

UNDP NEPAL
Terms of Reference
Outcome Evaluation: Country Programme Document (outcome 5 and 6)

1. Background and Context:

In November 2006, Nepal's decade-long armed conflict ended with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Government of Nepal and the then Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). A central pillar of this accord is adopting of a new constitution that grants equal rights and opportunities to all Nepali citizens. In April 2008, a Constituent Assembly (CA) election was held with a mandate to complete the new Constitution by May 2010. However, due to political fluidity the Constitution could not be promulgated on timely manner and as a result, the term of the CA had to be extended several times, spanning over two years.

Despite these extensions, the Constitution could not be promulgated because the political parties failed to reach consensus on key constitutional issues (e.g., number and demarcation of provincial boundaries, forms of governance etc) and the CA was dissolved, triggering a scenario unforeseen by the Constitution. Ultimately, the major political forces agreed to establish a neutral, caretaker government, which would also hold elections for the 2nd Constituent Assembly in November 2013.

In the aftermath of the devastating April and May earthquakes that hit the country, the 'major' political parties came up with 16 point agreement in terms of finalizing the Constitution, among others, building on the achievements of the first CA. Also, they decided to promulgate the Constitution based on consensus and if no consensus forged, they decided to follow the voting procedures in delivering the Constitution. Finally, the second CA adopted the constitution on 20 September 2015 by majority.

Despite the fact that the constitution was promulgated with an overwhelming support of CA members, about half a dozen southern plains-based Madhesi political parties boycotted the constitution writing process alleging that the major political parties had back-tracked from the provisions contained in the Interim Constitution, 2007. Their fundamental differences lied in the demarcation of the provincial boundaries, proportional inclusion in the state structures, electoral system and citizenship provisions. The issue of demarcation of the provincial boundaries has not made much headway even after the amendment of the Constitution in January, 2016 and the identity-based political parties are still in agitation.

In addition to this, the political fluidity has also hugely impacted the service delivery and accountability at the local level mainly due to the absence of the elected local bodies for more than 1.5 decades as no elections have been held after the tenure of the elected representatives came to end in 2002 when the Maoist insurgency was at its peak. Since then the local governance has largely been led by bureaucrats assigned for the duty, often in coordination with local political actors.

In the absence of the elected local bodies, the government has created Ward Citizen Forums (WCFs) in each of the wards of the all Village Development Committees and Municipalities. The WCFs have been serving as proxy representatives at the local level and have been quite involved in the local planning and civic oversight process. UNDP has been supporting the mechanism to promote voice and accountability at the local level.

UNDP Nepal new Country Program started in 2013 based on UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for a five-year period (2013-17). The Country Program Document (CPD) and the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) were formulated in parallel with the UNDAF based on the principles of human rights, gender equality, environmental sustainability, capacity development, and result based management. The CPD and CPAP contribute to 9 out of the 10 UNDAF outcome areas. These outcome areas are aimed at advancing equality and equity, protecting development gains, creating an enabling environment for enhanced international cooperation etc. and primarily focus on strengthening the quality of democracy, the social contract between the State and citizens, and the effectiveness and accountability of governance.

Overall, UNDP's support in relation to the governance covers a wide range from strengthening parliament and local government bodies to electoral reform to public administration reform. Inclusive democratic governance, effective accountability efficient service delivery and institution building are at the core of UNDP contribution.

The UNDAF Outcomes were originally drafted under the assumption that a new constitution would be promulgated latest by May 27, 2012 as the Interim Constitution did not expect the CA to be dissolved without delivering the Constitution. Therefore, most of the targets set out for these outcomes were meant to support the federalization process of the country and associated transition management under the overall framework of the new federal constitution could not be met.

Given this fluid and fast evolving political context, unlike the assumption of the UNDAF, UNDP, as a key player in the area of governance, started responding to the changing needs and priorities of the country while aligning the support with the overall objective of CPAP. For example, after the dissolution of the CA, UNDP supported heavily the election of the second CA which contributed to the fair and credible election of the CA.

