## Terms of Reference

TOR for

OUTCOME Evaluation in CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Duty station: Home-based with mission to Astana

Duration: 35 days

Type of contract: Professional Services Contracted

Language required: English, Russian

Background

According to the evaluation plan of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Kazakhstan for 2010-2015, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted[[1]](#footnote-1) to assess the impact of programme component of the UNDP’s development assistance:

*Outcome 5* National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all

*Outcome 6* The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

*Outcome 7* Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner

UNDP in Kazakhstan would like to evaluate its contribution during 2010-2015 to the achievement of the *Outcome on Civic Engagement* and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learnt. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in Kazakhstan’s context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development. Outcome evaluation also should be able to answer whether UNDP supported the Government of Kazakhstan in meeting the National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2050 and the Millennium Development Goals.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2015 with a view to contributing to the preparation of the new UNDP country programme starting from 2016.

BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

Kazakhstan has been successful in managing its transition since 1991, with GDP per capita up from U$1,500 in 1998 to nearly U$13,000 in 2013. Government investment has improved infrastructure and social services, and the country has made significant progress in human development. Trust in country leadership remains relatively strong, though institutional and governance performance is weak by international standards. In accordance with Worldwide Governance Indicators, Kazakhstan ranks highly for political stability, government effectiveness and regulatory quality, but low for accountability, control of corruption, and rule of law.

In December 2012, President Nazarbayev’s provided further national guidance in “the Kazakhstan-2050 Strategy”, stressing the need to improve public institutions’ efficiency by promoting fair competition, justice and the rule of law, and strengthening interaction with NGOs and the business sector. Kazakhstan was elected to the UN Human Rights Council for the period of 2013-2015 and has pledged to use its membership to strengthen human rights at home and globally[[2]](#footnote-2). In 2013, Kazakhstan announced its intention to bid for a non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council for 2017-2018. Kazakhstan has ratified the majority of the core UN human rights treaties[[3]](#footnote-3).

The Government of Kazakhstan has demonstrated commendable commitment to the public administration reform and improvement of public services and has sufficient institutional and financial capacities and political will to carry on with the reforms. The Government is not satisfied with the existing level of progress achieved and is eager to learn and improve the quality of public services and accountability for citizens. The existing state policies aimed at professionalization of public service and strengthening professional knowledge and skills of civil servants represent a major advantage for a knowledge oriented organization like UNDP, to further support the development of national capacities and promotion of democratic governance in the country.

In the period of last years, the government has also adopted several relevant policy documents and action plans, including the National Human Rights Action Plan for 2009-2012, the Legal Policy Concept Paper for 2010-2020, the Gender Equality Strategy 2006-2016 and state programmes on such issues as fighting corruption, and developing civil society. However, gaps remain in access to justice and inclusive access to social services for the most vulnerable groups through the prism of human rights, culture, age, gender and diversity mainstreaming. Addressing identified gaps and based on UN comparative advantage, the UNDAF 2010-2015 has been developed to contribute to national efforts in the national priority areas of improving public sector effectiveness and efficiency.

Kazakhstan adopted a new Law "On Public Services", which introduced regulations to enhance public accountability and expanded citizens' rights to quality services. The law offers to introduce the institute of appeal in case of violation of rights and legitimate interests of consumers of the services when getting public service. Also, requirements to the standard and rules of public service were improved, every citizen can be involved into discussion of draft standards of public services and in informing on quality and procedure of public services. Besides, the Law makes it possible to monitor public service rendering that enhances the role of non-governmental organizations and citizens in making managerial decisions. The Government tend to achieve all-inclusive public participation and provide greater access to the information about public services and standards of public services 80% by 2018 year (31.1% in 2013).

The lessons learned from the last UNDAF cycle for 2005-2009 call for greater UN cohesion in selecting joint strategic priorities and resource allocation thus addressing priority developmental challenges and strengthen the impact of interventions. These key strategies required giving rise to:

Civic engagement, focused on both strengthening civil society capacities and expanding and protecting spaces for citizen participation in political and public life;

Increasing empowerment of all actors in Kazakhstan, including non-governmental and civil society organizations, women and youth, to lead the process;

Increasing commitment to social inclusion, particularly for women, young people and children, the elderly, people with disabilities, refugees and other disadvantaged populations;

Effective and equitable delivery of service to citizens, especially for local communities;

