**UNDP Country Office– Saudi Arabia**

**Terms of Reference**

**Outcome Evaluation for Country Programme Outcome:** *Enhanced Policies and Strategies for Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and the Environment*

**Type of contract:** Individual Contract

**Mission Duration:** 15 Working days

**Duty Station:** UNDP Country Office Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**Availability date:** September 2015

1. **Introduction**

In accordance with the Evaluation plan of the UNDP County Office in Saudi Arabia, an outcome evaluation is scheduled to be conducted at the end of Q3 2015 to evaluate progress made towards the following Country Programme outcome – Outcome II: “Enhanced Policies and Strategies for Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and the Environment”. In this context, UNDP Saudi Arabia is seeking to evaluate the contribution of its projects to the achievement of the above mentioned outcome.

1. **Brief description of the Outcome**

The 9th National Development Plan (NDP 2010-14) for Saudi Arabia has the overall theme of sustaining development with a record allocated budget of $385 billion, a 67% increase from the 8th NDP, targeted at six goals: improving standards of living, regional development, economic diversification, knowledge-based economy and competitiveness, and human resources including youth and women. Although the 10th NDP has yet to be released, sustainability in its three pillars (social, environmental and economic) remains the leading concern. Saudi Arabia (KSA) has made great progress in recent years with rise in HDI to 0.836 in 2013 placing it in the Very High Human Development category. As noted in 2009 National MDG Report, ten of eleven targets have been or would be reached by 2015. About 1.63% of Saudi families live under $2/day (2005) largely in remote rural communities. As a G20 member and largest economy in the region, KSA is a global partner in development.

As noted by UNDP’s MDG Strategy for the Arab Region, where breakthroughs to MDG achievement have already been made as in KSA, a key focus is on the need for sustainability of development results. Developed with UNDP support, the 9th NDP aims to reinforce KSAs progress and support its sustainability. As noted therein, KSA relies on the oil sector for 90% of public revenues, 45% of GDP, and 90% of export earnings, while also facing high unemployment of 14.4% (2005). KSA seeks to diversify the economy beyond oil exports and create future employment opportunities, including development of a knowledge-based economy and geographic diversification of growth and increased share of private sector-generated GDP alongside greater effectiveness of local administration. KSA also invests in a new generation of universities to support future employment needs. Industrialization and urbanization are leading to rising ecological footprints with policy solutions to resource scarcity. This has been identified as a clear priority in the NDP for energy conservation, renewable energy, and water conservation as groundwater scarcity sets in and pollution impacts and climate risks to human development emerge.

An Outcome Evaluation on Development Policy found UNDP’s positive role in shifting focus towards sustainability of results and recommended future focus on social, environment and economic pillars of sustainable development. Increased emphasis was advised for results-based management and connecting partners to global partnerships.

The second Outcome Evaluation for the KSA Country Programme relating to **Enhanced Policies and Strategies for Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and the Environment** is to be held during September 2015. The ability to address energy efficiency and conservation of natural resources is one of the pillars that will define the sustainability of development in KSA. The baseline for the outcome stood at 96% energy intensity and 12.1 per capita solid waste generation. Outcome targets for 2015 specify a significant decrease in per capita solid waste generation and energy intensity per unit GDP.

UNDP’s cooperation focuses on capacities to design and implement energy efficiency policies, South-South Cooperation’s on the matter, capacity development of Nationals to carry on with sustainable development in terms of Water Conservation, Waste Management and clean energy. This includes use of global partnerships to share best practices.

