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**evaluation terms of reference**



**Review of UNV Facility for Evaluation - FACE**

**1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION**

***Background to the UNV Programme***

The United Nations Volunteer (UNV) programme is the UN organization that contributes to peace and development through volunteerism worldwide. Volunteerism is a powerful means of engaging people in tackling development challenges, and it can transform the pace and nature of development. Volunteerism benefits both society at large and the individual volunteer by strengthening trust, solidarity and reciprocity among citizens, and by purposefully creating opportunities for participation. UNV contributes to peace and development by advocating for recognition of volunteers, working with partners to integrate volunteerism into development programming, and mobilizing an increasing number and diversity of volunteers, including experienced UNV volunteers, throughout the world. UNV embraces volunteerism as universal and inclusive, and recognizes volunteerism in its diversity as well as the values that sustain it: free will, commitment, engagement and solidarity.

***Background to the Facility for Evaluation and Justification***

UNV is committed towards results-based management and organizational learning, which are both supported by its evaluation function. Following a decision of the UNDP Executive Board in June 1998, that “it is appropriate to finance from the Special Voluntary Fund (SVF) strategic and cross-cutting evaluations and to supplement the monitoring of United Nations Volunteers and projects executed by the United Nations Volunteers programme”, the FACE project was created in 1998.

The overall objective of FACE, as per the 1998 project document, is to enhance the relevance and effectiveness of the UNV evaluation function. More specifically, it aims to enable UNV (a) to promote organizational learning through maximizing the contribution to improving project and programme design and the incorporation of lessons learned into future activities, including the documentation and dissemination of instructive practices; and (b) to enhance corporate accountability through expanding the volume, scope and quality of evaluation activities.

The original FACE budget was US$ 500,000 and its initial duration 24 months. Several budget revisions and extensions-in-time have been undertaken and various status reports produced. Those reports are of descriptive nature and present information on the utilization of the FACE funds, including type of evaluations and reviews, reports produced and costs. It is time for a more in-depth analysis of the results of having a facility for evaluation and the significance of its use, with a view towards the achievement of stated objectives and the future design of the Facility. Also changes in the internal and external environment of the UNV programme call for such review and for the preparation of a new phase and project document of the Facility.

**2. Objectives and scope**

The ***objective*** of the review is to assess how the Facility for Evaluation has contributed to enhancing UNV’s evaluation function, organizational learning and accountability by analyzing process, effectiveness and sustainability aspects of the use of FACE to date. Ultimately, it will seek to assess whether FACE has been an effective instrument in contributing to results and performance of UNV and its programmes, whether FACE funded evaluations and reviews have been implemented in an independent, credible and useful manner, and whether it had an impact on the way UNV does business. In addition, the review will examine UNV’s current policy framework and programming needs, and will propose ways forward in which FACE can strategically support the organization.

The ***scope*** of the review includes all activities undertaken and results achieved with FACE funds since its start in 1998, taking into consideration the broader context of the evaluation function in UNV, where FACE resides. A complete list of evaluations and other activities funded with FACE resources will be provided to the consultant at the beginning of the review process.

The review will also cover evaluative exercises managed by the Evaluation Unit, which were not funded from FACE but other UNV budget lines, such as e.g. five global thematic “Volunteerism for Development” results workshops organized and case studies undertaken in 2007.

**3. Key Areas / Issues to be addressed**

Based on the objectives stated in the project document and the activities undertaken with FACE funds, the review will address the following main areas:

***Coherence and relevance***

* Are FACE activities coherent with UNV’s policy framework, as well as external UN and UNDP evaluation norms and standards?
* Have FACE funded activities been suitable to address UNV’s programming needs?
* Is the Facility still relevant given the changes in the UNV external and internal environment?
* Are the FACE activities still the most effective ones to achieve the Facility’s objectives?
* Is FACE correctly located and managed in UNV, allowing the evaluation function to operate in an independent manner and optimizing its influence on the way the organization operates?

***Efficiency / Process***

* How have FACE funds been used (thematic focus areas, type of activities, information/learning target groups)?
* Have FACE funded activities been implemented in the most cost efficient manner?
* Was the decision-making process on the use of FACE funds inclusive and participatory?
* Have FACE funded activities considered all stakeholders’ needs and interests (including UNV headquarters and country teams, UN and non-UN partners, government and civil society)?
* How have findings and recommendations been disseminated and how has learning been fostered?
* Have evaluations undertaken under the framework of FACE been conducted in a credible and impartial manner?
* Has the UNV evaluation function had the proper degree of independence to allow FACE to generate critical, useful and credible results?