Enhancing the Government-NGO partnership in increasing the quality of public services;

Effective long-term forecasting and management of changes in society, planning and programming strategic goals results based management of the Government.

increasing opportunities for people to participate in decision-making policy regarding the quality of public services shall be of primary concern;

to provide the country with a strong platform for fostering democratic processes, enhancing collaboration between the state and its constituencies and strengthening institutional capacities for stronger civil service and public sector;

The UNDP Country Office will be conducting an outcome evaluations in 2015, which should provide a more evidence-based information on UNDP’s contribution to the development results during the 2010-2015 country programme cycle. To achieve the *Outcome on Civic Engagement*, the UNDP has focused on enhancing capacities for integrated management of national and regional level government agencies, private sector, NGOs/CBOs etc.

Evaluation PURPOSE

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP’s programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of effective governance and civic engagement. The purpose of the proposed evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to fine-tune the current UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the rest of the CPAP 2010-2015 as well as informing the next programming cycle.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover UNDP Outcomes 5, 6 and 7 (Table 2) under current CPAP and UNDAF period 2010-2015. This outcome evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. The evaluation will also assess the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UNDAF 2010-2015.

*Table 2: CPAP results and resources framework – Effective Governance (Civic engagement)*

|  |
| --- |
| EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCENational priority: Establish an effective and up-to-date corps of civil servants and state-owned formations of Kazakhstan loyal to the cause they serve to and capable of acting as representatives of the people in achieving our priorities. |
| UNDAF outcome: By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups. |
| Country programme outcomes, indicators, baselines and target | Country Programme Outputs | Output indicators, baselines and targets |
| *National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all*Indicator: Implementation gap of the legal framework (Global Integrity Index)Baseline (2007): 44 pointsTarget: Reduce implementation gap by half | The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan | Indicator: Frequency and participation in National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) monitoringBaseline (2008): NHRAP drafted Target: NHRAP is monitored at least yearly (through open public meetings) and takes into account recommendations of civil society |
| The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented | Indicator: Increase in budget allocations for Gender Equality Strategy implementationBaseline (2008): TBDTarget: At least 30% budget increase |
| People have better access to justice through strengthened capacity of the justice system  | Indicator: Availability of court recordsBaseline (2008): records are made using taping or typingTarget: Court records are made using new technology and available for public access  |
| *The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes*Indicator: Conformity of national elections legislation to OSCE standardsBaseline: Non-conformation on 19 articles according to last OSCE report Target: All national legislation conform to OSCE standards | Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration | Indicator: All political parties and other key civil society organizations participate in dialogue platforms (Y/N)Baseline: One political club established and functions in 2008 |
| Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services | Indicator: Number of civil society organizations that benefit from capacity development initiatives Baseline: zero; Target: 300 organizations  |
| *Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner*Indicator: Updated Government strategies for border management (Y/N) | Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of regional cooperation. | Indicator: Number of joint initiatives implemented using RBM and capacity development toolsBaseline: zero; Target: 3 |
| Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance | Indicator: Border management strategies and plans of action produced (Y/N)Indicator: Practices at borders reformed (Y/N) |

Following projects (See Table 3) have been implemented in the period between late 2009 and early 2015 within the Effective governance (Civic engagement) outcome by UNDP CO in Kazakhstan.

*Table 3: Projects implemented during the period 2010 – 2015: Effective Governance (Civic engagement)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Title | Period |
| 1 | Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan | 2013-2014 |
| 2 | Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan | 2014-2016 |
| 3 | Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan | 2013-2015 |
| 4 | Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan | 2009-2011 |
| 5 | Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system | 2011-2012 |
| 6 | Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of the Kazakhstani society | 2010-2012 |
| 7 | Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan | 2013-2014 |
| 8 | Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan | 2013-2014 |
| 9 | Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services | 2012-2014 |
| 10 | Raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform of the Government of Kazakhstan | 2011 |
| 11 | Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan | 2013 |
| 12 | Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups | 2011-2012 |

Outcome status*:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcomes 5, 6 and 7 achievement, and also identify the challenges to attainment of the outcomes. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcomes.

Underlying factors*:* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcomes. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

Strategic Positioning of UNDP: Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP’s inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner. The Country Office (CO) position will be analyzed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating value by responding to partners' needs, mobilizing resources for the benefit of the country, not for UNDP, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP services and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in the rule of law result area.

Partnership strategy*:* Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the outcome to the country’s needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in development.