1. **Main outputs and initiatives expected to have contributed to the outcome**

The main outputs and initiatives that have contributed to the outcome are contained within the following projects outlined in the below table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | | |
| **Award** | **Project Title and Description** | **Status** |
| 80559 | **National Energy and Efficiency Programme (NEEP) Phase II** | Ongoing |
| The second phase of a capacity development programme for the new Saudi Energy Efficiency Centre to develop Energy Efficiency Policy and Regulations. |
| 59437 | **Ministry of Water and Electricity (MOWE) Capacity Building** | Ongoing |
| Capacity development for sustainable development and management of water resources in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. |
| 86404 | **Capacity building in Sustainable Waste Management (AMANA)** | Dormant |
| Developing a sustainable waste management strategy for AMANA and improving road and public transport services by applying intelligent transport systems. |
| 90136 | **Sustainability in Madinat Yanbu Al-Sinaiyah (MAYS)** | Closed |
| To assist the Royal Commission at Yanbu (RCY) in the evaluation of its continued efforts towards a sustainable environment in Madinat Yanbu Al-Sinaiyah and to ensure that Yanbu is recognised as a leader and trend setter in sustainability. |

1. **Outcome Evaluation Objectives:**

The objective of the outcome evaluation is to assess how the outputs under the above mentioned projects have contributed to the change in the outcome: “**Enhanced Policies and Strategies for Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and the Environment**”, including an assessment of sustainability of achievements, relevance and impact, efficiency and effectiveness, UNDP exit strategies, South-South Cooperation and innovation. In addition, the evaluation will seek to answer the following question: Has UNDP’s technical and advisory support provided to partners through relevant projects assisted in fulfilling the Government’s vision and mandates; sustained their functions and activities and thereby contributed to Saudi determination of its economic and social policies and strategies to the maximum possible extent?

The evaluation of this outcome was strategically placed at this particular time in order to promote needed adjustments, identify lessons learned and draw up a sustainability plan for the continuing projects, and feed lessons learned and recommendations into future cycles.

1. **Scope of the Outcome Evaluation:**

The outcome evaluation will include four standard categories of analysis (i.e. an assessment of progress towards the outcome, an assessment of the factors affecting the outcome, an assessment of key UNDP contributions to outcome, and an assessment of the partnership strategy used). The scope of the evaluation will be determined by the following questions:

*Outcome status:* What was the origin of the outcome and its constituent interventions? How were the past experience, findings and recommendations of previous evaluations, and dialogue with stakeholders used in design of outputs? What was the adequacy level of background work carried out? Has the outcome been achieved and, if not, is there any progress made towards its achievement? What is the balance effort needed and the suitability of pursuing the achievement of the outcome? What innovative approaches were tried and capacities developed through UNDP assistance?

*Underlying factors:* What are the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome? What were the key assumptions made, internal and external factors? What are the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities to issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholder and partner involvement in the completion of the outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out?

*UNDP contribution:* What is the relevance of the outcome and the constituent components specifically for UNDP assistance? Can UNDP funded constituent outputs and other interventions—including the outputs, programmes, projects and soft and hard assistance—be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome?

*Partnership strategy*: Was UNDP’s partnership strategy appropriate and effective? What were the partnerships formed? How did partnerships arise? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? How did they function and sustain? What was the level of the participation of stakeholders? Who were the key beneficiaries and their major perceptions?

1. **Expected Outcome Evaluation Outputs:**
2. Evaluation Inception Report, reflecting in it all substantive and logistical issues that would have to be addressed in order to complete the evaluation successfully. The inception report should include an Evaluation Matrix (summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology including detailed 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. (See Annex I)
3. Evaluation Report which includes, at least:
   1. Assessment of progress made towards the intended outcome
   2. Assessment of progress towards outputs
   3. Lessons learned concerning best/or less ideal practices in producing outputs and achieving the outcome
   4. Forward looking strategies and recommendations for continued UNDP assistance towards the achievement of the outcome

**Report Template:** See attachment to TOR for the Outcome Evaluation Report Template (Annex I)

**Report Quality:** UNDP will use the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports (Annex II) to evaluate the Quality of the final report.

1. **Duration of Outcome Evaluation:**

Duration: 15 working days. 10 on location in Saudi Arabia, 5 home-based.