***Effectiveness***

* Have UNV’s programming units effectively used lessons from FACE funded activities during subsequent project/ programme planning?
* Have they contributed to improving organizational accountability?
* Have they supported UNV’s organizational learning and strategic planning processes?
* What were the enabling and constraining factors for the use of FACE funds, and for the ownership and dissemination of outputs generated?
* Have FACE funded activities adequately addressed gender issues?
* Have they adequately addressed the added value of volunteerism for peace and development?

***Sustainability***

* How has learning taken place? Has it been sustainable?
* Have lessons generated from FACE activities been strategically used by UNV? How?
* How has the transfer of knowledge been secured for “future generations” of UNV programme staff?

***Strategic issues related to M&E supporting future programming***

* Considering the past experience and the future strategic and programmatic direction of UNV, what should be the strategic and programmatic direction of evaluation and monitoring respectively in the organization? Where should those functions be placed and how should they be managed?
* How should Phase 2 of FACE be configured to fulfill this mandate?
* What activities and subject matters should FACE focus on in the future? What kind of evaluation processes should UNV invest in to effectively perform its accountability and learning functions? What are the budget implications?
* What are the necessary adjustments for Phase 2 of the FACE project document?

The above is preliminary list of semi-structured questions, which can be fine-tuned and complemented during the review process.

**4. METHODS AND APPROACHES**

The review should be done in consultation with all relevant stakeholders, using a mixed method approach and a variety of participatory tools. The review design needs to take into consideration the different stakeholder groups, their specific needs and inputs, in order to avoid biases in the overall analysis.

Methods and tools that can be combined at different stages as part of the review include:

* Desk review
* Briefing meetings and interviews with UNV HQ: Evaluation Unit (EU), Programme Development and Operations Group, Special Operations, Office of the Executive Coordinator and others with an interest and stake in evaluation
* In-depth telephone interviews with and questionnaires for selected stakeholders (UNV high-level management, programmatic units, country office teams), to collect recommendations on the future direction of FACE
* All evaluations and reviews in UNV are consistent with the UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) Norms and Standards, and the UNDP Evaluation Policy. Consultants undertaking evaluations and reviews need to adhere to those and, furthermore, are required to sign the UNEG Code of Conduct for UN evaluators. All documents mentioned are included in the Annex of this TOR.

**5. REVIEW PROCESS**

The review will unfold in a phased approach:

* **Desk review**: a close examination of UNV internal and UN documents, as well as UNV corporate systems where information on FACE is available, in order to understand the UN and UNV context, UNV’s corporate and policy frameworks, and activities undertaken with FACE funds.
* **Preparation of Inception report**: that includes a review matrix with evaluation criteria, key questions, indicators and means of verification; detailed information on methods and tools to be used; as well as the review work plan.
* **Semi-structured interviews**:
  + with current and former staff of the UNV Evaluation Unit and other UNV internal actors as needed to acquire a general overview of the history of FACE, key issues observed over the duration of the project, and the rationale behind key decisions taken and outcomes of evaluations/reviews.
  + with UNDP Evaluation Office staff to get the external and independent perspective.
* **Telephone interviews** with selected stakeholders, including the UNDP Evaluation Office, to collect recommendations on the future strategic direction of FACE (vis-à-vis UNV’s current policy frameworks and programming needs) and to discuss key elements of Phase 2 of the FACE that should be in the new project document.
* **Analysis and report writing**: the review findings, conclusions and recommendations will be documented in a draft review report.
* **Presentation**: presentation of draft review report, including recommendations for Phase 2 of the FACE, to UNV stakeholders and the UNDP Evaluation Office.
* **Finalization**: preparation of final report including recommendations for Phase 2 of the FACE to the stakeholders, addressing factual errors and omissions identified by key stakeholders that may lead to a distortion of the analysis.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps in the review process** | **Estimated # of working days** | **Period of implementation** | **Deadline for completion** |
| Contract signature | --- |  | August 2009 |
| Desk review and preparation of inception report (home based, with short briefing in Bonn) | Up to 5 days |  | 2 October 2009 |
| Semi-structured interviews (in Bonn, including travel) and other review activities | Up to 5 days | 5 to 9 October 2009 | 9 October 2009 |
| Telephone interviews (home based) | Up to 1 day |  | 16 October 2009 |
| Analysis and writing of draft review report (home based) | Up to 5 days |  | 27 October 2009 |
| Presentation of draft report (in Bonn, including travel) | Up to 3 days |  | 26 October 2009 |
| Finalization of report (home based) | Up to 2 days |  | 5 November 2009 |
| Total: | Up to 21 days |  |  |

The number of working days indicated above is indicative. The contract and remuneration of the consultant will not be based on days worked but on key deliverables, which are described in the section below.

