Terms of Reference (ToR)

NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANCY

Mid-term evaluation: "Joint Youth Programme"

Job Title:	National Consultant for the Mid-term Evaluation of "the Joint Youth Programme"
Category:	Youth Employment
Duty Station:	Kigali, Rwanda
Type of contract:	National consultant
Expected starting date:	Immediately
Duration of assignment:	50 days

I. Background and context

Initiated in 2019, the One UN Joint Youth Programme is a 5-year Programme ending in June 2024. The Joint Programme builds on the past successes of the Youth and Women Employment Programme such as the YouthConnekt initiative as well as the Art-Rwanda and iAccelerator programmes that established impactful approaches for youth empowerment.

The Joint Youth Programme aims to reach three key objectives: (1) increased youth (girls and boys) access to decent jobs in Rwanda; (2) empowerment of youth to fully engage in policy-making and civic engagement; and (3) increased youth use of health services and adoption of healthy lifestyle practices. These objectives align the Programme with the UN's renewed Youth Strategy, contributing to the advancement in Rwanda of each of the Strategy's three pillars: peace and security, human rights, sustainable development. The Programme contributes to the One UN Rwanda's UNDAP's efforts to create decent jobs and provide access to education and health care services. By seeking to realize the full potential of youth, the Programme also aligns with the African Union's Vision 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals. At the national level, the proposed Programme's strategy to promote

skills development and job creation aligns with the Rwandan Government's Vision 2050, the National Strategy for Transformation, and the National Youth Policy. The joint programme is also in line with the One UN Rwanda United Nations Assistance Development Plan (UNDAP 2018-2023) and specifically with:

- Outcome 1: "By 2023 people in Rwanda benefit from more inclusive, competitive and sustainable economic growth that generates decent work and promotes quality livelihoods for all" and its indicator 1.1. "Number of new decent jobs created".
- Outcome 3: ''By 2023 people in Rwanda, particularly the most vulnerable, enjoy increased and equitable access to quality education, health, nutrition and WASH services''.
- Outcome 4: "By 2023, people in Rwanda, particularly the most vulnerable, have increased resilience to both natural and man-made shocks for a life free from all forms of violence and discrimination".
- Outcome 6: "By 2023, people in Rwanda participate more actively in democratic and development processes and benefit from transparent and accountable public and private sector institutions that develop evidence-based policies and deliver quality services."

The Joint programme brought together 7 sister UN agencies based on their comparative advantages (UNDP, UNFPA, WHO, UNWOMEN, FAO, UNCDF, UNICEF) under the coordination of MYCULTURE and UNDP to support different implementing partners (MYCULTURE, MoH, MIGEPROF, Imbuto Foundation, NYC, RYAF, among others).

Within this Joint Programme, UNDP has been providing technical and financial support to the Ministry of Youth and Culture for the implementation of the YouthConnekt initiative. Covering issues of youth employment, the role of youth in national dialogue and innovation with a strong gender and technology focus, YouthConnekt is a successful multi-faceted programme initiated in 2012 by the Government of Rwanda through the Ministry of Youth and ICT (MYICT) in partnership with UNDP[1]. The Platform seeks to empower young people and connect them with leaders from the public, private sector and the civil society to forge partnerships to provide employment and entrepreneurship opportunities (such as internships, courses, mentorships, job advertisements, job fairs, coaching, business incubator centres, banks, as well as other platforms) to youth. The platform connects young people to role models, resources, knowledge and skills development[2]. By combining elements of skills development, entrepreneurship, access to jobs and finance, awareness raising on issues related to youth development, and promotion of youth citizenship through community work and inclusion in local and national policy dialogue, the YouthConnekt initiative has proven to be a very innovative and effective way of facilitating the demographic transition and creating high productive off-farm jobs.

Within the Joint Youth Programme, UNFPA has been providing technical and financial support for the implementation of the i-accelerator initiative implemented by the Imbuto Foundation. The Innovation Accelerator (iAccelerator) is a mentorship-driven acceleration programme, which aims to promote an entrepreneurial spirit among young people and encourage them to think critically and creatively on issues related to sexual and reproductive health. The iAccelerator is a countrywide selection of sustainable and scalable youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health projects.

