Output 1.3 Knowledge on multi-hazard mapping and risk assessment is available and enhanced.

Outcome 2 - Vulnerable people, communities and regions in Georgia have increased resilience and face fewer risks from natural and climate change threats to their livelihoods

- Output 2.1 Nation-wide, multi hazard maps and risk profiles based on risk assessment are developed.
- Output 2.2. Municipal level multi-hazard response and preparedness capacities are enhanced.

3/ Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions:

The evaluation will assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project interventions, in line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. To support the analysis the following indicative questions are proposed but could be broadened and agreed within inception report:

Relevance:

- Is the project relevant for the main beneficiary?
- Are the expected results/outputs of the project consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the log frame matrix/project theory)?
- 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, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) or will be likely to achieve it/them?
- To what extent has the project already achieved its expected results/outputs or will be likely to achieve them?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the project's objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- 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 effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?

The response to the above questions should be followed by evaluation findings and consequent specific short and long term recommendations that could be undertaken by UNDP, national partners and/or the stakeholders.

- These analyses have to be done for each output and for the overall project.
- The evaluator is responsible for refining the evaluation methodology, evaluation questions, carrying out the evaluation and delivering UNDP Georgia with a draft report and a final report.
- The key stakeholders, those involved in the implementation, those served or affected by the project and the users of the evaluation should be involved in the evaluation process.

- Finalize the evaluation report, including incorporation of feedback from UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.

4/ Methodology

The Consultant may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project mid-term evaluation. Methods should include desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The International consultant is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary. The International Consultant should present both quantitative data and qualitative findings and data.

The consultant will work in a team with national evaluator who will provide technical support with organizing meetings with national stakeholders, providing written and verbal translation as needed, and any other inputs required for the assignment.

The main tasks of the consultant will include:

1. Elaboration of **Inception report** – The report should include detailed description of appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, interviews/meetings to be conducted, as well as the work plan/evaluation schedule and evaluation matrix to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented above. A list of interviewees should be included into the work schedule submitted by the Consultant. Inception Report should be approved by UNDP Georgia (Suggested template for Inception Report provided in Annex 1).

Evaluation should be done through a combination of techniques, including

- ☑ Desk study review of all relevant project documentation
- ☑ Extended interviews with project stakeholders
- ☑ Extended interviews with project partners
- ☑ Meetings/interviews with project consultants and experts
- ☑ Data triangulation and quality control

2. **Desk review** – Perform a comprehensive documentary analysis of the background documents as well as the project deliverables. Evaluation should include but not be limited to the list of documents presented in **Annex 2**.

3. Interviews with: stakeholders according to the work plan and methodology provided; project consultants and experts (can be done remotely)

- I. Conduct interviews/meetings with the project partners, beneficiaries according to the work plan provided
- II. Conduct the interview/meetings with the stakeholders according to the work plan and
- III. Conduct interviews/meetings with the project consultants, experts and other contractors (can be done remotely).

4. **Elaborate and submit Draft Report** – the report shall be prepared in English and include the lessons learned and recommendations. The proposed outline of the report is given in **Annex 3**. The report should meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in Annex 4.

5. Submit Final Report - Based on the draft report and the comments provided by UNDP, stakeholders and donor, the evaluator will produce a final report. The final report provides the complete content of the report as per the main outline proposed in Annex 3. Upon completion of the draft final report, UNDP and other stakeholders' feedback will provide additional feedback. The final report will be completed by the evaluator 10 days after UNDP provides the feedback.

If it is not possible to travel to the country, due to COVID 19 restrictions, for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account and 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 UNDP.

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 governments and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

The assignment envisages one mission to Georgia, but If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom, teams etc.). International consultants 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 be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultant will be hired support the evaluation and undertake interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5/ Deliverables

1. Inception report that includes methodology and evaluation workplan/schedule and evaluation matrix
2. Draft report with the findings, lessons learned and strategic recommendations.
3. Final report incorporating feedback from UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.
4. Presentation of the final report to UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.

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 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.

6/ Evaluation Ethics

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

7/ Management Arrangements

The Evaluators' Team (international and local consultants) will work under the overall oversight of UNDP's commissioning unit (Energy and Environment Team Leader and M&E specialist). The Project Manager will provide necessary information for the evaluation and will be the primary point of contact for the evaluators however PM will not be involved in evaluation process. UNDP project staff will be providing contact details of

stakeholders and providing all the logistical support as needed. During the 5-day mission to the country, office space could be provided to team of international and national evaluators.