1. **Methodology of Outcome Evaluation:**

Outcome evaluations have shifted away from the older approach of assessing project results against project objectives towards an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions. Outcomes are influenced by a full range of UNDP activities (projects, programmes, non-project activities and “soft” assistance within and outside of projects) as well as the activities of other development actors. Therefore, a number of variables beyond the projects need to be considered during the evaluation. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by UNDP partners.

Information on the methodologies is given in **Guidelines for Evaluators**, issued by Evaluation Office, UNDP. The evaluator is expected to use all relevant methods to obtain data and information for their analysis and drawing up of findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation consultant/team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation consultant/team.

These include:

* Documentation review: Begin with the CPD for a description of the intended outcome, the baseline for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used. Examine contextual information and baselines contained in project documents and all relevant documents as well as relevant evaluation reports.
* Use of interviews, field visits, questionnaires and meeting including participatory forums to validate information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources such as monitoring reports; also use to the extent possible the data collected and analysis undertaken by the country office prior to the outcome evaluation; and examine local sources of knowledge about factors influencing the outcome.
* Identification of the major contributing factors that “drive” change.
* Investigate the pre-selected outcome indicators, go beyond these to explore other possible outcome indicators, and determine whether the indicators have actually been continuously tracked.
* Undertake a constructive critique of the outcome formulation itself; determine whether or not individual outputs are effective in contributing to outcomes, drawing the link between UNDP outputs and outcomes.
* Determine whether individual outputs are effective in contributing to outcomes.
* Determine whether or not the UNDP strategy and management of overall country operations appears to be coherently focused on change at the outcome level. Examine whether UNDP’s in-house planning and management of different interventions has been aligned to exploit synergies in contributing to outcomes.
* Determine whether or not there is consensus among UNDP actors, stakeholders and partners, and that the partnership strategy designed was the best one to achieve the outcome; examine how the partnerships were formed and how they performed; examine how the partnership strategy affected the achievement of or progress towards the outcome.

1. **Evaluation ethics**

All UNDP Programme and project evaluations are to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. Both documents can be found at the following link: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

Evaluators:

• 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. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

• Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators 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, evaluators 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 the evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.

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

All consultants engaged in evaluation must sign an Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form at the start of their contract (see Annex IV).

1. **Evaluation Consultant:**

The international consultant must have the following qualifications:

* A senior level development expert with substantive knowledge of development theories and issues.
* Has a strong background in development research methodologies and evaluation with specific focus on the areas of Energy and Environment
* Has a good knowledge of the country's development issues and significant experience in working on poverty, human development, and gender and in evaluating complex multilateral aid programmes.
* Has an advanced degree in the Natural Sciences or related fields
* Familiarity with UNDP or UN operations at NCC context will be a plus
* English is a must and Arabic an asset

1. **Implementation Arrangements**
2. The UNDP Country Office will appoint an Evaluation Focal Person that will be responsible for the evaluation mission.
3. The modalities of carrying out the evaluation will be agreed among the CO and the Evaluation consultant. It could include:
   1. Briefing of the evaluation consultant;
   2. Setting up of field work parameters and responsibilities for data and information gathering;
   3. An analysis segment;
   4. Meetings with stakeholders and
   5. Report writing.
4. An initial note (inception report) will be prepared and submitted by the Evaluation consultant within commencement of evaluation, reflecting in it all substantive and logistical issues that would have to be addressed in order to complete the evaluation successfully.
5. A draft report comprising especially the findings, outline lessons, conclusions and recommendations will be made available prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission.
6. A wrap up meeting will be held in UNDP Saudi Arabia office prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. The consultant will give a presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations.
7. The Evaluation consultant will forward a Final Report of the Evaluation to the Resident Representative, UNDP Saudi Arabia within 10 days of completion of the evaluation mission.
8. **Reference Materials**

The following documents should be studied by the evaluation consultant prior to undertaking the assignment:

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
3. UNDP Saudi Arabia Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
4. Project Documents and relevant reports
5. Other documents and materials related to the outcome to be evaluated (from the government, donors, etc. including project/outcome evaluations, Programme evaluations etc.)
6. **Attachments to TOR**
7. Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report)
8. Outcome Evaluation Report Template.
9. UNEG Quality Checklists for Evaluation Reports
10. Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

-------------

Interested evaluators should send their CVs outlining their background experience and qualifications to:

Mayssam Tamim, Assistant Resident Representative at [mayssam.tamim@undp.org](mailto:mayssam.tamim@undp.org)

Deadline: **Thursday, 9 July 2015**

**Attachments to Terms of Reference**

**Annex I**

**Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report) — The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create 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. (See Table A.)

