

Terms of reference (ToRs) for the evaluation of DRR/CCA programme

International and local Consultant: Evaluation of the UNDP project
“Strengthening national capacities and frameworks for disaster risk reduction and climate change
adaptation” 2012-2016

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Location: | Home based, with travel to Mozambique |
| Application Deadline: | 28 April 2017 |
| Type of Contract: | Individual Contract |
| Post Level: | International and Local Consultants |
| Languages Required: | English and Portuguese |
| Starting Date: | 2 Maio 2017 |
| Duration of Contract: | 30 days |

Proposal should be submitted to the following address United Nations Development Program, Mozambique, Maputo, Av. Kenneth Kaunda nr 931, P.O. Box 4595, Maputo OR by email to procurement.mz@undp.org cc to mauro.salia@undp.org and manuela.muianga@undp.org no later than 21th April 2017.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The procuring UNDP entity will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

I. BACKGROUND

Mozambique is considered as a country highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate-related hazards, such as floods, drought, cyclones and epidemics. The number of people affected by one or more of these hazards has registered an annual increase of almost 5,000 every year over the period 1998 to 2009¹. Of these hazards, floods occur with a frequency of 2 to 3 years as a result of the country's location downstream of nine major river basins. Drought is also a major concern. In 2009, it was estimated that approximately 1.3 million people within the country are exposed to this hazard². The current El Nino triggered drought (2015/2016) has impacted over 1.5million people in the south and central regions of the country. Additionally, more than 60% of the population lives in coastal areas³ and are thus highly vulnerable to the effects of cyclone storms along the over 2770 km coastline. With an elevated poverty rate of over 70%⁴, a high dependency on rain-fed agriculture, and high HIV rate, the impacts of these extreme events increase the underlying vulnerability of a population already stretched to the limit of its coping strategies.

¹ 2011 Global Assessment report on disaster risk reduction; *Revealing risk, redefining development*

² Global Assessment report 2009

³ INGC synthesis report on climate change 2009

⁴ 2010 UNDP Human development report

coastal land. The impacts will reach many different sectors, threaten development progress in the country and hinder progress towards meeting the then Millennium Development Goals and progress on the recently approved SDGs. Furthermore, current development processes such as construction of new infrastructure without disaster proofing or climate proofing measures may also compound the situation of increased vulnerability. As such, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures are essential to ensure sustainable development within the country. In order to effectively support the government efforts to address these disasters and climate change issues toward achieving sustainable development, the programme was designed to contribute to strengthening national capacities and frameworks for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

The project ***"Strengthening national capacities and frameworks for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation"*** represents UNDP's contribution to the Government of Mozambique efforts on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, and was approved in 2012 in recognition that disaster preparedness, mitigation and risk reduction, as well as vulnerability reduction and climate change adaptation are fundamental factors contributing to sustainable development in Mozambique, a country that is affected by frequent natural disasters. The design of the programme was informed by recommendations from the evaluation of the 2008-2011 DRR/CCA programme support to the government through INGC. The programme was implemented within five years (2012-2016) in line with the UNDAF programme cycle (2012-2016). The purpose of the project was therefore to support government institutions, civil society and the general population to reduce disaster risk within the country and to adapt to the negative effects of climate change, in order to guarantee development gains for the country as a whole, and especially for those most vulnerable. To make contributions to the achievement of the above, the project will concentrate on 4 different thematic areas, in line with the UNDAF outputs, focusing on: 1) the development of integrated and operational policy and regulatory framework for effective coordination and implementation of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation; 2) active participation of local communities in risk reduction activities and natural resources management in districts at risk; 3) integrated information management and monitoring systems for disasters; and 4) ensuring that communities in disaster prone areas benefit effectively from emergency preparedness, humanitarian assistance and early recovery actions. Geographical coverage includes three provinces – Gaza, Nampula and Cabo Delgado. Nonetheless, activities were also implemented in provinces where such activities were found to contribute to DRR and CCA and thus in building disaster resilience. The total planned budget for the implementation was estimated in \$15,339,000. The main intervention partners were INGC, MITADER, INAM and MEF.

Within this overall framework, UNDP is selecting an Evaluation Team composed by 2 experts to conduct the Final Evaluation of the project. These Terms of Reference provide information on the evaluation purpose and scope, the methodology and expected deliverables as well as on the profile of the team and the selection process.

II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the overall performance against the project objective and outcomes to inform future Disaster Risk Reduction programme interventions in Mozambique relating

to both soft (policy and advocacy) and technical programming (implementation of policy through institutional support) at all levels. In this context, the evaluation will assess the impact of UNDP Mozambique's contribution to strengthening capacity for disaster risk reduction at all levels in Mozambique and document the factors that contributed to the achievement (or not) of related results with specific reference to the value added of UNDP Mozambique. The evaluation results and recommendations will inform UNDP Mozambique in its new disaster resilience and climate change adaptation programming in alignment with the government agenda on disaster resilience, new UNDAF and CPD as well as with other global policies.

