Detailed Terms of Reference for the mid-term evaluation of the UNDP Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017

*(annexed to the Individual TOR)*

1. Background and Context

Since its inception, UNDP has been extending support to groups of countries at regional and sub-regional levels in addition to its global and country-level operations through the regional programmes. These regional programmes have a clear programme structure with results and resources framework, and their programme cycle is aligned with the overall programmatic framework and planned results of the Strategic Plan. The Regional Programme Document for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RPD for ECIS) 2014-2017 was approved by the Executive Board in January 2014.[[1]](#footnote-1) UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC) has set out four specific programme areas of interventions at the regional level for the current programme cycle, namely sustainable development, governance and peacebuilding, resilience and climate change, and contribution to the development debates.

The RPD builds on the successes and lessons learned of the previous RPD 2011-2013[[2]](#footnote-2). All regional activities are aligned with the overall programmatic framework and planned results of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The RPD also reflects the global sustainable development agenda and leverages United Nations intergovernmental policy processes such as the Millennium Development Goals and the post-2015 process.

The Regional Programme is directly executed by UNDP, with oversight of the programme delegated to the Regional Director of the Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RBEC). The Regional Center (hereinafter referred to as the Istanbul Regional Hub) Manager, under the supervision of the Deputy Regional Director, is responsible for ensuring effective management and monitoring of the regional projects. The Advisory Board (consisting of resident representatives and senior management of central headquarter bureaux) provide overall guidance to the regional programme and help to validate its relevance vis-à-vis country and global activities.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In line with the corporate guidance, the mid-term review of the Regional Programme[[4]](#footnote-4) is planned and as per the RBEC Evaluation Plan, mid-term evaluation of all outcomes has to be carried out. Therefore, since both processes coincided, it is planned to conduct one comprehensive exercise as both assessments have an objective to assess UNDP’s contribution at the regional level towards achieving the respective Strategic Plan outcomes. At the same time, while both review and evaluation are interlinked and may follow the same approach, the scope and timelines for each is different. The mid-term review of the Regional Programme is envisaged to be ‘light’, relying primarily on information available through internal systems and tools to assess and understand performance and identify what needs to change moving forward in 2016-2017, whereas the mid-term outcome evaluation will follow the corporate evaluation policy and require more in-depth analysis of each outcome.

**Regional Context**

The region covered by the RBEC regional programme - a total of 17 countries and one territory[[5]](#footnote-5) in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) - represents a diverse group of countries, including countries seeking EU integration[[6]](#footnote-6). The region comprises middle-income countries with relatively high levels of human development[[7]](#footnote-7). The 2014 Human Development Report (HDR) indicates that the region’s EU member countries all rank in the “very high” category of the Human Development Index, and most other countries in the region rank in the “high human development” category.[[8]](#footnote-8) The remaining countries are classified at least at the ‘medium human development” level, including Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, the region’s two poorest countries in terms of GDP per capita.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Although fluctuation exists[[10]](#footnote-10), the region has enjoyed broad-based economic improvement since the fall of the former Soviet Union. While human development continues to rise in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region, particularly in the areas of public health and education, growing concerns are also reported in the HDR which could undermine the progress made in the region in recent years. They include growing inequality both in opportunities and incomes, as well as increasing environmental challenges such as industrial pollution (e.g. air and water) and other environmental degradation.

Another area of concern is that development progress in the region has not spread equally among the disadvantaged and marginalized social groups, such as the Roma. The collapse of the social system has redefined people’s lives, values and behaviors in much of the region. The importance of understanding the concept of social exclusion that deprives people of the opportunity to participate in economic, social and civic processes, and recognizing that social inclusion as a critical means for achieving human development, are particularly highlighted in the region.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Key Programme Areas and Approach**

The programmatic focus of the RPD reflects both the changing development context of the region and the need to: (a) manage risks for resilience and accelerated human development, including building resilience to shocks, threats and hazards and addressing the impact of climate change, the growing need to protect the natural resource base and competition for resources; (b) improve inclusion in view of increasing disparities and inequalities; and (c) address key governance challenges.

It introduces innovation as an integral dimension of all programme areas and aims to support integrated issues-based approaches to programme development, taking into consideration regional, subregional, cross-boundary and cross-regional links, challenges and opportunities.