Similarly, UNDP supported the CA not only in the writing of the Constitution but also made the case to build on the work done by the first CA. In parallel, UNDP provided support to the executive to get ready to implement the Constitution such that transition to the federal government is smooth and the service delivery least disruptive.

UNDP in Nepal, however, has had to readjust its interventions to respond to the emerging needs as the political context and events unfolded. As the UNDAF and CPD were already approved or were already in the advanced process of being approved, it was not possible to change the outcome and output statements in these strategic frameworks and plans. Instead, UNDP took advantage of its annual review of CPAP with the Coordinating Agency (i.e. Ministry of Finance) to introduce changes in indicators or add new indicators/targets to the CPAP while the project documents were pitched at results that were needed to respond

to the new needs in the area of governance. For example, a new indicator was set for outcome 6, output 6.2.

This terms of reference is prepared to assess UNDP contribution towards UNDAF/CPD/CPAP outcomes 5 and 6. This TOR outlines the scope, methodology specific deliverables, and relevant human resource requirement for the evaluation and will serve as a point of reference throughout the evaluation process.

2. UNDAF/CPD Outcomes 5 and 6

Outcome 5 basically covers the broader systems and processes of democratic governance, such as electoral reform and strengthening local governance, whereas Outcome 6 tries to address the more specific governance needs of transitioning into a federal system of governance as envisioned by the Interim Constitution of Nepal, 2007. The details of outcomes and their outputs are as below:

Outcome 5: Institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance are more accountable, effective, efficient and inclusive.

Output 5.1: Election Commission of Nepal has the capacity to conduct credible, inclusive and transparent elections.

Output 5.2: Provincial and local bodies can plan, budget, monitor, report and deliver inclusive government services.

Output 5.3: Provincial, district and local bodies have improved capacity to access additional financial resources in equitable and appropriate ways.

Outcome 6: Tiers of government established and function to meet the provisions of the new federal constitution.

Output 6.1: National institutions, policies and legislation reviewed from inclusion and gender perspectives, and developed in line with the provisions of Nepal's inclusive federal constitution.

Output 6.2: Civil service has the capacity to meet the needs of the inclusive federal constitution and government structures.

Output 6.3: National and provincial legislatures, executives and other state bodies have necessary capacities to fulfil their accountabilities to vulnerable groups.

As explained above, some of the assumptions behind these outcome and output statements did not hold true as the political development towards a new constitution took many unforeseen turns. While Nepal now has a new constitution, its implementation is taking longer time than expected hence establishing a federal structure with tiers of government is likely to be time-taking. With the remaining time in this current program cycle (i.e. 1.5 years), and given the contestations surrounding provincial boundaries and number of provinces, it is unlikely that much can be achieved in terms of outcomes six. Despite this situation, however, UNDP could not change the outcome and output statements because of

corporate procedures. Therefore, a theory of change has been modified to reflect UNDP's contributions in response to the evolving political context.

This TOR outlines the scope, methodology specific deliverables, and relevant human resource requirement for the evaluation and will serve as a point of reference throughout the evaluation process.

3. Evaluation of the outcomes

3.1 Evaluation Purpose:

The purpose of this evaluation is to take stock and evaluate UNDP contribution towards inclusive and accountable governance through CPAP outcomes 5 and 6.

3.2 Evaluation Objective

The overall objective of this outcome evaluation is to assess whether and to what extent the planned outcomes for 5 and 6 have been or are being achieved and to what extent UNDP support has contributed and is likely to contribute towards achieving the outcomes.

The evaluation findings will be mainly used to correct/customize the implementation of UNDP support for the remaining period of the Program cycle and to distil lessons for planning, formulation and implementation of the new Country Programme Document.

3.3 Evaluation Scope

This outcome evaluation is to evaluate the collective results through UNDP support in terms of (i) strengthening the system and process of the country's governance to make it inclusive, accountable and effective leading to improve public service delivery, and (ii) constitution building and federalization process including administrative restructuring in the context of transitioning country into the federal form of governance.