Lessons learnt: Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in incubation, and in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve related outcomes. This will support learning lessons about UNDP’s contribution to the outcomes over the UNDAF cycle so as to design a better assistance strategy for the programming cycle.

Outcome evaluation design should clearly spell out the key questions according to the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated. The questions when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. The questions cover the following key areas of evaluation criteria:

a) *Relevance: the extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation:*

Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?

Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?

How has UNDP’s support for the rule of law development positively contributed to a favorable environment for civic engagement in Kazakhstan?

Has UNDP made impact to empower the poor and the disadvantaged groups to participate in the development process and have their voices heard?

Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance, rule of law, participatory decision-making and access to justice?

Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to improve civic engagement?

To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

b) *Efficiency:* *measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.*

Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?

How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the civic engagement portfolio? Where are the gaps if any?

How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the civic engagement portfolio?

Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the improvement of public sector?

Has UNDP successfully piloted access to justice for the poor and the disadvantaged?

c) *Effectiveness:* *the extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives*.

How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2015?

What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2015?

What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?

Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?

Has UNDP contributed to governmental institutions be more likely to solicit public opinions relating to issues of rights and access to justice and to public services?

To what extent has the rights-based approach been integrated in CO development programming and implementation activities?

Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?

Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights in the legal and administrative systems?

How UDNP has used and promoted the rule of law system to improve the well-being of disadvantaged people such as persons with disabilities, oralmans (Kazakh repatriates), youth and women?

d) *Sustainability:* *the benefits of the Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted*

How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?

Are there national plans reforms to promote the civic engagement legal – or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years?

Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

Apart from the criteria above, there are additional commonly applied evaluation criteria such as impact, coverage, connectedness, value-for-money, client satisfaction and protection used in the evaluation, although, not all criteria are applicable to every evaluation. Within the Outcome evaluation there can be additional evaluation questions specified for each the criteria, however all they must be agreed with the UNDP in Kazakhstan. Based on the above analysis, Contractor (herein referred to as evaluation team) must provide recommendations on how UNDP in Kazakhstan should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the outcome change is achieved by the end of the UNDAF period and beyond.

methotology

This section suggests an overall approaches and methods for conducting the evaluation, as well as data sources and tools that will likely yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions. However, the final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation team and UNDP about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

The evaluation team is encouraged to review the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) that specifies the outputs, targets and indicators for each component. Based on the objectives and scope mentioned above, the evaluation team will elaborate a methodology and plan, which will be approved by UNDP and validate information stemmed from contextual sources such as work plans or monitoring reports.

Outcome evaluation will use available data to the greatest extent possible. This will encompass administrative data as well as various studies and surveys, including those conducted by the UN agencies. This approach will help address the possible shortage of data and reveal gaps that should be corrected as the result of the evaluation.

The reliability of disaggregated data at the rayon (district) level should be taken into account as the capacity for data collection at the local level is still quite low and it is relatively expensive to conduct comprehensive surveys at sub-regional level. In this regard, it is necessary to use objective and subjective data available from the official sources (national and local statistics offices, administrative data), additionally verified by independent sources such as surveys and studies conducted by local and international research companies, civil society organizations and UN agencies. The relevant sources and access to data will be provided by UNDP and national stakeholders respectively.

The main issues associated with evaluability of some Programme components within Outcome Evaluation might be caused by too general outcome indicators set in the beginning, or their absence. Nonetheless, due to clearly stated overall Country Programme intervention goals and envisaged impact with corresponding indicators there is a certain capacity for data collection, management and analysis in the given Outcome Evaluation. Thus, it is very important to ensure that the Country Programme is evaluable and has an evaluability model that is clearly structured. That, within the model, the goals and objectives are measurable so that the degree to which they have been achieved can be assessed (*i.e. answer the question: what data can be collected that will provide clear evidence that the goals and objectives have been met?*). In general the indicators allow the evaluator to ensure that the Country Programme is serving those people it intended to reach, that the relevant data is collected in an organized and consistent fashion.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UNDP, the governmental institutions, CSOs as well as members of donor community,** private sector representatives, multilateral and bilateral donors, and beneficiaries. Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, as well as with donors and partners are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible.

