

Appendix I: Terms of Reference

Rationale and Purpose

The United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and the UN Department of Peacekeeping (DPKO) have long recognized the need to evaluate their past and ongoing collaboration, which started in the early 1990's and has never been independently evaluated. In July 2007, the Department of Field Support (DFS) was created and became de facto UNV's direct counterpart in its peacekeeping collaboration assuming all previous responsibilities ascribed to DPKO under the Global Memorandum of understanding with UNV¹. UNV and DFS are now commissioning a joint evaluation on their past and ongoing collaboration, with a view towards strengthening the coordination between DFS and UNV for the use of volunteers in peacekeeping operations and to evaluate the contribution of United Nations volunteers as a component of peacekeeping operations.

The evaluation is particularly relevant given the evolution and growth of the collaboration between UNV and DPKO since its infancy. The surge in peacekeeping operations globally over the past few years, and 1999-2008 in particular, has resulted in DFS becoming UNV's second largest partner organization. UNV volunteers account for about one third of all international civilian staff in UN peacekeeping operations. There are over 2500 UNV volunteers currently serving in 18 peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations around the world, assisting various stages of the "mission life-line", i.e. from start-up through downsizing.

The **purpose** of the evaluation is to respond to General Assembly resolution 60/266 which requested the Secretary-General to strengthen coordination between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the Secretariat and the United Nations Volunteer programme for the use of volunteers in peacekeeping operations and to evaluate the contribution of the United Nations Volunteers as a component of peacekeeping operations.

Background

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations plans, directs, manages and provides political and substantive guidance to field operations under its responsibility. The Department of Field Support provides the Department of Peacekeeping Operations with support to United Nations field operations, including the provision of personnel, financial, logistics, communications and information technology services.

The United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme is the UN organization that promotes volunteerism to support peace and development worldwide. Volunteerism can transform the pace and nature of development and it benefits both society at large and the individual volunteer. UNV contributes to peace and development by advocating for volunteerism globally, encouraging partners to integrate volunteerism into development programming, and mobilizing volunteers.

¹ In its resolution 61/256, the General Assembly affirmed its support for the restructuring of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), including the establishment of a Department of Field Support (DFS). Under this resolution DFS is now responsible for delivering dedicated support to United Nations field operations, including personnel and is a provider of services to DPKO. To strengthen the efficiency and coherence of support provided to the field and to ensure effective oversight, existing Headquarters capacities related to field operations were consolidated and assigned to DFS in July 2007. As a result of the restructuring in DPKO, the United Nations Volunteer (UNV) Programme's operational partner is now DFS, inclusive of formalized responsibilities outlined between DPKO and UNV in the Memorandum of Understanding, and Note of Guiding Principles signed by DPKO and UNV in 2003. For the purposes of the evaluation, it is understood that all references to DFS throughout the document are inclusive of the prior historical relationship with DPKO and that the evaluation will assess UNV support within the context of DPKO missions.

The collaboration between UNV and DFS/DPKO has been formalized through the 2003 UNV-DPKO Global Memorandum of Understanding and the 2003 UNV-DPKO Note on Guiding Principles. The collaboration between DPKO and UNV since 1992 reflects two basic principles. The first is that volunteerism is universal and inclusive, and that values of free will, commitment, engagement and solidarity are paramount in all volunteer action. The second is a growing recognition, especially following the International Year of Volunteers 2001, that volunteerism brings benefits to both society at large and the individual volunteers; makes important contributions, economically as well as socially; and contributes to more cohesive societies by building trust and reciprocity among citizens. UNV assignments have covered almost every aspect of United Nations peacekeeping field operations, including substantive areas, such as political affairs, electoral support, humanitarian relief, human rights, administrative and technical support. It is part of the agreement between the two organizations that there be a substantive balance between UNV volunteers working in substantive and operational support.

Recent General Assembly resolutions have acknowledged the valuable contribution of United Nations Volunteers in the United Nations system (59/296 of 22 June 2005) and requested the Secretary-General to strengthen coordination between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the Secretariat and the United Nations volunteers programme for the use of volunteers in peacekeeping operations and to evaluate the contribution of United Nations Volunteers as a component of peacekeeping operations (60/266 of 28 June 2006).