Following the framework of the Strategic Plan and priorities of the region, RBEC has selected four outcomes at the regional level for the current programme cycle 2014-2017[[12]](#footnote-12) and has developed four umbrella programmes corresponding to these four outcomes as follows:

1. ***Sustainable Development Pathways in Europe and the CIS***
	* Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded (SP Outcome 1).
2. ***Supporting the voice for citizens, development, the rule of law and accountability in governance systems in Europe and the CIS***
	* Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance (SP Outcome 2).
3. ***Building resilience in managing risks in Europe and the CIS***
	* Outcome 3: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change (SP Outcome 5).
4. ***UNDP’s contribution to development debates and effective development cooperation in Europe and the CIS***
	* Outcome 4: Development debates and actions at all level prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles (SP Outcome 7).

In implementing the Regional Programme, the Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) uses three operational modalities of support, i.e., implementation of regional projects, development of knowledge products and the provision of advisory services. The regional work is also based on five mutually reinforcing ‘regionality’ principles which define the particular value added of regional or subregional approaches to addressing development challenges. They include promotion of regional public goods, management of cross-border externalities and spillovers and advancement of solutions to cross-border and transboundary development challenges, promotion of multi-country experiences and perspectives, and identification of key risks to development, promotion experimentation and innovation, and generation and sharing of development knowledge, experience and expertise.[[13]](#footnote-13)

2. Evaluation Purpose

Based on the corporate guidance, each Bureau carries out a mid-term review of the Regional Programme to provide inputs to the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan. Moreover, as per its approved Evaluation Plan, RBEC has planned to undertake an independent mid-term evaluation of the Regional Programme covering all four outcomes. RBEC has therefore, combined both exercises to make mid-term review of the Regional Programme and then assess UNDP contribution towards the progress made on each of the four outcomes.

The MTR should look: at a) achievements and challenges related to development results at the regional level, with a focus on the regionality principles (mainly through the implementation of regional projects); and b) development effectiveness achievements and challenges related to provision of advisory services to COs (development effectiveness). It should also assess development of knowledge products, which has a potential to contribute to the development results and effectiveness.

While mid-term review will have specific format and timeline to respond to, based on the corporate guidance and requirements, the evaluation segment will be carried out in accordance with UNDP Evaluation Policy on outcome evaluations.

3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The objectives of this exercise are to:

* Assess the progress of the Regional Programme implementation and identify gaps in achieving planned development results in the region.
* Provide RBEC Management with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through regional programme support and partnerships with other key players during last two years.
* Generate independent evidence-based results and substantive inputs to the mid-term review process of the Strategic Plan.
* Adjust implementation through introducing corrective measures, help capture innovations, sustain and scale-up successful approaches that work in the implementation of the current programme and facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels.
* Provide inputs to other relevant evaluations and regional reports with quantitative and qualitative results achieved through the regional programmes.
* Ensure that country level programming and the support from the IRH is risk informed.
* Contribute to the verification/ refinement of the theory of change underlying the regional programme.
* Review and suggest adjustments to the regional programme results framework to better capture the results at regional level in line with the corporate guidance on the Regional Program’s monitoring plan that builds on the common framework for monitoring regional programmes.

Scope and methodologies should be tailored to investigate the Regional Program’s contribution to both development results and development effectiveness.

The present evaluation will cover the first half of the current regional programme cycle - 2014 and 2015. The assessment should be more forward-looking giving specific programmatic recommendations for the next two years. It will mainly focus its analysis on the selected regional projects and activities managed by IRH.

The exercise is expected to take into consideration the challenges faced during the current programming cycle, specifically:

* Challenges in measuring the contribution and impact in all outcomes and outputs achievement at the regional level given the programmatic framework of the regional programme.
* The Results and Resources Framework of the Regional Programme has been finalized during the second year only, pending the finalization of the Integrated Results and Resources Framework of the SP with a final set of indicators and other data.
* Due to the relocation process[[14]](#footnote-14) from Bratislava to Istanbul and corporate restructuring process (affecting the regional practice architecture and resulting in a significant staff turnover), the delivery of regional development results, IRH services and implementation of regional initiatives and activities were taking place in somewhat disruptive manner during the first year of the implementation, especially with regard to the provision of high-quality advisory services to the Country Offices.

4. Evaluation Questions and the Methodology

The regional programme mid-term review and evaluation will assess performance against a given framework.

***For the Mid-Term Review of the Regional Programme***

The key questions to be addressed during the review would be following:

* **Context:** How has UNDP’s operating environment shifted in the region since the adoption of the SP (2014-2017) and the RPD?  What strategic opportunities and risks are emerging as a result?
* **Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Results:** Is the RP on track to make its contribution to the SP and support COs in the region? What are the gaps left to achieve UNDP's targets in the region and is the pace good enough to do so? What are the underlying causes of underperformance and key drivers of success?
* **Institutional Effectiveness:** What are the initial results from the structural change in the RP/RSC? How is the resource situation evolving? Are there developments with regard to UNDP’s role in the UN RDT and engagement with regional bodies?
* **Lessons Learned and Recommendations:** What are the key thematic, operational and institutional lessons to be drawn? What are the main recommendations for 2016-17 and perhaps beyond? In particular, the focus should be made on UNDP positioning at the regional level for the SDGs agenda.