The outcome evaluation will assist UNDP in gaining a better understanding of the following aspects of its interventions:

Assessment of the extent to which the planned outcomes have been or likely to be achieved by the end of 2017, given the assessment of the political, social and administrative context of the country during the Program period. Evaluation of the outputs under the outcomes if they have been achieved or are likely to be achieved during the Program period,

Assessment of the transmission mechanisms by which the outputs contribute to the achievement of the specified outcomes

Review of major factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome, both external and internal (within UNDP intervention)

3.4 Evaluation Questions:

The evaluation will be conducted against the following evaluation criteria;

Relevance

- To what extent do the intended outcome and the relevant outputs address national priorities given the evolving national priorities and needs?
- Have UNDP interventions been relevant to address the problems of women and socially excluded groups in the change political context of the Country?
- Has UNDP been able to adapt its programming under outcome 5 and 6 to address priority needs of the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent the planned outcomes have been or are likely to be achieved?
- Are there any unexpected outcome(s) being achieved beyond the planned outcome?
- If the outcomes are not being achieved, what would be the reasons? What could be the challenges to achieve the outcome?
- Has UNDP best utilized its comparative advantage in deciding to deliver the planned outcomes and outputs?
- What are the key gaps that UNDP interventions could address considering its comparative advantage that would significantly contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
- Has UNDP's partnership strategy and its implementation approach been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcome?
- To what extent the results both at the outcome and output levels benefit women and men equitably particularly in the transition period of the country?
- To what extent the results at the outcome and output level benefits marginalised groups particularly in the transition period of the country.
- Is the current set of indicators, both outcome and output, effective in informing the progress made towards the outcomes?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the outcomes?

Efficiency

- How have different UNDP programs as well as other organizations built on each other's work to contribute to the outcome?
- How have other UN agencies interventions been complementary to achieve the outcomes of UNDP supported initiatives?
- Is there an opportunity for UNDP to add value to other UN agencies work?
- Has UNDP been cost effective in delivering the results contributing to the outcomes?

Sustainability

- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
- What is the level of capacity and commitment from the Government and other stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
- To what extent has UNDP been able to respond for enhancing the sustainability of the outcome /output results?
- What could be done to strengthen sustainability?

Evaluation team is required to assess the UNDP contribution to the outcomes through the following projects and related interventions:

The outcomes 5 and 6 are being contributed by the following key initiatives:

(i) The Election Support Project (ESP) 2012- 2017

The ESP provides technical assistance to the Election Commission of Nepal (ECN) for institutional strengthening and professional development following the electoral cycle approach. The project has three core objectives: to strengthen the capacity of the ECN to function as a permanent, independent, credible and professional institution of governance; to ensure election cycle is conducted in an effective, sustainable, and credible manner and to Increase democratic participation of voters in the electoral cycle , particularly of under-represented and disadvantaged segments of the Nepali society. To achieve the objectives, the ESP provides assistance to the ECN in the following core areas: biometric voter registration, electoral mapping and geographic information system, public outreach and voter education, electoral security and electoral dispute resolution, policy support through development of strategic plan and its implementation, gender and social inclusion etc. A total budget is USD 24.6 million and is implemented in partnership with European Union, DFID, Norway and Denmark.

(II) Local Government and Community Development Programme (LGCDP II) and its Policy and Programme Support Facility) 2013-2017

The LGCDP- II is a national programme funded by the Government of Nepal and 12 development partners. The stated goal of LGCDP II is to contribute towards poverty reduction through better local governance and community development. The national programme covers both the demand and supply dimensions of local governance and is implemented nationwide under the leadership of the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development.

UNDP has been partnering in the Program in two ways: 1. as a provider of TA under the Policy and Program Support Facility (PPSF) and a member of the Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA).

The Policy and Program Support Facility (PPSF), a United Nations Joint Programme, brings together three UN agencies: UNDP, UNCDF and UNV. The main objective of PPSF is to support effective implementation of LGCDP II at all levels through the provision of technical assistance with prime focus on three main areas:

- Programme implementation, through the provision of national TA at the centre, in the regions and at the local level,;
- Policy, field testing and innovation, and capacity development, through the provision of TA, seed funding, operations and logistics;
- Coordination and oversight, through the establishment of a Development Partner Coordination Cell (DPCC) and the deployment of TA for the purposes of fiduciary assessments, and technical reviews and evaluations.