Based on the objectives mentioned above, the evaluation team will propose a methodology and plan for this assignment, which will be approved by UNDP senior management. An approach relating objectives and/or outcomes to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives. However, it’s recommended that the methodology should take into account the following:

The Outcome Evaluation may include, but is not limited to, the following methods of data collection:

Desk review – review and identify relevant sources of information and conceptual frameworks that exist and are available (please, see Annex II). Note that two relevant evaluations exist (UNDP evaluation of 4 components of their part of the programme and evaluation of UNICEF child protection work in EKO):

Examination of contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2030, UNDAF, CPAP and other sources. These documents speak to the outcome itself, as opposed to what UNDP is doing about it, and how it was envisaged at certain points in time preceding UNDP’s interventions.

Validation of information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources such as the CPAP, and project evaluation reports. To do this, consultant(s) may use interviews or questionnaires during the evaluation that seek key respondents’ perceptions on a number of issues, including their perception of whether an outcome has changed.

The current status of and degree of change in the outcomes shall be assessed against the Country Analysis and the baselines for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used in relation to UNDAF, CPAP, relevant project/program documents, progress and monitoring reports of projects/programs, contextual information from partners.

Documents and relevant background material on the development context in Kazakhstan materials, relevant support documents, evaluations, assessments, and a variety of temporal and focused reports. In particular, programme/project reports, the annual reports and the consultant’s technical assessment reports, respective project documents, project reports, Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR). In additional, the evaluation team could review project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluation team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

Undertake a constructive critique of the outcome formulation itself (and the associated indicators). This is integral to the scope of outcome evaluation. The consultants should make recommendations on how the outcome statement can be improved in terms of conceptual clarity, credibility of association with UNDP operations and prospects for gathering of evidence.

Critical analysis of available data (its validity and reliability) with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UNDP inputs to the Government of Kazakhstan.

Interviews – structured, semi-structured, in-depth, key informant, focus group etc. to capture the perspectives of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, participating ministries, departments and agencies, relevant personnel from UNDP and local authorities, donors, other relevant stakeholders (including trainees, community members and community leaders) and others associated with the Country Programme. Interviews with key informants including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used.

Case studies - in-depth review of one or a small number of selected cases, using framework of analysis and a range of data collection methods. Several case studies can be quite sophisticated in research design, however simpler and structured approaches to case study can still be of great value.

Information systems – analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to a service or process, used for monitoring.

Field visits to selected sites for briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with donors and partners, where appropriate visits to project sites and partner institutions[[5]](#footnote-5);

deliverables of the evaluation

The evaluation team will prepare reports which triangulate findings to address the questions of the Outcome evaluation, highlight key significant changes in regard to the key thematic policy documents, draw out lessons learned, present findings and recommendations, reflecting comments and feedback received from selected staff. It is important to receive the report on a timely basis, as reports will be wasted if they arrive too late to inform decisions.

The structure of the reports should be used to guide the reader to the main areas (please, see Annex III for the evaluation report template). It is expected that the reports should include analysis of the outcome pertaining to women and men throughout the report and that gender analysis is not confined to a separate chapter. The reports should be clear, present well-documented and supported findings, and provide concrete and implementable recommendations. UNDP should be able to share it readily with partners and it should generate consensus around the finding and recommendations. The language of the reports should be simple, free from jargon and with specialist terms explained.

Here are the principal evaluation products the evaluation team is accountable for following activities and deliverables:

Evaluation inception report (**submitted with expression of interest** and prepared before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise and consist of *5-10 pages excluding annexes*) – to clarify the evaluation team’s 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 (to be presented in an evaluation matrix discussed below). The evaluation inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The evaluation inception report provides with an opportunity to verify that all share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

**Evaluation matrix** (*suggested as a deliverable to be included in the evaluation inception report*) is a tool that evaluation team creates as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also 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. (Please, see Table 4 below)

*Table 4. Evaluation matrix*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection Methods / Tools** | **Indicators/ Success Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Draft evaluation report (*consist of 50-60 pages excluding annexes*) – for revision by UNDP Kazakhstan at the end of data collection. The draft evaluation report should contain all the sections outlined in the *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex III) and be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation.

Final evaluation report. The final task of the evaluation team is to prepare a comprehensive and well-presented copy of the final evaluation report, covering all section of *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex III) and containing 50-60 pages[[6]](#footnote-6). Evaluation brief and summary are required. When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluation team is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Implementation arrangements

Evaluation plan

The evaluation team may not begin data collection until the inception report has been reviewed and cleared. The evaluation team must develop an *Evaluation plan* and pilot-test the evaluation instruments. The Evaluation plan is a written document that specifies the evaluation design and details its procedures (what needs to be evaluated, with whom, by whom, when, how).