***For the mid-term evaluation of RP outcomes***

The contribution of the programme to the outcomes will be assessed according to a standard set of evaluation criteria:

* **Relevance**: How relevant is the regional programme to the priority development challenges and emerging needs of the region? What changes should UNDP make in order to make its interventions more relevant and more effective?
* **Effectiveness**: To what extent has the regional programme contributed to the realization of the four outcomes as outlined in the regional programme document? What were the major factors influencing the achievement of the results and how far these results are attributable to UNDP?
* **Efficiency**: Has the regional programme made good use of its financial and human resources?
* **Sustainability**: To what extent the results that the RP contributed to are sustainable? Did the regional programme create capacities for sustained results?

The evaluation should include **Case studies of most strategic regional initiatives** that demonstrate the regional program’s contribution to development results/ effectiveness and regional value-added.

In addition to the evaluation questions above, the Evaluation Team will explicitly identify and present lessons learned from programme implementation, addressing the following questions: What are the key lessons derived from this evaluation? Does UNDP have a comparative advantage? How specific areas for innovation and scaling-up been identified?

While assessing performance using the above criteria, the evaluation team will identify various factors that can explain the performance. This is a summative evaluation, aiming to assess the extent to which programme and project activities implemented with partners during 2014-2015 have contributed to progress under these outcomes and the achievement of set targets, whether existing UNDP’s partnership arrangements with partners proved to be successful and relevant and overall whether UNDP-supported activities have contributed to the improvements in the Region.

Overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.[[15]](#footnote-15) The Evaluation Team will determine the specific design and methods for the exercise during the initial inception period and outline the detailed methodology in the inception report prepared. The methodology should highlight the impact-oriented character of the evaluation.

**Data collection and analysis**

Data for the report will be collected through various means, including the following:

* **Desk reviews**: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:
	+ RPD (2014-2017), Strategic Plan (2014-2017); all umbrella Regional Project Documents;
	+ Annual Work plans and budgets, progress reports for 2014 and 2015, Annual Reports on the Advisory Services provided to COs from the BIRH service tracker and other sources, etc.
	+ IWPs and ROARs, RPD related evaluations, evaluation and MTRs of regional projects, relevant external evaluations by donors and partners, etc.
	+ Progress reports and related documentation of selected regional projects contributing to the RPD results in the ECIS region, including websites, articles and other relevant reports;
	+ Programme Advisory Board and other Meeting Reports pertaining to Regional Priority setting, annual work planning and progress reporting;
	+ Regional knowledge products, knowledge management and innovation initiatives supported by the RPD.
	+ UNDP Structural review information and related documents pertaining to RBEC.
	+ Other relevant documents that inform analysis of the environment in which UNDP in the region operates.
* **Discussions with the relevant programme and project staff**: The evaluation team members will be working and consulting the evaluation exercise with relevant teams on continuous basis. Debriefing meetings with Management Team will also be carried out to inform on the review and evaluation processes as well as share any preliminary observations as necessary.
* **Stakeholder interviews and focus groups**: The evaluation team will conduct interviews with representative sample of relevant stakeholders, including UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at headquarters, Istanbul Regional Hub, and Country Offices, policy makers, beneficiary groups, donors and other development partners.

During the preparatory work, a set of representative projects will be identified with the evaluation team, based on the consultation with relevant teams (Outcome Managers in the IRH).

**Review and evaluation process**

Inception: Once the Team Leader and team members have been selected, they will receive an orientation and briefing by respective IRH staff. Each evaluation team member will first conduct a desk review of relevant materials during first 2-3 days upon signature of the contract. A set of key UNDP documents and programme information will be provided by various teams of IRH for this purpose.

The evaluation team, will then travel to Istanbul for one week. During this period, the evaluation team will be introduced to IRH staff, further continue desk review, conduct consultations with teams and collect more data and documentation pertaining to the regional programme. The team will then prepare and submit the first deliverable - inception report - that will contain the proposed schedule of tasks, final evaluation design, with any additional methodological and process related decisions made during the mission that may not have been addressed in this description and if, applicable, develop any data collection instruments required. The inception report has to be accepted by the IRH Management.