The PPSF is being funded by DFID, the Government of Norway, and the Government of Denmark, UNDP, UNCDF and UNV. The total budget of PPSF is USD 16 million, out of which one million is unfunded.

(III) Project to Prepare the Public Administration for State Reforms (PREPARE) 2013-2016:

The project aims to provide technical support to the relevant government institutions to get prepared for administrative restructuring and reforms in the context of the new federal constitution. The project has been providing support for policy review on inclusive aspects of administration, addressing the individual and institutional capacity issues. It is also, undertaking functional analysis and assignment of major service delivery sectors of the government to help the policy makers to make decision regarding assignment of functions and responsibilities of the different tiers of the government and has created a basis for the reorganization of the civil service along federal lines. Likewise, the transition management plan provides a broad framework for federalizing the administration by distilling the requirements in terms of developing new laws and policies, development of new institutions, reorganization of existing institutional arrangements, restructuring of civil services, (re) allocation of staff, and development of mechanisms and processes for carrying out service delivery with least possible disruptions.

The project support to assess the institutional arrangement needs of the government's structure in the federal context will help identify the required organization set-ups, define organizational interlinkages, and identify staffing requirements to carry out the functions in the context of federal government structures of the country. The total budget of the project is USD 2.1 million up to 2016 end. The project has been implemented by the Ministry of General Administration (MoGA), Government of Nepal since 2013.

(IV) Support to Participatory Constitution Building in Nepal (SPCBN) Project 2008-2015

The Constituent Assembly/ Legislature-Parliament/ (CA/LP) elected in 2008 was the most representative elected legislative body in Nepal's history. Shortly after its formation, work on Nepal's new constitution began. UNDP supported the process through the Support to Participatory Constitution Building in Nepal (SPCBN) project, with three major objectives: i) to support the development of the capacities of the Constituent Assembly (CA), its several committees, members, the CA secretariat and its technical advisors to produce a new constitution; ii) to support selected civil society organizations to facilitate participation of the general public, with a special emphasis on women and excluded groups, by hosting public consultations on the draft of the new constitution, soliciting public feedback and submitting it to the CA; and iii) to assist Nepal's state institutions in preparing for a smooth transition towards a new constitutional order and state structure. The project worked with the CA, civil society, political leaders, media and other relevant actors in order to increase their knowledge on constitution making as well as to feed their views into the constitution making process.

(v) Parliament Support Project (PSP) 2015-2019

The Parliament Support Project, a new initiative of the UNDP-Nepal, started from 1 September 2015 as the promulgation of the constitution has several far-reaching consequences for Legislative-Parliament (LP) to make it functional in a federal set-up. The overall objective of the project is to strengthen LP as an institution in responding to the needs and concerns of all citizens including women, youth, and marginalized groups, in assuming its role in law/policy making and providing oversight .

4. Geographical coverage:

UNDP's support under outcome 5 and 6 covers both central and grassroots level government institutions within Kathmandu valley and outside in the districts. The support provided at the local level are in the form of outreach, awareness raising and long term capacity building.

5. Methodology:

Outcome evaluations include three standard categories of analysis:

- An assessment of progress towards the outcome
- An assessment of factors affecting the outcome
- An assessment of key UNDP contributions to outcomes

During the outcome evaluation, the team is expected to apply a mixed-method approach by collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate the findings. The

evaluation methodology will have to be developed in close consultation with UNDP's Strategic Planning and Development Effectiveness Unit (SPDEU), Governance and Rule of Law Unit including the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) under UNDP.

6. Data collection methods:

Desk reviews of relevant documents (e.g., United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Nepal (UNDAF), UNDP Nepal Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), project documents, progress reports, UNDP Nepal Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Policy, government plans and policies etc.

The evaluation team can use the source of data to verify the results from the government annual reports and websites such as MOGA/PREPARE annual reports, LGCDP annual report and Local bodies fiscal commission reports, ECS annual report, SPCBN and PSP annual and review reports, and the mid-term evaluation reports from international and national observations etc.