---

[1] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SdT6Q4zsNQg
[2] http://youthconnekt.rw/

The main donor of the Joint Youth Programme is KOICA (Korea International Cooperation Agency). MYCULTURE, UNDP and UNFPA signed an agreement with Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) in 2019 to support the scaling-up of the YouthConnekt and i-accelerator initiatives in Rwanda through a 4-year programme (2019-2022) with a budget of USD 7,500,000.

II. Evaluation Purpose

The main purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation is to examine the results, achievements, and constraints of UNDP and UNFPA funded activities of the Joint Youth Programme with a specific focus on the KOICA funded activities. It also aims at evaluating the other activities funded by UNICEF, WHO, FAO, UNCDF and UNWOMEN.

The Project was initiated in 2019 and is planned to end in June 2024. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation and lessons learned from its implementation will inform the end of the programme cycle.

The consultant is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations regarding the overall design and orientation of the programming cycle, after evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assessing the achievements the project outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will also assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt adjustments. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would also help the Joint Youth Programme to document lessons learnt and best practices.

III. Evaluation scope and objectives

Objectives

In line with the Joint Youth programme's objectives, UNDP Rwanda, in collaboration with the project's implementing partners (MYCULTURE, Imbuto Foundation, WHO, MINAGRI, MIGEPROF, MOH) and all UN agencies, plans to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the Joint Youth programme. The evaluation aims to assess the achievements of the outputs and outcomes. The mid-term evaluation main objectives are the following:

- Assess the Programme's implementation strategy
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions
- Assess the Programme's processes, including budgetary efficiency
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs are being achieved
- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the programme's activities including the most successful initiatives to be scaled-up
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets

- Document lessons learnt of effective approaches
- Make recommendations for the next project cycle
- Make recommendations for strengthening the synergies among UN agencies and implementing partners

Scope

The evaluation covers the implementation period of the project, from 2019 up to now. It covers the UN agencies funded interventions of the Joint Youth Programme with a specific attention to the KOICA funded activities. The geographic coverage of the evaluation is the whole country (Rwanda). The scope of the mid-term evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments towards the success of the project
- Document success stories and lessons learnt for the most effective approach
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the programme

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

(i)   Assess whether the programme design was clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;

(ii)   An evaluation of the project's delivery of achievement of its overall objectives;

(iii)   An evaluation of programme's performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document; An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the programme outputs produced to date in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the duration of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Steering Committee and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the programme;

(iv)   An evaluation of the programme's contribution to the achievements of UNDAP's outcome and outputs and the national Development agenda (NST, National Youth Policy);

(v)   Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Programme Document;

(vi)   An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:

a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;

b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms used by the Joint Youth Programme in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in project implementation;

c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of lthe project;

d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC);

e. Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.

(vii) A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the programme were met;

(viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of programme activities;

(ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach[3]

(x) Assess of the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly

(xi) Lessons learned during programme implementation;

(xii) Evaluate the programme's exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity

IV. Evaluation

Evaluation criteria

The programme will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance**: measures whether the programme addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- **Effectiveness**: measures whether the programme activities achieve its goals.
- **Efficiency**: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.
- **Sustainability**: measures whether the benefits of the programme are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The programme needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

---

[3] For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation" http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616

- **Impacts of intervention**: measures the positive and negative changes produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Evaluation Questions

More specifically, the mid-term evaluation aims at addressing the following questions for each evaluation criteria, although not limited to:

Relevance

- Where is this Programme being implemented? How was the Programme site selected? What has been the main focus of the programme implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the programme aligned to the national development strategy (NST, Vision 2020- 2050)?
- The extent to which the programme activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent did the objectives remain valid throughout the programme duration?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and Effects?

Effectiveness

- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?
- Have the different outputs been achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- To what extend the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?
- What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?
- How did UNDP support the achievement of programme outcome and outputs?
- How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other programmes?

Efficiency

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What was the original budget for the Programme? How have the Programme funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?

- Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the Programme? What are they and how are they being addressed?

Sustainability

- To what extent will the benefits of the programme continue after donor funding stops?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?
- Does the programme have a clear exit strategy?
- To what extend the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?

Impact of interventions

- What are the stated goals of the Programme? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the programme and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the programme contribute to the achievement of UNDAP & NST1 outcomes and outputs?
- What has happened as a result of the programme?
- What have been the main impact of the programme on the Youth Employment framework in Rwanda?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the programme contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the programme?
- What difference has the programme made to beneficiaries?