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix

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

**Annex II**

**Outcome Evaluation Report Template[[1]](#footnote-1)**

This is an outline for an outcome evaluation report. It does not follow a prescribed format but simply presents one way to organize the information. Project evaluations should employ a similar structure and emphasize results, although they may differ somewhat in terms of scope and substance.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

* What is the context and purpose of the outcome evaluation?
* What are the main findings and conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned?

**INTRODUCTION**

* Why was this outcome selected for evaluation? (refer back to the rationale for including this outcome in the evaluation plan at the beginning of the Country Programme)
* What is the purpose of the outcome evaluation? Is there any special reason why the evaluation is being done at this point in time? (is this an early, mid-term or late evaluation in the Country Programme)
* What products are expected from the evaluation? (should be stated in TOR)
* What are the key issues addressed by the evaluation? (should be stated in the TOR)
* What was the methodology used for the evaluation? (should be stated in the TOR)
* What is the structure of the evaluation report? (how the content will be organized in the report)

**THE DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

* When and why did UNDP begin working towards this outcome and for how long has it been doing so? What are the problems that the outcome is expected to address?
* Who are the key partners for the outcome? The main stakeholders? The expected beneficiaries?

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The findings and conclusions of the evaluation report should reflect the scope presented in the TOR. There should be some flexibility for the evaluation team to include new issues that arise during the course of the evaluation. The findings and conclusions in the report will take their lead from the nature of the exercise. If the purpose of the outcome evaluation was to learn about the partnership strategy, the findings and recommendations may address issues of partnership more than the other elements listed below. If the purpose was for mid-course adjustments to outputs produced by UNDP, the report findings and conclusions might give some more emphasis to issues related to UNDP’s contribution to the outcome via outputs. The section on findings and conclusions should include the **ratings** assigned by the outcome evaluator to the outcome, outputs and, if relevant, to the sustainability and relevance of the outcome.

The following questions are typical of those that must be answered by the findings and conclusions section of an outcome evaluation. They reflect the four categories of analysis.

**1. Status of the outcome**

* Has the outcome been achieved or has progress been made towards its achievement?
* Was the outcome selected relevant given the country context and needs, and UNDP’s niche? (Presumably, if the outcome is within the SRF it is relevant; however, the outcome evaluation should verify this assumption.)

**2. Factors affecting the outcome**

* What factors (political, sociological, economic, etc.) have affected the outcome, either positively or negatively?
* How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?

**3. UNDP contributions to the outcome through outputs**

* What were the key outputs produced by UNDP that contributed to the outcome (including outputs produced by “soft” and hard assistance)?
* Were the outputs produced by UNDP relevant to the outcome?
* What were the quantity, quality and timeliness of outputs? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs?
* How well did UNDP use its resources to produce target outputs?
* Were the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcome or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators?
* Did UNDP have an effect on the outcome directly through “soft” assistance (e.g., policy advice, dialogue, advocacy and brokerage) that may not have translated into clearly identifiable outputs or may have predated UNDP’s full-fledged involvement in the outcome? (For example, was policy advice delivered by UNDP advisors over the course of several years on the advisability of reforming the public service delivery system and on the various options available? Could this have laid the groundwork for reform that subsequently occurred?)

**4. UNDP partnership strategy**

* What was the partnership strategy used by UNDP in pursuing the outcome and was it effective?
* Were partners, stakeholders and/or beneficiaries of UNDP assistance involved in the design of UNDP interventions in the outcome area? If yes, what were the nature and extent of their participation? If no, why not?