The Evaluation Team will prepare the mid-term review report as stipulated in the requirements and present it to the IRH. The dates of the mission will be planned to advance to ensure full participation of relevant IRH staff for validation of the results. One week will be provided to the IRH to collect comments from the relevant staff and then one week to the Evaluation Team to finalize the report.

The evaluation team will then complete data collection and analysis for evaluation of the outcomes and reconvene in the Istanbul Regional Hub for one week. The Evaluation Team will present during a debriefing session the results of the evaluation including findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations and then submit a draft Evaluation report. This first draft will be reviewed by the Istanbul Regional Hub for comments. Based on the comments received within two weeks, the team will revise and finalize the report, while recording any changes made in an audit trail.

1. Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

The evaluation team will collectively produce the following deliverables:

1. Inception Report: an inception report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team and submitted by the Evaluation Team Leader, containing a detailed design and methodology, structure of the evaluation report, management issues related to data collection and overall evaluation activities (e.g. division of labor, proposed schedule of tasks, etc.) and any other issues which may not have been addressed in the original Terms of Reference. The report should be brief and concise.
2. Presentation of the draft mid-term review report to RBEC/IRH for validation and preliminary feedback.
3. Final Mid-Term Review Report – should be about 20 pages (8,500 words maximum) of the main text of the report (excluding annexes). The report should be strategic, future-oriented, results-driven and analytical.
4. Presentation of the draft mid-term outcomes evaluation report to RBEC/IRH for validation and preliminary feedback.
5. Final Mid-Term Outcomes Evaluation Report – should be maximum of 50 pages for the main text, organized into the chapters and annexes and follow the corporate policy and guidance[[16]](#footnote-16). The executive summary of the evaluation report must be a concise summary of the evaluation findings in plain language that can be widely circulated. The evaluation team will submit to the IRH its final report, after reflecting all comments provided by reviewers. This report will elaborate more on the analysis and produce more findings resulted from additional data collection from annual reports, discussions with other stakeholders and development partners of RBEC/IRH under respective outcomes. The report will also suggest the adjustments to the regional programme results framework based on the corporate guidance
6. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The mid-term review and evaluation will be carried out by a group of independent external consultants. The evaluation team will comprise a Team Leader and one Evaluation Specialist.

* The Team Leader is expected to be an experienced evaluation expert, selected from the Europe and CIS region or internationally. He/she should have substantive knowledge of one or more areas of the UNDP regional programme, and work experience in the region under evaluation. The Team Leader should have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice, and the ability to lead a group of multicultural and multidisciplinary experts for an evaluation of complex development programmes. He/she should also have proven drafting skills, excellent communication skills, and familiarity with UN/UNDP operations. The Team Leader will be responsible for reviewing Outcome 1, 3 and Outcome 4. The Team Leader will be responsible for coordinating the inputs of the Evaluation Specialist and for putting final deliverables together.
* The Evaluation Specialist, either regional or international, are expected to have substantive technical expertise and knowledge in the areas of Democratic Governance (human rights, rule of law, access to justice, womens empowerement, HIV and health issues), respectively, within the context of Europe and the CIS region. They should have experience conducting evaluations in the region, demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice, excellent report writing and communication skills, as well as familiarity with the UN System/UNDP. As members of the multicultural and multidisciplinary evaluation team leader and specialist should be excellent team players, substantively contributing to the team’s discussions throughout the evaluation process.
1. Implementation Arrangements

UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub

The IRH QA and Coordination Team will support the Istanbul Regional Hub Manager in coordinating the overall evaluation exercise and ensuring liaison within the Regional Bureau, the Regional Hub, other Bureaus at headquarters, Country Offices etc. The QA and Coordination Team will also ensure that an appropriate quality assurance mechanism exists during the evaluation.

The Team Leaders responsible for each of the outcome will ensure that the Evaluation Teams are provided with sufficient reference materials and methodological guidance. They will also identify selected regional projects and activities to be reviewed and be consulted on case studies to be used in the analysis. The Team Leaders will also ensure that assigned programme staff extend necessary support to the Evaluation Team as required.

The Evaluation Team

A team of independent external consultants will be established to carry out the exercise. The team will consist of: i) Evaluation Team Leader – A regional or international evaluation consultant, with the overall responsibility to lead the team and coordinate the drafting and finalization of the deliverables; and ii) one Evaluation Specialist – either regional or international, who will support the Team Leader and provide the expertise in the subject areas of the evaluation. The Team will undertake data collection and analysis activities, and prepare designated parts of the reports.