Objectives and Scope

The objectives of the evaluation are:

To provide an independent analysis of the coherence, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and – to the extent possible – impact and sustainability of UNV-DFS collaborative activities;

To identify UNV's comparative advantage in the context of peacekeeping operations and the value added by UNV volunteers to those operations;

To make recommendations on areas where the UNV-DFS partnership can most effectively meet peacekeeping missions' programmatic and operational results, as well as on future strategic and programmatic approaches of the partnership.

The evaluation will cover all UNV – DFS collaborative activities since their inception in 1992. It will encompass activities related to the deployment and management of UNV volunteers in the various subject areas of peacekeeping missions, including "substantive" ones such as political affairs, civil affairs, electoral support, humanitarian relief, human rights, as well as administrative support. The analysis will distinguish those various areas, so that recommendations are specific and utilization-focused. There will be no limit in scope in the geographical coverage with the exception of the field visits to be undertaken, which will include a sample of projects only.

The focus of the evaluation is the collaboration between UNV and DFS, not an evaluation of DFS's operations.

Recommendations of the evaluation will be taken into account in the preparation of a new Memorandum of Understanding between UNV and DFS.

Evaluation Methods and Approaches

Data Collection

In terms of data collection, the evaluation will use a multiple method approach including:

Desk review (all historical and statistical information and data concerning the collaboration between UNV and DPKO since 1992, including: all MOUs, related UN legislation, reports on reviews and assessments, mission reports, newsletters, updates, reports from UNV's online Volunteer Reporting

System, UNV 2007 results workshop report on “V4D in Post-conflict Environments”, annual budgets, papers from the 2007 UNV Special Operations desk review on peacekeeping)

Setting up of a repository and bibliography that will also serve for future reference

Preparation of an analytical summary of background documents identifying evident changes and trends in the collaboration over time

Group and individual interviews with: UNV and DFS HQ staff, UNV field managers, DFS field leadership and staff, DPKO/DPA / EAD HQ and field staff; and UNV volunteers serving in peacekeeping operations

HQ/project/field visits

Three visits to each, UNV and DFS HQ during the preparatory, implementation and follow-up phase of the evaluation

Project/field visits to several ongoing peacekeeping operations covering all areas of work of UNV volunteers and including at least two where electoral support collaboration is ongoing

Web-based surveys to collect data from UNV volunteers, DFS and UNV staff and management, and other stakeholders

Workshops if necessary and appropriate.

The appropriate set of methods and their precise nature (e.g. exact number and location of field visits) will be determined during the Scoping Mission, which is described in detail in Section 6 of this TOR.

Validation

The Evaluation Team will use a variety of methods to ensure that the data is valid, including triangulation. The precise methods of validation will be detailed in the Inception Report (also described in Section 6 of the TOR).

Stakeholder Participation

The evaluation will pursue a strong participatory approach, involving a broad range of stakeholders having direct involvement in UNV/DFS collaboration during planning, design, conduct and follow-up of the evaluation. Stakeholders include:

Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) – relating to the use of UNV volunteers in the substantive programme of peacekeeping operations;

Department of Political Affairs (DPA) – to cover UNV volunteers working as political affairs officers, as well as the political/peacebuilding Missions directed by DPA (currently seven having a UNV component)

Electoral Assistance Division (EAD) – to cover UNV volunteers working on electoral support

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) - to cover UNV volunteers working on human rights issues in peacekeeping operations

Special Representative of the Secretary-General, UNDP, OCHA and the Resident Coordinator mechanism in cases where the Mission is set up according to the integrated concept approach

Government representatives as appropriate (including National Electoral Commissions, National DDR Commissions), the judiciary/prison/police, civil society organizations as appropriate (including political organizations), private sector representatives, other UN Agencies, other multilateral organizations, and bilateral donors.

Beneficiaries who are the recipients of direct support from UNVs in peacekeeping operations.

Stakeholders will be involved in the mission through briefings, debriefings and peer reviews of evaluation deliverables.

A detailed stakeholder mapping will be undertaken and a plan of stakeholder involvement be drawn during the Scoping Mission.

Users

The main users of the evaluation are UNV and DFS management. The outcomes of the evaluation will feed into reports to the UNDP Executive Board and the General Assembly, and will be made available through the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center. It is understood that the report will not contain any information that jeopardizes the reasonable protection and confidentiality of stakeholders.

Finding 1: Management Team

Finding 2: A joint UNV-DFS management team will oversee the development of terms of reference, the evaluation report and process.