Key informant interviews at the national and local level which consist of key government officials of the relevant ministries, parliament, project staffs, civil society actors etc

Focus group discussions at the national and local level can be carried out with the beneficiaries, relevant stakeholders including relevant government officials and project staffs

Direct observations during field visits to selected sites to observe some of the field based activities of the projects such as voter registration process, public outreach programmes, electoral education centers, ward citizen forum etc.

7. Target groups and stakeholders:

Primary target groups and stakeholders: key government counterparts/implementing partners (IPs) e.g., Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MoFALD), Ministry of General Administration (MOGA), Ministry of Finance (MoF), Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers (OPMCM), Legislative Parliament, Election Commission, DDC, municipalities and VDCs, civil society, academics, experts etc. organizations.

Secondary target groups and stakeholders: Political parties, Development partners, UN agencies, INGOs, private sector, Government agencies other than the (IPs) etc.

8. Evaluation Product:

The evaluation team is expected to produce the following deliverables:

Inception Report; Inception report on the evaluation team's plan on how it will be carrying out the evaluation and its understanding of what will be evaluated and why, an evaluation matrix outlining which data collection methodologies should be used to address each of the evaluation questions, a proposed schedule of tasks. A presentation of the inception report shall have to be made and finalized incorporating the feedback from EMG.

Draft Evaluation; Report to be shared with UNDP and relevant stakeholders for feedback and quality assurance.

Evaluation Debriefing: Debriefing meeting with UNDP and key stakeholders where main findings will be presented.

Final Evaluation Report: The final report is expected to cover findings based on the criteria and questions supported by good analysis of qualitative and quantitative evidence, as applicable, lessons learned, and forward-looking recommendations.

9. Composition, Skills and Experience of the Evaluation Team

UNDP will hire an international expert as a team lead to carry out this evaluation. The international team lead will be supported by two national consultants while carrying out this evaluation.

Team Leader (International Expert)

The team leader needs to have particular experiences, knowledge and understanding of the constitution building process focusing on federalization/decentralization and the transition management associated with them and will be responsible to lead in those areas during the evaluation process. The team leader's role will be to guide the national consultants and prepare consolidated reports.

Specifically, the following qualifications and experiences are required for international expert to carry out this assignment;

Required qualifications and skills for the team leader include:

- Master's degree in political science, international development or related field; PHD preferred,
- At least 10 years of experiences in carrying out reviews and evaluations of the development projects/programmes for national and international development agencies,
- At least 12 years of professional experience in the field of governance particularly, constitution making, federalism/decentralization etc.
- Sound knowledge of outcome evaluation and results-based management and experience in conducting at least 2 outcome evaluations.
- Familiar with regional, preferably national context (e.g., social, political and economic)
- Knowledge/familiarity with gender and inclusion issues
- Proven experiences of being a team leader
- Familiar with UNDP rules, regulations and guidelines will be an added advantage

S\He will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the report;
- Decide the division of labour within the team;

- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, indicators and partnership strategy for the report;
- Contribute to and ensure overall quality of the final report.
- Take the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of deliverables

Consultancy period:

The total period of this consultancy will be of 42 days (over the period of July to September 2016) of which 25 days will be in-country involving one visit. The team leader will visit two field sites in the regions based on the following programme coverage matrix.

	FWR	MWR	WR	CR	ER
Projects	District	Districts	Districts	Districts	Districts
ESP	Kailali	Banke	Kaski	Kathmandu	Morang
LGCDP	Kailali	Banke	Kaski	Makwanpur Kavrepalanchowk	Morang
SPCBN	Kailali	Banke	Kaski		Morang
	Doti				Nawalparasi
	Dhadeldura				

10. Time line:

Tentative Evaluation Schedule 2 months (July to September 2016)			
S.N	Content	Date	Responsible
1.	Inception Report	20 th July	Evaluation Team
2.	Draft Evaluation Report for Feedback	22 nd August	UNDP
3.	Evaluation debriefing meeting with UNDP and related stakeholders	24 th August	Evaluation Team
4.	Final Evaluation Report Submission	4 th September	Evaluation Team