V. Methodology

General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results). UNDP's Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluators and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluators, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, development partners, civil society organizations partners, private sector, beneficiaries, etc.) and through

focus group discussions. Further data on the programme indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the programme progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of programme document, financial and monitoring reports (such as minutes, Face Forms, Narrative reports, Steering Committee meetings resolutions, Programme annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant);

(ii) Review of specific items produced so far, including datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;

(iii) Field verification where necessary, for some specific activities

(iv) Interviews with key resource persons within the concerned institutions and UN agencies (heads of units, focal persons, implementing technical persons…)

(v) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders

VI. Deliverables (Evaluation Products)

This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:

- **Evaluation inception report**—An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with UNDP and MYCULTURE **1 week after signing the contract**

- **Draft evaluation report**—Submission of draft evaluation report to MYCULTURE and UNDP for comments and inputs. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will then review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.

- **A summarized documents, highlighting lesson learnt of best practices and key set of recommendations as well as a Presentation of Draft evaluation report (PPT presentation)** to the Technical Committee for inputs, comments and approval.

- **Mid-term evaluation report.** The final report should be completed **1 week after receipt of consolidated comments from stakeholders** and submitted to MYCULTURE and UNDP.

VII. Evaluation Team Composition and required competencies

The Individual consultant should have the following skills/competencies and characteristics:

- At least master's degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Economics or/and Management and Business;
- At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation.
- At least 10 years accumulated experience in programme management support, programme/project formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;
- Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Youth Employment/Empowerment/ entrepreneurship and/or business development;
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-rights based approach and environmental sustainability concepts;
- Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner
- Proven understanding of key elements of result-based programme management in International development cooperation
- Fluent in English and working knowledge of French would be an added advantage
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English

VIII. How to apply

Candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

(i) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

(ii) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects as well as the contact details (e-mail and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

(iii) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology, if applicable, on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment

(iv) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

All interested applicants should submit the above documents to UNDP CO Rwanda by emailing procurement.rw@undp.org.

IX. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation[4].The critical issues the evaluator must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation include evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, (for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality

X. Implementation Arrangements

This section describes the organization and management structure for the evaluation and defines the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

UNDP

UNDP is responsible for the management of this mid-term evaluation and will contract independent consultant to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. UNDP will be the focal point for the evaluation and will facilitate the logistical requirements and provide technical assistance during all phases of the evaluation process, including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

UNDP Programme Analyst

Day-to-day management of the Evaluation Team will be provided by UNDP programme analyst overseeing the project. He or she will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluation Team, including payments are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluation Team. He or she will provide all documentation to the team for the desk review, set up interview appointments and field visits and convene focus group meetings.

Evaluation Management Team

An Evaluation Management Team led by UNDP composed of a representative of MYCULTURE, UNDP Environment Head of Unit, Programme Analyst, M&E specialist, the Chief of UNDP Management Support Unit, UNFPA and KOICA will oversee the conduct of the evaluation at the technical level and will be responsible for providing guidance and direction for the evaluation process and inputs and comments on the draft evaluation report as well as for approving the final document. The team will provide quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria.

---

[4] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Available at www.uneval.org/**ethicalguidelines**

The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, ensure wide stakeholder consultations, will be in charge of verifying all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final report and the drafting and implementation of follow up actions.

XI. Time Frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted in February-March 2018 for an estimated 35 working days. The evaluation will include the following phases with their respective time frame.

Phase	Tasks and deliverables	Time-Line
Desk Review and Inception report phase	• Desk review conducted • Briefings of evaluators • An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators detailing the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.	**5 days**
Stakeholder consultations and Interviews	• The evaluators will consult with all relevant stakeholders and conduct a series of interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits in order to collect the required data.	**20 days**
Analysis of data and drafting report	• Once the data is collected, the evaluators will analyse them and draft the evaluation report.	**15 days**
Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting	• Once the draft final mid-term evaluation report submitted, it will be presented to all stakeholders for reviewing. The comments shared by the stakeholders will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.	**4 days**
Final Report	• The evaluators will revise the final report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the report to UNDP.	**6 days**
	Total number of working days	**50 days**