Finding 3: Quality Assurance

As UNV is a subsidiary body of UNDP, the UNDP Evaluation Office will provide quality assurance support to the management team, in particular through reviewing and commenting on the evaluation deliverables (see section VI of the TOR). Additionally, an external expert will provide advice regarding evaluation methods and other relevant aspects in support of quality assurance, as well as comments on the key deliverables, such as the inception report, the country reports and the final evaluation report.

Finding 4: Code of Conduct, Ethical Guidelines, and Norms and Standards for Evaluations in the UN System

The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The evaluation consultants will sign the Code of Conduct and respect the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN system established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). All documents are available on the UNEG website (<http://www.uneval.org/>).

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation criteria and questions below cover all aspects of the complex UNV – DFS collaboration and will inform the future strategy and programmatic approach of the collaboration.

1. Coherence – The quality of being logically integrated, consistent, and intelligible related to diverse elements, relationships, values, policies and goals.

Is the involvement of UNV volunteers in peacekeeping operations coherent with global goals, GA resolutions? - *External Coherence*

Is the involvement of UNV volunteers in peacekeeping coherent with UNV's and DFS/DPKO's mission mandates, goals and objectives? – *Internal Coherence*

2 Relevance - The extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of UNV and DFS.

To what extent are the objectives of the collaboration still valid and appropriate from the perspective of all stakeholders?

Are the criteria and parameters for the use of UNV volunteers in peacekeeping operations as defined in the Guiding Principles still relevant?

What is the motivation for UNV volunteers working in peacekeeping operations?

Is the level of a UNV Volunteers dedication and motivation linked to the duration of their assignment in peacekeeping? At what point are these levels affected? What are the main reasons for these changes?

Does the collaboration extend its value beyond that of a mere staffing modality?

To what extent does the collaboration help the two agencies achieve their strategic results?

What areas of the collaboration with UNV are most useful to DFS?

What are the key strategic challenges in the UNV - DFS collaboration?

What strategic recommendations can be made for the new Memorandum of Understanding between UNV and DFS?

3 Effectiveness - A measure of the extent to which an activity attains its objectives.

To what extent have the objectives of the collaboration been achieved / are likely to be achieved?

What were the major factors influencing these objectives?

In this regard, Article 5 of the Note on Guiding Principles between DPKO and UNV will be taken into account. The Note provides the conceptual underpinning for the UNV – DPKO collaboration, as laid out in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the two Parties on 18 November 2003, and Article 5 states: „DPKO and UNV agree to work together to enhance an environment in which volunteerism is recognized as a significant element in the success of United Nations peacekeeping operations”.

Does the collaboration serve the cause of peace and development through enhancing opportunities for the participation and involvement of all peoples in the spirit of solidarity and partnership (ref. Article 3 of the Note on Guiding Principles between DPKO and UNV)?

Has a “reasonable balance” been maintained between substantive roles of UNV volunteers, as compared to operational mission support functions? How should a “reasonable balance” be defined/redefined to meet the intended objectives of the DFS and UNV collaboration?

How can the collaboration be strengthened to ensure greater capacity building, coaching and mentoring elements for UNV Volunteer roles in peacekeeping operations?

4 Efficiency - Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term, which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. (DAC definition)

Were activities under the UNV – DFS collaboration cost-efficient?

Were expected results achieved on time?

Were the collaborative activities implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Is the deployment of UNV volunteers the most efficient form to reach stated goals and objectives?

5 Impact - The positive and negative changes produced by UNV’s support to peacekeeping operations, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

What real difference has the work of UNV volunteers in peacekeeping operations made to the beneficiaries, i.e. recipients of direct support from UNV volunteers? What value have they added to peacekeeping operations?

When and where is the intentional use of UNV volunteers most effective (i.e. electoral support, human rights etc.)? What potential “best niche” areas should be further developed in the collaboration between DPKO/DFS and UNV?

What qualitative and quantitative results are achieved through such distinctive contributions?

Without the involvement of UNV Volunteers/ volunteerism, what would have been different? Would the outcomes/ impact have been the same, slower, negative, not happened at all?

How did UNV volunteers contribute to promoting volunteerism locally?

How have UNV volunteers contributed to the transfer of knowledge in peacekeeping operations?

What is the potential for the intentional use of UNV volunteers to support capacity building?