11. Timeframe for the Evaluation Process

Desk review- **4 days**

Preparation of Inception Report- **3 days**

Preparation of zero draft including in country visit and visits to the field, consultations, interviews, and briefing and presentation– **25 days**

Incorporation of the feedback - **2 days**

Preparing the draft report - **4 days**

Incorporating comments and finalizing the report- **4 days**

12. Evaluation Implementation Arrangements

Evaluation Steering Committee

An Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC) will be formed at the senior level which will be represented by the Outcome board members and UNDP Country Director. The National counterparts such as National Planning Commission, the Ministry of Finance, and the Project Directors of the relevant projects will also represent the group. Some key donors also participate as stakeholders to the group.

This is the primary decision-making entity which will oversee the progress of the evaluation and review the evaluation product, provide feedback and ensure quality of the final product.

Evaluation Management Group

An Evaluation Management Group (EMG) will be formed under the leadership of UNDP, Deputy Country Director (DCD). The Assistant Country Director, (ACD) of the Governance unit of UNDP will be the Evaluation Manager and Secretariat to ESG. Programme Specialist and Programme Analysts of the UNDP's Governance unit will be the members of the ESC. SPEDEU (UNDP) will also be representing in this group. Programme /Project Managers of the related projects will also be the part of this group. The group will particularly support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation activities and management of the evaluation budget, hire the team of external consultants, ensure participation of relevant stakeholders in this process, review and provide substantive comments to the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, and evaluation matrix, provide substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports etc.

Evaluation Task Manager

UNDP, ACD Governance Unit will be the evaluation task manager and the secretariat to the EMG to ensure day to day functioning of the evaluation process. The Evaluation Task Manager will be responsible to draft the TOR with guidance from the Evaluation Steering Committee, ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation teams and the process (following UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines), oversee the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation activities and management of the evaluation budget, manage the recruitment process to hire the team of external consultants, ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in the evaluation process and governing entities, review and provide substantive comments to the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, and evaluation matrix , for quality assurance purposes, prepare briefs to inform the Evaluation Steering Committee on progress made, support the EMG to prepare management response to the evaluation for ESC's review, prepare a communication plan for the dissemination of evaluation findings and prepare an action plan to follow-up on management responses etc.

Annex 1:

Related documents:

Project Documents;

-LGCDP

-Election

- SPCBN/PSP

- PREPARE

Evaluation (Mid Term etc) of the related projects

Theory of Change etc

1. Required format for evaluation report

UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports		
<p>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.</p>		
Evaluation Title:		
Commissioning Office:		
Program unit responsible:		
1. The Report Structure		
1.1	The report is well structured, logical, clear and complete.	
1.2	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).	
1.3	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.	
1.4	The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes: 1. Overview of the evaluation object 2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience 3. Evaluation methodology 4. Most important findings and conclusions 5. Main recommendations	
1.5	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: 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 biodata and/or justification of team composition	

	6. Evaluation matrix 7. results framework	
1. Objective of Evaluation		
2.1	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.	
2.2	The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.	
2.3	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.	
2.4	The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	
2.5	The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
2.6	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.		
3.1	The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained.	
3.2	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.	
3.3	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.	
3.4	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators ⁴ .	
3.5	As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights.	
4. Evaluation Methodology		
4.1	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.	
4.2	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.	
4.3	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.	
4.4	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.	
4.5	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.	
4.6	The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.	
4.7	The methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	
4.8	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		
5.1	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.	
5.2	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
5.3	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope.	
5.4	Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence.	
5.5	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
5.6	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible	
5.7	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.	
6. Conclusions		
6.1	Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	
6.2	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.	
6.3	Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	
6.4	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.	
6.5	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		
7.1	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.	
7.2	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	
7.3	Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.	
7.4	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation.	
7.5	Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.	
7.6	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.	
7.7	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.	
8. Gender and Human Rights		
8.1	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	
8.2	The report uses gender sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.	
8.3	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.	
8.4	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.	
8.5	Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender equality and human rights aspects.	

Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Data Sources	Data collection methods and tools	Indicators/success standards	Methods of data analysis