XII. Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultancy fee will be paid as a Lump Sum (inclusive of all expenses related to the consultancy), and will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components of the consultancy. The consultancy fee will be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

- 30% after presentation and adoption of the inception report
- 30% after presentation and approval of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final report

XIII. Annexes

Annex 1: Key Stakeholders and partners

Stakeholders	Intervention area	the contact person
Ministry of Youth and Culture	GoR	Minister
Ministry of Youth and Culture	GoR	Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Youth and Culture	GoR	Head of SPIU
Ministry of Youth and Culture	GoR	YouthConnekt specialist
Ministry of Gender and family promotion	GoR	Minister and Focal point
Ministry of Health	GoR	Minister and Focal point
Ministry of Agriculture and Animal resources	GoR	Minister and Focal point
UNDP	UN	One UN Resident Coordinator, Rwanda
UNDP	UN	UNDP Rwanda Resident Representative
UNDP	UN	UNDP Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP	UN	Head of Sustainable Growth Unit, UNDP
UNDP	UN	M&E specialist
UNDP	UN	Programme Analyst, UNDP
UNDP	UN	Business Incubators
UNFPA	UN	UNFPA Rwanda Representative
UNFPA	UN	UNFPA Joint youth programme focal point
KOICA	Donor	Country Director
KOICA	Donor	Deputy Country Director
KOICA	Donor	YouthConnekt focal point
WHO	UN	Representative
WHO	UN	Joint Youth programme Focal point

UNWOMEN	UN	Representative
UNWOMEN	UN	JYP Focal point
UNICEF	UN	Representative
UNICEF	UN	Deputy Representative and JYP Focal point
UNCDF	UN	Joint Youth programme Focal point
FAO	UN	Representative
FAO	UN	Joint Youth programme Focal point
Imbuto Foundation	Youth empowerment	Director General
Imbuto Foundation	Youth empowerment	Project Officer / Youth Empowerment & Mentorship
National Youth Council	Representative	Executive secretary
JYP Beneficiaries	20 to be identified in partnership with JYP Technical team	Beneficiaries
Projects to be visited	Selected number of projects funded by JYP	Projects such as Art-Rwanda initiative, I-accelerator, Ecobrigade, generation unlimited, vulnerable youth, etc.
PSF	Private Sector	PSF Representative
PSF	Private Sector	Chamber of young entrepreneurs' representative
Start-up Mart	Private Sector	Business development consultancy firm in charge of YouthConnekt mentorship programme

Annex 2: Documents to be consulted

The list below details the important documents that the evaluator should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. The list might include other relevant documents identified during the inception phase and the consultation process.

Documents

Joint Youth Programme PRODOC

Annual reports 2019-2020-2021 Joint Youth Programme (Presentation SCM, KOICA annual reports, UN agencies annual reports)

Quarterly Progress reports "Youth and Women Employment Programme", 2019-2021

Project Steering Committee Meetings minutes, Joint Youth Programme, 2019-2021

National Youth Policy, Rwanda

Republic of Rwanda, NST 2018

Republic of Rwanda, Vision 2050

United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, CCPD 2019-2024

UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation

UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluations for Development Results (2009)

UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' 2005.

Addendum June 2011 Evaluation: Updated guidance on Evaluation in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009)

Annex 3: Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the evaluation criteria as stated below:

The offer will be evaluated by using the best value for money approach. Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70% whereas the financial proposal will be evaluated on 30%. Below is the breakdown for the technical proposal which will be brought to 70%.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical		
At least master's degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Economics or/and Management and Business;	10%	10
At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation	15%	15
At least 10 years' experience in programme management support including formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation	15%	15
Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Youth Employment/Empowerment/ entrepreneurship and business development;	20%	20

initiatives;		
Overall Methodology (clear demonstration of evaluation methodology and understanding of the ToR)	30%	30
Fluent in English (written and verbal skills)	10%	10

Annex 4: Sample Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators need to create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It 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. The draft sample evaluation Matrix to be used by the evaluators is presented below.

Table A. 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 5: Required format for the evaluation report

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports:

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

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

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—Should:
- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework**, **implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals.**
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a 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).

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. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions: Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).

- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—The report should describe the procedures used to 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. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

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

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Recommendations—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned—As appropriate, 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.

Report annexes—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
- ToR for the evaluation

- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

Annex 6: Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System (see link)