6 Sustainability - Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable. (DAC definition)

Did the supposed intervention techniques/mechanisms of the UNV Programme – including volunteerism promotion, community development and local capacity-building – help to provide additional sustainability to the peacekeeping activities?

Looking at the specific mandate, modus operandi and comparative strengths of the UNV programme, and also given the limitations of what peacekeeping can achieve, to what extent did the benefits of the UNV volunteers' support to peacekeeping operations (in the various subject areas of their deployment) continue after the volunteers left and/or their activities ceased?

What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the UNV activities (e.g. commitment of the volunteers, high turn-over, lack of counterparts, ...)?

Has capacity been created, whether within or outside the mission, that has contributed to the sustainability of what has been put in place by the UNV volunteers?

Can it be said that promoting volunteerism locally can help to enhance and sustain the operations of a peacekeeping mission?

Have community development/capacity building activities undertaken by UNV Volunteers provided the mission with added credibility, collaboration and/or support from local communities, their leaders and local authorities?

7 Gender mainstreaming - "... the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as of men an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality." (United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) definition, July 1997)

How is gender mainstreaming addressed during the implementation of UNV volunteer assignments?

What are supporting or hindering factors in mainstreaming gender under the UNV – DFS collaboration?

8 Management issues – with management being defined as a process that is used to accomplish organizational goals with the key functions being planning, organizing, directing or leading, and controlling or coordinating.

Is UNV programme and administrative support at the mission and Headquarters level structured appropriately to provide effective managerial support?

What role does the UNV Programme Manager contribute in setting the direction for the promotion of volunteerism within the mission? What lessons learned can be identified to strengthen the volunteerism element?

To what extent is the participation of UN volunteers integrated into the strategic and operational planning for new peacekeeping operations?

What is the impact, both positive and negative, of the policy on the recruitment of UNV volunteers for mission posts? What, if any, changes should be made?

How have UNV volunteers been integrated into mission plans and activities relating to security, welfare and recreation, training and other managerial initiatives at the mission level?

Does the status of UNV volunteers have an effect on their ability to do their work and on the recognition they receive? How can the issues identified be addressed in the future?

What is the potential for improving M&E in the UNV/DFS collaboration? What benefits would it bring and how could it be done?

How can learning be further strengthened in the future?

Evaluation Process

The evaluation will cover three phases with the following activities and methods used in each of those as described below.

Phase 1 - Preparation

Establishment of Management Team (for details, please see Section 4).

Desk Review (for details, please see Section 4).

Stakeholder Mapping: Basic mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation. These will include internal and external stakeholders and indicate the relationships between different sets of stakeholders.

Inception Meetings: Interviews and discussions in UNV HQ with the Office of the Executive Coordinator (on strategic issues), Special Operations (on operational issues) and the Evaluation Unit (on the evaluation process and methodological guidance). Interviews and discussions in DFS HQ with various sections / units to be advised and specified by DFS.

Scoping Mission: A mission of the Evaluation Team Leader to UNV and DFS HQs, with participation of members of the Evaluation Management Team, in order to:

- Identify and collect further documentation
- Validate the stakeholder mapping
- Get key stakeholders' perspectives on issues that should be examined
- Ensure key stakeholders understand the evaluation objectives, methodology and process
- Address logistical issues related to the main evaluation mission including timing
- Identify the appropriate set of data collection and analysis methods, including measurable indicators
- Prepare the evaluation framework including evaluation criteria and questions
- Address issues related to the rest of the evaluation process including division of labour among evaluation team members.
- Adjust the TOR as necessary based on information gathered during the scoping mission and to address issues that arose during that mission.

Inception Report: Short report that includes the final evaluation design and plan, background to the evaluation, the key evaluation questions, detailed methodology, information sources and instruments, a plan for data collection, the design for data analysis and the final reporting format. It will have as attachment the **final TOR**.

Phase 2 - Implementation of the Evaluation

Evaluation Mission: The evaluation mission will take approximately six weeks, be conducted by an independent Evaluation Team, and focus on data collection and validation. "Entry workshops" will be held at the beginning of each country visit, where the evaluation objectives, methods and process will be explained to all country level stakeholders. The team will visit important field sites as identified in the Scoping Mission. At the end of each country visit, there will be de-briefing meetings with key stakeholders in the country.