Once approved by UNDP, the Evaluation plan becomes the key management document for the evaluation, guiding delivery in accordance with expectations of UNDP throughout the performance of the contract. The Evaluation plan can have, but is not limited to, the following sections:

Roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders

Evaluation framework

Evaluation calendar

Evaluation criteria

Types of information needed

Sampling and selection of sources of information

Data collection procedures and methods

Methods for analyzing collected information

In preparing *Evaluation plan*, the evaluation team is expected to identify what is feasible taking into consideration both the financial resources required and non-financial or indirect costs of the evaluation, including the time and effort that people involved must contribute. It is very crucial that evaluation team already at the application stage effectively designs a composition of the evaluation team for each stage of the *Outcome Evaluation* with required skills and experience (e.g. to ensure overcoming language barrier during field mission, data collection and interpreting documents for desk review available only in local languages, some companies may need to involve local consultants or indicate availability of team members with corresponding skills and experience).

Supervision and stakeholders’ involvement

In general, the evaluation team has independence from organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation. However, UNDP along with Government institutions will have overall responsibility for organizing the *Outcome Evaluation* and will appoint a focal person/s for coordination in Astana. These focal points, with the assistance of UNDP, will backstop and manage the steps involved in planning, implementing and following up the evaluation exercise. On a daily basis, the evaluation team will work with UNDP and de-brief about the progress of the *Outcome Evaluation* as needed.

Duty station and logistical modalities

The assignment is home-based with a mission to Kazakhstan to conduct fieldwork. UNDP will interact with the chosen evaluation team by communicating through e-mail correspondence while outside of Kazakhstan, as well as support the evaluation team in country. There will be an office space, supplies, equipment and materials provided in premises of UNDP.

Evaluation timeframe

The time required will vary depending on the questions the evaluation is attempting to answer, the human and financial resources available, and other external factors. It is important to think through timing issues to ensure that a proposed evaluation is feasible and will provide accurate, reliable, and useful information. It is envisaged that evaluation will take place through April - June 2015 and will involve 35 working days in total (please see the Table 5):

*Table 5. Evaluation timeframe*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Working days |
| Conducting a desk review | 5 |
| Preparing the detailed evaluation inception report ( to finalize evaluation design and methods) | 4 |
| In-country evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) and 2 days of in country analysis with preliminary feedback to country stakeholders. | 10 |
| Preparing the draft report | 8 |
| Finalizing the evaluation report (incorporate comments provided)  | 6 |
| Follow up support to UNDP in knowledge sharing and dissemination  | 2 |

*(e.g. 35 working days in total over a period of two months)*

Evaluation team composition and required competencies

Evaluation team of selected consultancy service organization must comprise of at least two members:

an international consultant (team leader) with relevant experience in assessing the development of civic engagement and participatory decision making procedures

a national consultant who is well-familiar with the development challenges of Kazakhstan in the area of rule of law, public sector performance, judiciary and civic engagement, who will assist the team leader with the review of the documents in local language, field missions, data collection and interpreting and other activities as required.

*Eligibility and requirements for the evaluation teams:*

An organization (public, private, or nonprofit), academic/[research](http://www.fundsforngos.org/category/research-2/) institution;

Work experience in conducting independent evaluations,

Experience in M&E, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science at least 5 years;

Experience in cooperation with international experts / organizations is an advantage;

Ability to travel in the regions.

*Required functional competencies for evaluation team members:*

Possess strong analytical skills and the ability to conceptualize, articulate and debate about local governance and human rights issues with a positive and forward-looking attitude;

Understand human rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming in programming;

Understand results-based management principles, logic modeling/logical framework analysis;

Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with various partners including government, civil society, private sector, UN Agencies and other development donors;

Excellent organizational and time management skills;

Strong analytical skills and experience in undertaking of similar assignments;

Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work with people from different backgrounds to deliver quality products within a short timeframe;

Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills;

Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands;

Be client oriented and open to feedback.

*Required corporate competencies for evaluation team members:*

Sound knowledge of the UN programming principles and procedures; the UN system and common country programming processes; the UN evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights based approach (HRBA);

Demonstrate integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;

Promote the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;

Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Fulfill all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

*Education of evaluation team members:*

MA or PhD in economics, business administration, political science, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science.