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Flowing from the discussion above, the section on recommendations should answer the following question:

* What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in this outcome?

**LESSONS LEARNED**

* What are the main lessons that can be drawn from the outcome experience that may have generic application?
* What are the best and worst practices in designing, undertaking, monitoring and evaluating outputs, activities and partnerships around the outcome?

**ANNEXES**

Annexes are to include the following: TOR, itinerary and list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, questionnaire used and summary of results, list of documents reviewed and any other relevant material.

**Annex III**

**UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports** | | |
| This checklist is intended to help evaluation managers and evaluators to ensure the final product of the evaluation - evaluation report - meets the expected quality. It can also be shared as part of the TOR prior to the conduct of the evaluation or after the report is finalized to assess its quality. | | |
| **Evaluation Title:** | | |
| **Commissioning Office:** | | |
| 1. **The Report Structure** | | |
| 1.0 | The report is well structured, logical, clear and complete. | |
| 1.1 | Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). | |
| 1.2 | The title page and opening pages provide key basic information. 1. Name of the evaluation object 2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report 3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object 4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators 5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation 6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes 7. List of acronyms. | |
| 1.3 | The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes1: 1. Overview of the evaluation object 2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience 3. Evaluation methodology 4. Most important findings and conclusions 5. Main recommendations | |
| 1.4 | Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:2 1. TORs  2. List of persons interviewed and sites visited.  3. List of documents consulted  4. More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity  5. Evaluators bio data and/or justification of team composition  6. Evaluation matrix  7. results framework | |
| **2. Object of Evaluation** | |
| 2.0 | The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation3. |
| 2.1 | The **logic model and/or the expected results chain** (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described. |
| 2.2 | The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government’s strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency’s corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate. |
| 2.3 | The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: • **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly. • **The geographic context and boundaries (**such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant  • The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object  • The **total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions. |
| 2.4 | The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles. |
| 2.5 | The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation. |
| **3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.** | |
| 3.0 | The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained. |
| 3.1 | The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used. |
| 3.2 | The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. |
| 3.3 | The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators4. |
| 3.4 | As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights. |
| **4. Evaluation Methodology** | |
| 4.0 | The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes. |
| 4.1 | The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant. |
| 4.2 | The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits. |
| 4.3 | The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample. |
| 4.4 | The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation. |
| 4.5 | The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions. |
| 4.6 | The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope. |
| 4.7 | The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools, etc.) |
| **5. Findings** | |
| 5.0 | Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. |
| 5.1 | Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data. |
| 5.2 | Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope. |
| 5.3 | Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence. |
| 5.4 | Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed. |
| 5.5 | Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible |
| 5.6 | Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence. |
| **6. Conclusions** | |
| 6.0 | Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation. |
| 6.1 | The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions. |
| 6.2 | Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. |
| 6.3 | Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users. |
| 6.4 | Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. |
| **7. Recommendations** | |
| 7.0 | Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders. |
| 7.1 | The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. |
| 7.2 | Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions. |
| 7.3 | Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation. |
| 7.4 | Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation. |
| 7.5 | Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear. |
| 7.6 | Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up. |
| **8. Gender and Human Rights** | |
| 8.0 | The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach |
| 8.1 | The report uses gender sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc. |
| 8.2 | The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender equality and human rights responsive and appropriate for analyzing the gender equality and human rights issues identified in the scope. |
| 8.3 | The report assesses if the design of the object was based on a sound gender analysis and human rights analysis and implementation for results was monitored through gender and human rights frameworks, as well as the actual results on gender equality and human rights. |
| 8.4 | Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender equality and human rights aspects. |

**ANNEX IV**

**United Nations Evaluation Group – Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form**

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

**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 ( ) on ( )**

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

1. This format is also presented in the annex to the Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators (Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)