The following countries have been identified to be visited during the evaluation mission:

- 1) Sudan/Darfur (UNMIS & UNAMID)
- 2) DR Congo (MONUC)
- 3) Chad (MINURCAT)
- 4) Haiti (MINUSTAH)
- 5) Timor Leste (UNMIT)

This initial list has been prepared based on the following criteria: size of UNV component, regional/cultural environment, host country support, security concerns, functional emphasis of the volunteers' contributions, mission lifecycle stage. In order to take full advantage of the analysis to be undertaken during the inception phase, the final selection of countries will be confirmed in the Inception Report. The estimated number of days for each country visit is 10 (ten) days, including travel time.

Preparation of country mission reports: The information collected in each country should be organized in individual reports, all with the same structure, which will form annexes to the final overall report.

Preparation of Draft Overall Report: The information collected will be analyzed and presented in a draft evaluation report, to be submitted to the Management Team within three weeks after completion of the evaluation mission.

Review of Draft Report: UNV and DFS will review the draft evaluation report with regards to factual corrections and views on interpretation by key stakeholders. The joint UNV - DFS Management Team will undertake a review of the draft report and provide its comments. The Evaluation Team Leader in close cooperation with the Management Team will finalize the evaluation report based on those reviews. S/he will also prepare the evaluation brief, which is a summary of the evaluation report.

Stakeholder Meeting: A meeting with the key stakeholders will be organized to present the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

Recommendation 2: Phase 3 - Follow-up

Organizational Follow-up: UNV and DFS will consider the recommendations made by the evaluation, and identify and agree upon appropriate follow-up actions.

Communication: The evaluation report and brief will be provided in both, hard and electronic versions to heads of UNV Programme and DFS for distribution as jointly agreed.

Timeframe and responsibilities

The tentative timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are as follows:

| Activity | Responsible party | Estimated date |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Phase 1 | | |
| 1 Finalize draft TOR | UNV and DFS | January 2010 |
| 2 Prepare draft agreement on the joint evaluation (including nominations for the management team) | UNV and DFS | January 2010 |
| 3 Sign agreement | UNV and DFS | January 2010 |
| Activity | Responsible party | Estimated date |
| 4 Tender evaluation | UNV and DFS | February/March 2010 |
| 5 Select consulting firm | UNV and DFS | April 2010 |
| 6 Undertake Desk Review | Evaluation Team Leader | May 2010 |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 7 Undertake Stakeholder Mapping | Evaluation Team Leader | May 2010 |
| 8 Hold Inception Meetings | Evaluation Team Leader + UNV and DFS | May/June 2010 |
| 9 Undertake Scoping Mission | Evaluation Team Leader + UNV and DFS | May/June 2010 |
| 10 Prepare Inception Report | Evaluation Team Leader | June 2010 |
| Phase 2 | | |
| 11 Undertake evaluation mission | Evaluation Team | July/August 2010 |
| 12 Preparation of country reports | Evaluation Team | July/August 2010 |
| 13 Analysis and preparation of draft report | Evaluation Team | September 2010 |
| 14 Review of draft report and preparation of feedback to consultants | UNV and DFS, Management Team | October 2010 |
| 15 Preparation of second draft report | Evaluation Team | October 2010 |
| 16 Stakeholder Meeting | UNV and DFS | November 2010 |
| 17 Preparation of stakeholder feedback to consultants | UNV and DFS, Management Team | November 2010 |
| 18 Preparation of final report | Evaluation Team | December 2010 |
| Phase 3 | | |
| 19 Preparation of organizational follow-up to recommendations | UNV and DFS | January/February 2011 |
| 20 Communication of lessons | UNV and DFS | March 2011 |

Key Deliverables

The expected deliverables from the evaluation and responsibilities for preparing those are as follows:

Inception Report including the evaluation framework (maximum 20 pages) and final TOR (as annex):
Evaluation Team Leader (TL)

The proposed tentative content is as follows:

Introduction

Origin of the evaluation

Delineation of the evaluation's scope (if any)

Expectations expressed in the terms of reference

Evaluation process

Main text

Objectives, principles, priorities and stakes

Indicators considered for each evaluation criteria

[Evaluation questions](#) and explanatory comments on each question

Method and work plan for the gathering of data available at UNV and DFS/DPKO

[Strategy](#) for the field data collection and its analysis

[Annexes](#) (indicative):

Documents used

TOR

Acronyms and abbreviations

others

[Country mission reports](#) (maximum 10 pages for each country): Evaluation Team Leader

The country mission reports should have the following outline:

History of DPKO/DFS/UNV collaboration in the country

Key areas and roles of the collaboration in the country

Overall assessment of the collaboration in the country

Answers to each evaluation question, indicating findings supporting them, and conclusions

Recommendations (clustered and prioritized, preferably in the form of options with benefits and risks)

[Evaluation report](#): 60 pages maximum, excluding annexes; to be produced by the TL; with the following content:

[Executive summary](#) (length: 3 pages maximum, covering all key elements of the report, with the possibility of being a stand-alone document)

Purpose of the evaluation

Method

Analysis and main findings

Main conclusions

Main recommendations

[Introduction](#)

Objectives

Brief analysis of the context of the intervention

Purpose of the evaluation

[Methods](#)

Evaluation criteria and questions, and related indicators

Data collection process actually implemented and limitations if any

Analysis approach actually implemented and limitations if any

[Main findings, conclusions and recommendations](#)

Overall assessment of the collaboration

Answers to each evaluation question, indicating findings supporting them

Recommendations (clustered and prioritized, preferably in the form of options with benefits and risks)

Annexes (indicative)

Methodology

Overview of collaboration

Informants met

Documents consulted

Terms of Reference

Statistical data

Details on peacekeeping missions specifically assessed

Questionnaires and survey reports

Acronyms and abbreviations

others

Two-page Evaluation Brief: TL

Presentation for the Stakeholder Workshop: TL

Profile of Evaluation Team

An evaluation team should conduct this evaluation, with a team leader and additional professional evaluators or specialists to meet the minimum team composition presented below:

Profile of the team leader (TL):

At least a master's degree in relevant discipline;

At least ten years' experience in evaluation, with significant experience in the area of peace-keeping;

Excellent understanding of the context and functioning of UN peace-keeping missions;

Fluency in English and French.

Minimum profile of team members (TM) – these are not individual characteristics, rather the profile that the group as a whole should have:

At least ten years of evaluation experience, with good understanding of participatory and inclusive approaches;

Excellent facilitation skills and experience in designing and facilitating M&E workshops and consultations with stakeholders;

Excellent understanding of and experience in planning and management of peace-keeping missions (e.g. the general make up of typical operations, strategic and staff planning, rules and procedures in the recruitment and management of staff, etc.);

Good knowledge of UNV and volunteerism in general;

Good understanding of issues related to community development, peace building, reintegration, etc.;

Fluency in English and French.

Minimum competencies of the evaluation team – the team leader and all team members should demonstrate the following minimum competencies:

Ethics, integrity and independence throughout the evaluation process;

Excellent reading and analytical skills;

Excellent writing, presentation and communication skills;

Cultural and gender sensitivity.

In cases which the joint UNV-DFS Evaluation Management Team finds necessary, the Evaluation Team may be supported by a National Consultant.

Management and Funding Arrangements

An Evaluation Management Team will be established consisting of members of both partners, UNV and DFS (*names and functions to be included*). The team will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the evaluation

Funding for the evaluation will be equally shared between the UNV Programme and DFS, as jointly agreed. A letter of agreement will be signed between UNV and DFS with the specific arrangements regarding funding, management, procurement and roles/responsibilities for the joint evaluation.

Supporting Documentation

- Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (A/55/305–S/2000/809), 1998 - the so-called “Brahimi Report”
- Report on Secretary-General on the Participation of United Nations Volunteers in peacekeeping operations (A/55/697), 18 December 2000.
- Report of Joint Inspection Unit on the evaluation of the United Nations Volunteers Programme (JIU/REP/2003/7)
- DPKO – UNV MOU and Note on Guiding Principles, 2003
- GA/RES/59/296 of 22 June 2005
- GA resolution 60/266 dated 28 June 2006
- United Nations Peacekeeping Operations – Principles and Guidelines, 2008, the so-called “Capstone Doctrine”
- Desk Study on UNV’s Conflict Related Work, A. Weijers, 2003
- Review of UNV’s Involvement in Conflict Resolution and Confidence Building, J. Cohen, 2000
- Evaluation of Humanitarian Assistance, Peace-Building and Democratization Activities of the UNV Programme, 1996
- Draft Handbook “A participatory methodology for assessing the contribution of volunteerism to development”, UNV, 2008
- Reports of the UNDP Administrator on UNV to the UNDP Executive Board, 2006 and 2008
- “Volunteers Against Conflict”, UNU, 1996.