*Experience of evaluation team members:*

5 or more years of relevant professional experience is required, including previous substantive research experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management (preferably in local development and governance, social protection, welfare, and population reproduction);

Experience with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches;

Prior monitoring and evaluation experience in Kazakhstan or CIS region (especially Central Asian countries) is an asset.

Knowledge of the social and political situation and regional development trends in CIS countries is an advantage;

*Language Requirements for evaluation team members:*

Proficiency in English language and proven report writing skills, knowledge of Russian and Kazakh is an asset.

It is demanded by UNDP that evaluation team is independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation[[7]](#footnote-7).

Evaluation team Ethics

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[8]](#footnote-8) and should describe critical issues evaluation team must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including 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, as well as some categories of vulnerable population; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluation team is also requested to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System’[[9]](#footnote-9)

*Table 6. Payment modalities and specifications*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 10% | At contract signing (to cover cost related with initiation of the evaluation, i.e. travel, communication etc.) |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the draft evaluation report |
| 50% | Following submission and approval by UNDP of the final evaluation report |

Annexes

*Annex II:* A list of key documents, among others, to be consulted and analyzed:

Country Programme Document

Country Programme Action Plan

Programme Board meetings

Project Documents

Annual Progress Reports Variety of temporal and focused reports

Relevant legislation and policy documents

UNDAF for 2010-2015

National Human Rights Action Plan for 2009-2012

Human Development report 2011. Government of RK, UNDP

MDGR 2010

Project Annual Reports

Strategic Plan of MHSD, MNE etc.

*Annex III:* Evaluation Report Template

This template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ and ‘Ethical Standards for Evaluations’[[10]](#footnote-10).

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

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 evaluation teams

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, 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 multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.

Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.

Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.

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

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)[[11]](#footnote-11).

Background information on evaluation teams — 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 analyze 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.

Outcome Results — Overall results (attainment of objectives), Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency, Country ownership, Sustainability, Impact.

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.

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the outcome

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

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 evaluation teams and justification of team composition

Code of conduct signed by evaluation teams

Itinerary

The Evaluation Report will be submitted to the GEFOS Quality Assessment System to ensure the appropriate quality of the evaluation and to make it available for knowledge sharing purposes.