**6. KEY DELIVERABLES**

The expected outputs of the review are:

* Inception report, including:
  + Review matrix with key questions, indicators and means of verification (see Annex)
  + Detailed information on methods and tools to be used
  + Review work plan
* Draft and final review report (see Annex), including:
  + Executive summary
  + History of the FACE and activities carried out
  + Analysis on process, effectiveness and sustainability of the FACE to date
  + Recommendations on ways forward for the FACE and strategic direction of monitoring and evaluation in UNV

**7. Management of the REVIEW**

The review will be managed according to the Prince-2 methodology. A Project Board will be established representing the following roles:

* **Executive** – UNV (Deputy) Executive Coordinator: ultimately responsible for the project, supported by the Senior User and Senior Supplier. Will ensure that the review is focused, achieve the expected deliverables and give value for money.
* **Senior Suppliers** – UNV Office of the Executive Coordinator (OEC), UNV Programme Development and Operations Group (PDOG), UNV Partnership and Communications Group (PCG), UNV Support Services Group (SSG): representing the interests of those designing, developing, facilitating, procuring, implementing and possibly operating the project products.
* **Senior User** – UNV Evaluation Unit (EU): responsible for specifying the needs of those who will use the final project (the review report with its findings, conclusions and recommendations), and for monitoring that the solution will meet the needs in terms of quality, functionality and ease of use.

A **Project Manager** will be assigned by the Project Executive to run the project on a day-to-day basis, including ATLAS transactions, provision of support to the review consultant, liaison with UNV stakeholders, regular reporting on the progress of the review and other necessary tasks as identified by the Project Board.

Given that UNV is administered by UNDP, **Project Assurance** will be provided by the UNDP Evaluation Office. It will ensure that the review will be implemented in a methodologically sound manner and that the interests of all stakeholders will be addressed. Its independence is critical in performing this function. The UNDP Evaluation Office will review and comment on the draft TOR, as well as the draft inception and draft evaluation reports, and it will participate to the extent practically feasible in the selection of the consultant and presentations on key deliverables.

A **Consultant** will undertake the reviewand be guided in thisby the UNV Evaluation Unit, while financial management transactions (ATLAS) will be undertaken by the Project Manager. While the overall responsibility for the provision of guidance to the Consultant will lie with the Head of the Evaluation Unit, the day-to-day guidance and support will be under the responsibility of an EU Evaluation Specialist who will also ensure close collaboration with other UNV stakeholders both, at UNV Headquarters and Country Office levels as appropriate.

The following chart presents the project structure in a graphical manner:
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**8. Requirements**

The assignment will be contracted to a consultant/ company with experience in monitoring and evaluation and knowledge of volunteerism. The consultant/ company should have:

* University degree(s) at the post-graduate level in a relevant field of study
* Work experience in development, including in developing countries
* Proven track record and experience in monitoring and evaluation, in particular advising on, designing or implementing M&E systems in an organizational setting, as well as assessing evaluation functions of development organizations
* Knowledge of the UN, UNDP and the United Nations Evalaution Group (UNEG)
* Knowledge and experience of volunteerism with its diverse manifestations and cultural settings
* Excellent analytical and report writing skills
* Good people and communication skills
* Fluency in English and working knowledge of French and Spanish (ability to read and understand documents written in the two languages).

**9. Annexes**

* UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation: <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/>
* UNEG Code of Conduct for UN Evaluators: <http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=100>
* UNV template for evaluation/review matrix (see below)
* Template for evaluation/review reports (to be provided at the start of the review)

E evaluation/review matrix template



**Note on this template:** This matrix is a suggested model and a useful tool to systematize the evaluation/review questions and means to collect information. It is not a mandatory instrument for all evaluation/review processes, but can be very valuable to support the evaluator/reviewer in coming up with practical ways of addressing all evaluation/review criteria and issues to be analyzed. It can be adapted, depending on the needs of each specific evaluation/review.

Evaluation/Review Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Questions | Information needed | Indicators | Data collection methods and sources |
| **Relevance** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| Question 7 |  |  |  |
| Question 8 |  |  |  |
| Question 9 |  |  |  |
| Question 10 |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| Question 7 |  |  |  |
| Question 8 |  |  |  |
| Question 9 |  |  |  |
| Question 10 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| Question 7 |  |  |  |
| Question 8 |  |  |  |
| Question 9 |  |  |  |
| Question 10 |  |  |  |
| **Impact/ effects** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| **Volunteerism** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |
| Question 7 |  |  |  |
| Question 8 |  |  |  |
| Question 9 |  |  |  |
| **Other evaluation criteria** | Question 1 |  |  |  |
| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  |  |
| Question 6 |  |  |  |