All members of the team should have substantive experience and in-depth knowledge of development in the region under evaluation (Europe and the CIS). Gender and regional balance will be ensured in the evaluation team. The evaluation team, collectively, is responsible for developing an evaluation design, undertaking data collection activities, and preparing the draft and final reports for submission to the Istanbul Regional Hub, as well as any supporting documents prepared during the evaluation.

1. Timeframe for the Evaluation Process

A tentative schedule of activities and travel plans are provided below. Estimated number of working days for the Evaluation team leader 67 days, and for an evaluation specialist is 35 days. The timeline will be adjusted and concrete dates finalized during the inception process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Timeline*** | ***Deliverable*** |
| First week of October  | Identification of the evaluation team members and contractual arrangements  |
| 2nd week of October  | * Orientation of the team members
* Desk review
 |
| 3rd week of October  | * Inception mission by Evaluation Team to the IRH for one week
* Submission of the Inception Report
 |
| 4th week of October  | * Data collection and analysis
 |
| 1st week of December | * Mission to IRH for one week to present the findings of the mid-term review for validation and feedback
 |
| 2nd week of December  | * Submission of the mid-term review report (one week for comments/validation)
 |
| 3rdt week of December  | * Finalization of the mid-term review report and submission to IRH
 |
| 3rd week of January | * Analysis for Outcomes evaluation is to be completed and draft report to be prepared
 |
| 2nd week of February  | * Mission by Evaluation Team to the IRH for validation for one week
* Presentation of preliminary results to the IRH
* Submission of the draft evaluation report for comments (2 weeks)
 |
| By end of February | * Draft Report is submitted for comments. Including the proposed results framework
 |
| First week of March (1 week) | * Finalization of the report
 |

1. Cost

The cost of the evaluation exercise is to be covered by the Istanbul Regional Hub. When making contractual obligations, the consultants should include all travel and other incidental costs (e.g. internet, printing, stationery, etc.) in the lumpsum amount to be paid in different installments corresponding to the set deliverables. Within this assignment three missions are envisaged (5 days each) to Istanbul Regional Hub.

1. Annex

*List of reference materials (to be finalized during the inception process):*

1. Regional Programme Document 2014-2017 and updated RRF
2. UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017
3. IRRF Methodological notes (SP Outcomes 1, 2, 5 and 7)
4. Regional Programme Evaluation Report 2011-2013
5. RBEC ROAR 2014
6. Advisory Services Report 2014
7. Advisory Services Report 2015 (mid-year report is released, annual in January 2016)
8. Project documents of selected projects and their reports (list of selected projects to be provided by Teams)
1. [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Evaluation of the Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS 2011-2013 <http://issuu.com/undp-evaluation/docs/rpe-rbec_2013> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. P.24 of the [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The mid-term term review results will feed into the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Programme countries include: Albania; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Belarus; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Georgia; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Moldova; Montenegro; Serbia including Kosovo – United Nations Administered Territory under Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999); Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Turkey; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; and Uzbekistan [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Armenia has joined EAEU in late 2014 and Kyrgyzstan joined EAEU in August 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan changed the classification from LIC to MIC in 2014 and 2015 respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Press Release, UNDP Human Development Report (HDR): “*Sustainability and Equity: A better Future for All*,” UNDP, 2011 (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/PR6-EuropeCIS-2011HDR-English.pdf>). The “very high human development” category includes 6 countries of the region, i.e. the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Slovakia, Poland, Lithuania and Croatia; the “high human development” group includes 15 countries, i.e. Romania, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Serbia, Belarus, Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Ukraine, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkey; and the “medium” category (5) includes Turkmenistan, Republic of Moldova, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 2011 HDR, UNDP. The GDP per capita in the region ranges from the highest group of $30,848 (Cyprus) and $25,581 (Czech Republic) to the lowest group, $2.283 (Kyrgyzstan) and $1,972 (Tajikistan). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. IMF foresees Russia slowdown, affecting all neighboring countries, with economic contraction in 2015 <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2015/01/pdf/c2.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. RBEC Regional HDR, “Beyond Transition Towards Inclusive Societies.” Bratislava 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Full text on regionality principles is available in the [Regional Programme Document for Europe and the CIS 2014-2017](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2014/first-regular-session/English/DPRPDREC3.doc) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. In 2014 the Regional Service Center was relocated from Bratislava to Istanbul. This decision is the result of an organisation-wide institutional review process, taking also into consideration the changing development landscape combined with a constrained financial environment. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Template is presented in the Annex 7 of the [Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf) and suggested report structure is further guided in [UNDP Outcome-level evaluation: A companion guide (Section 7.2)](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)