8/ Recruitment Qualifications and Competencies of International Evaluator:

Education

- At least Master's degree in social sciences, public administration, environmental and climate change fields. **(minimum requirement);**

Experience

- At least 5 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level **(minimum requirement);**
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations for climate change related projects **(minimum requirement)**
- Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required **(minimum requirement)**
- Experience of working in climate change, DRR, environmental spheres is an asset.
- Experience of conducting project evaluations for international organizations, including UNDP is an asset

Language

- Proficiency in both spoken and written English.

Corporate competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Understanding of the mandate and the role of UNDP would be an asset.
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional competencies:

- Strong communication and analytical skills.
- Demonstrated skills in drafting reports.
- Ability to work under pressure with several tasks and various deadlines.
- Actively generates creative, practical approaches and solutions to overcome challenging situations.
- Excellent writing, presentation/public speaking skills.
- A pro-active approach to problem-solving.
- Computer literacy.

Leadership and Self-Management skills:

- Builds strong relationships with the working group and with the project partners; focuses on impact and results for the project partners and responds positively to feedback.
- Cooperates with working group effectively and demonstrates strong conflict resolution skills.
- Consistently approaches work with energy, positivity and a constructive attitude.
- Demonstrates strong influencing and facilitation skills.
- Remains calm, in control and good humoured under pressure.
- Demonstrates openness to change, new ideas and ability to manage ambiguity.

- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills.
- Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge and competencies.
- Is able to work independently and hurdle competing priorities.

Conflict of interest:

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

9/ Timeframe for the evaluation process

The consultancy is expected to be carried out in 30 working days over a period of September - January 2022. The timeline for submission of specific deliverables is the following:

Deliverables	Due dates	
1/ Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan (suggested content in Annex 2)	Within 2 weeks upon signing the contract	Submitted
2/ Draft Evaluation Report prepared and accepted (suggested template in Annex 3, report quality requirements in Annex 4)	Within 3 months upon submission of Inception report	Submitted
3/ and 4/Final Evaluation report and presentation of the evaluation results for UNDP and main stakeholders	Within 4 weeks after receiving the comments from UNDP.	Latest 15 March 2022

The timeline of the activities will be detailed in the inception report including flexibility and delays in the timeframe for the evaluation, with additional time for implementing evaluation virtually (if so decided) recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19.

9/ Payment modality and deliverables:

The payment schedule is given below and will be made upon satisfactory completion/submission and approval of the deliverables by UNDP:

20% - upon successful submission and acceptance by UNDP of deliverable 1.

40% - upon successful submission and acceptance by UNDP of deliverable 2 Draft report with the findings, lessons learned and strategic recommendations.

40%- upon successful submission of Deliverables 3 and 4: Final report incorporating feedback from UNDP, the donor and stakeholders, and Presentation of the final report to UNDP, the donor and stakeholders.

Annex 1

Inception report

(Suggested content)

1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. Evaluation objective, purpose and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. Evaluation criteria and questions. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. Evaluability analysis. Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. Cross-cutting issues. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. Evaluation matrix. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites or scheduling online meetings, interviews and workshops amid COVID-19 restrictions.
10. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2019) and ensuring quality and usability. The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in Annex 4.

Annex 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

1. Project Document/RRF
2. Project progress reports
3. GCF project document
4. Overall organigram
5. Risk matrix
6. LOAs with partners
7. LOA progress reports

Evaluation Report Template

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention.
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
- Countries of the evaluation intervention.
- Names and organizations of evaluators.
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
- Acknowledgements.

2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports on second page (as one page):

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title		
Atlas ID		
Corporate outcome and output		
Country		
Region		
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
Project budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source		
Implementing party ¹		

Evaluation Information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/other		
Period under evaluation	Start	End

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

Evaluators		
Evaluator email address		
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion

3. **Table of contents**, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.
4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**
5. **Executive summary (four-page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
 - Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
 - Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
 - Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
 - Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
 - Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.
6. **Introduction**
 - Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
 - Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
 - Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention — see upcoming section on intervention).
 - Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.
7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:
 - Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
 - Explain the **expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
 - Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other **programme or country-specific plans and goals**.
 - Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
 - Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
 - Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
 - Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
 - Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.

- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
 - Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).
8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
- **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
 - **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
 - **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used.² The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
 - **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.
9. **Evaluation approach and methods.**³ The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:
- **Evaluation approach.**
 - **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
 - **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
 - **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
 - **Performance standards:**⁴ the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
 - **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

² The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

³ All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report.