*Annex IV*: **Key stakeholders and partners[[12]](#footnote-12)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Organization | Name and Position of the focal point | Contact information |
| Government partners |  |  |
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs |  | mfa.gov.kz |
| Ministry of National Economy  |  |  |
| Ministry of Health and Social development |  |  |
| Civil Society Organizations |  |  |
| PF “KAMEDA”, Almaty | Makhabbat Yespenova, Projects Coordinator  | 8 701 726 52 32 |
| PA «Association of Business Women of Kazakhstan” | Ainur Argynbekova  | 87019180080<http://www.businesswomen.kz/> |
| Association of Social Workers and Volunteers (ASRiV) | Kulchariya Kokkozeva, Chairman  | 87772996528 |
| RPA “IRIS” | Gulmira Beketova  | 87772106010 |
| Social corporate fund “ZUBR” | Vitaliy Kulik, Director  | 87775555008[zubr.24net.kz](http://zubr.24net.kz/) |
| PF «Development of Youth Entrepreneurship” | Yersin Kudiyarov, Co-founder | 87774244001www.rmp.kz |
| Aleksandra Koshkina, Director  | 8 7222 520508www.rmp.kz |
|  YPF “Kazakhstan Youth Support” |  Botabek Tokishkadyrov | 8 775 433 43 38 |
| PA “Otansyingysh Oralmandar”  | Ainur Shariv  | 87014414191 |
| PF “Academy of Legal awareness” | Mukhtar Baimagulov | 87077797936 |
| PA “East Kazakhstan Oblast Voluntary Society of the People with Disabilities”  | Magiza Mirzavetdinova  | 8 7232 221516 |
| PF ““Pavlodar Regional Governance School”  | Almira Batayeva  | 87779347063 |
| Academia |  |  |
| Nazarbayev University |  | [www.nu.edu.kz](http://www.nu.edu.kz)  |
| University “Kainar” |  | 8 (7222) 566 041, 522 914, 566 027www.kainar-semey.kz |
| Academy of Public administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan  | Bolatbek Abdrasilov, Rector  | 8 7172 753268pa-academy.kz/‎ |
| Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Law | Chris Nguyen, Consultant | 8727 2 704475[www.kimep.kz](http://www.kimep.kz/) |
| Assessment and Monitoring Center of Public Agencies Efficiency  | Asel Kenesova | 87751880411<http://www.bagalau.kz/> |
| UN Agencies |  |  |
| UNV |  |  |
| UNDP |  | [www.undp.kz](http://www.undp.kz) |
| UNISEF |  | [www.unicef.kz](http://www.unicef.kz) |
| UNFPA |  |  |
| Donors and International Organization |
| Kazakhstan Government |  | www.government.kz/‎ |
| Corporate and Private Sector |  |  |
| Entrepreneurship Development Fund ‘DAMU’ | Angela Maslova Representative in Semey  |  87222 520159<http://www.damu.kz/9647> |
| National Commercial Board “Atameken” | Ardak Adilzhanov  | 87752983688<http://palata.kz>  |
| JSC “Fund of Financial Support of Agriculture”  | Maksat Kenzhebayev  | 87752999866<http://www.fad.kz> |
| “Kazbusinessconsulting” LTD | Ramiz Alakhverdiyev  | 8701 779 35 35[kbc.24net.kz](http://kbc.24net.kz/)  |
| “Center of Business researches “BISAM – Central Asia” LTD  | Leonid Gurevich  | 87273 780523<http://www.bisam.kz> |
| Entrepreneurs Service Center |  | 8/7222/ 52-14-98<http://www.fund-damu.kz/14137> |
| Media  |  |  |
| Correspondent office of JSC Agency “Khabar”  |  | [www.khabar.kz](http://www.khabar.kz)  |
| JSC RTRC “Kazakhstan” |  | 8 kaztrk.kz/rus/‎ |
| “Arna Press” newspaper, radio 7 | Asan Myrzakhanov, Journalist | 87771165001<http://arnapress.kz> |
| “Liter” newspaper | Yekaterina Gulyaeva, Journalist  | 87771741068[www.liter.kz](http://www.liter.kz)  |
| Tendrinews  | Ruslan Shakabayev, Journalist | 87013536763<http://tengrinews.kz> |
| Khabar Agency | Saruar Kabdullayev, Journalist  | 87755856472[www.khabar.kz](http://www.khabar.kz)  |
| KTK | Olzhas Nurekenov, Journalist  | 87055005843,[www.ktk.kz](http://www.ktk.kz)  |
| Kazakh TV  |  | +7 7172 553-700; +7 7172 553-451Fax: +77172 553-701http://kazakh-tv.kz |
| The print press |  |  |
| Kazakhstanskaya Pravda | Aigul Bidanova, Journalist  | 87771536472<http://www.kazpravda.kz> |

*Annex V:* Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation team:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[13]](#footnote-13)

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Code of conducts signed by the evaluation team

**Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

Evaluation team:

* Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
* Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations andhave this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
* Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
* Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
* Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
* Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
* Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_Donata Maria MACCELLI

**Name of Consultancy Organization:** \_LATTANZIO ADVISORY SpA \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *Rome 13/04/2014*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

Evaluation team:

* Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
* Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
* Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
* Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
* Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
* Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
* Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_Ivan APANASSEVICH

**Name of Consultancy Organization:** \_LATTANZIO ADVISORY SpA \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *Rome 14/04/2014*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please see Annex I: The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [www.un.org/en/ga/search/view\_doc.asp?symbol=A/67/122](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/67/122) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Kazakhstan is not party to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (OP-ICESCR) (signature only, 2010), the 2nd Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR-OP 2), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (signature only, 2008) or the Optional Protocol to the CRPD (OP-CRPD (signature only, 2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Please see more on Evaluability: *The Justice Research and Statistics Association. Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation. Source:* [*http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf*](http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The list of main stakeholders is provided in Annex IV; nonetheless, the list of the partners could be expanded upon the request of the evaluation team if deemed necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Evaluation team may need to use ‘Times New Roman’ font at a size of 12 points, with Normal margin and line spacing 1.15. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For this reason, staff members of UNDP based in other country offices, the regional centers and Headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation team. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Please see, Annex V [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. UNEG, ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’, 2005, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/unegstandards> and UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008, available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. NB: This list outlines the main groups of stakeholders. The extended list of stakeholders will be provided before the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For more information on Code of Conduct please visit: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)