⁴ A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.

- **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).⁵
- **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

13. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

15. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- TOR for the evaluation.
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.

⁵ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
- List of supporting documents reviewed.
- Project or programme results model or results framework.
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators.

Evaluation Report Quality Assessment Requirements

Are the evaluation report's objectives, criteria, methodology and data sources fully described and are they appropriate given the subject being evaluated and the reasons for carrying out the evaluation?	
2.1	Is the evaluation report well-balanced and structured? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With sufficient but not excessive background information? - Is the report a reasonable length? - Are required annexes provided?
2.2	Does the evaluation report clearly address the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR?
METHODOLOGY	
2.3	Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any changes from the proposed approach are detailed with reasons why
2.4	Are the nature and extent of the role and involvement of stakeholders in the project/programme explained adequately?
2.5	Does the evaluation clearly assess the project's/programme's level of relevance?
2.6	Does the evaluation clearly assess the project's/programme's level of effectiveness?
2.7	Does the evaluation clearly assess the project's/programme's level of efficiency?
2.8	Does the evaluation clearly assess the project's/programme's level of sustainability?
DATA COLLECTION	
2.9	Are data-collection methods and analysis clearly outlined? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data sources clearly outlined (including triangulation methods)? - Data analysis approaches detailed? Data-collection methods and tools explained?
2.10	Is the data-collection approach and analysis adequate for the scope of the evaluation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive set of data sources (especially for triangulation) where appropriate? - Comprehensive set of quantitative and qualitative surveys, and analysis approaches where appropriate? - Clear presentation of data analysis and citation within the report? - Documented meetings and surveys with stakeholders and beneficiary groups, where appropriate?
2.11	Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issues with access to data or verification of data sources? - Issues in availability of interviewees? - Outline how these constraints were addressed
REPORT CONTENT	
2.12	Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme strategy and/or UNDAF?
2.13	Does the evaluation draw linkages to related national government strategies and plans in the sector/area of support? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the evaluation discuss how capacity development or the strengthening of national capacities can be addressed?
	Does the evaluation detail project funding and provide funding data (especially for GEF)?

2.14	- Variances between planned and actual expenditures assessed and explained? Observations from financial audits completed for the project considered?
2.15	Does the evaluation include an assessment of the project's M&E design, implementation and overall quality?
2.16	Does the evaluation identify ways in which the programme/project has produced a catalytic role and has demonstrated: (a) the production of a public good; (b) demonstration; (c) replication; and/or (d) scaling up (GEF evaluations)?
2.17	Are indicators in the results framework assessed individually, with final achievements noted?
Does the evaluation report address gender and other key cross-cutting issues?	
3.1	Are human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable group issues addressed where relevant?
3.2	Does the report discuss the poverty/environment nexus or sustainable livelihood issues, as relevant?
3.3	Does the report discuss disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant?
3.4	Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues as relevant?
3.5	Are the principles and policy of gender equality and the empowerment of women integrated in the evaluation's scope and indicators as relevant?
3.6	Do the evaluation's criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how gender equality and the empowerment of women have been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention and the results achieved, as relevant?
3.7	Are a gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques selected?
3.8	Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations take aspects of gender equality and the empowerment of women into consideration?
3.9	Does the evaluation draw linkages to the Sustainable Development Goals and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated?
3.10	Does the terminal evaluation adequately address social and environmental safeguards, as relevant? (GEF evaluations)
Does the report clearly and concisely outline and support its findings, conclusions and recommendations?	
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	
4.1	Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of findings?
4.2	Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of conclusions?
4.3	Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned?
4.4	Do the findings and conclusions relate directly to the objectives of the project/programme? - Are the objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the TOR?
4.5	Are the findings and conclusions supported with data and interview sources? - Are constraints in access to data and interview sources detailed?
Do the conclusions build on the findings of the evaluation?	

4.6	- Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and present a balanced picture of the strengths and limitations of the evaluation's focus?
4.7	Are risks discussed in the evaluation report?
RECOMMENDATIONS	
4.8	Are the recommendations clear, concise, realistic and actionable? - A number of recommendations are reasonable given the size and scope of the project/ programme Recommendations link directly to findings and conclusions
4.9	Are recommendations linked to country programme outcomes and strategies and actionable by the country office? - Is guidance given for implementation of the recommendations? Do recommendations identify implementing roles (UNDP, government, programme, stakeholder, other)?

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

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

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.