An additional purpose of the evaluation is to draw lessons and identify good practices that can be replicated in future interventions.

III. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In accordance with UNDP evaluation policy procedures, the Government of Mozambique through the National Institute for Disaster Management (INGC) and UNDP have agreed to undertake an evaluation of the DRR/CCA project (2012-16) to assess the project's performance in achieving the intended results in Mozambique, in terms of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, appropriateness, impact and sustainability, translated into:

- assess the relevance of the design and choice of UNDP areas of response based on its mandate and comparative advantage;
- assess progress towards achieving the stated programme outcomes and outputs, considering cross cutting-issues such as capacity development, institutional strengthening and gender;
- assess the relevance of activities carried out under each of the programme components, especially with regards to developing capacities at central and decentralised level;
- assess the extent to which the programme results have contributed to the achievement of the UNDAF/CPD (2012-2016) objectives and overall support to the operations of the UN system in Mozambique;
- assess the relevance and efficiency of implementation arrangements, including but not limited to, organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanism used by UNDP to support the project/programme;
- document challenges encountered and enumerate what needs to be done, how and by who, to make the project more responsive and better aligned to national development priorities while at the same time making greater contribution to the UNDAF (2017-2020) and ensuring sustainability of the programme;
- Document lessons learned and identify good practices that can be replicated in future interventions;
- consider future potential synergies other than those being explored currently, for example, with the environment portfolio and the UNDP Project on Decentralisation, extractive industries;
- identify operational issues and bottlenecks in the implementation of the programme, implementation modalities and frameworks, and advise on any required change in terms of outputs, implementing partners, and allocation of resources and make recommendations;

IV. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact:

Relevance:

- To what extent are the project objectives aligned with national priorities, context and needs?
- To what extent is UNDP intervention under the project is responding to the project outputs?

- To what extent has the project's selected method of implementation been appropriate to the development context?
- To what extent is the project interventions being acceptable and feasible within the local context?

Effectiveness

- What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- Has UNDP worked effectively with all implementing partners and other international and national delivery partners to achieve project results?
- Considering the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of both UNDP and implementing partners, is the project well suited to provide support to national and local governments in Mozambique in its intervention areas?
- What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede project's performance in these areas?

Efficiency

- Has project's strategy and execution in the intervention areas been efficient and cost effective?
- Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that the project has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that UNDP interventions are sustainable?
- What mechanisms have been set in place by the project to support the government of Mozambique to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
- How should the project interventions be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities and civil society in improving living conditions in a longer term?
- What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships to promote long term sustainability?

Impact

- Has the project been effective in helping improve living conditions at the local level in Mozambique?
- What progress was made towards achievement of UNDAF Outcome 3?

The evaluation will also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from project's interventions?

Gender Equality

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of project's interventions?
- To what extent has UNDP support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on the project results in support to UNDAF/CPD Outputs, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP Mozambique Country Office could adjust its future programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the new project design 2017-2020 achieves planned outcomes/outputs and is positioned for sustainable results.

V. METHODOLOGY

It is proposed that a combination of methodological approaches be used to ensure that the most appropriate methods will be applied throughout the exercise. These approaches include, but are not limited to the following:

- Desk review of all the relevant documents including the UNDAF, CPD, CPAP, AWP's, Five-Year Government Plan (PQG), the 10-year Master Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction, the various Project Documents, RRF, field visits/monitoring reports, programme/project management meeting reports, reports of Steering Committee Meetings and other project and programme review meetings.
- Interviews with key informants and counterparts (central/provincial/district/community levels);
- Analyses and synthesis of all relevant data and information and subsequent compilation of succinct report addressing the full range of scope of work outlined above

The evaluation team will be expected to clearly document and explain its justification for the choice of methodological approach(es) to be used in this process, including planned surveys and questionnaires. The team shall visit the provinces and some selected project sites at district level as needed, interviewing project stakeholders/beneficiaries and visiting project activities.

The evaluators are expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported, and observed progress in UNDP areas of intervention at national and local levels in Mozambique. The evaluators will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to improved national and local government. In the case of this UNDP project, a theory of change was not explicitly defined. The evaluators are expected to construct a theory of change for the project based against stated objectives and anticipated results, and more generally from UNDPs Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and capacity development strategies and techniques.

The methodology and the work schedule prepared by the team shall be discussed and agreed with the DRR/CCA team of the CPR/Env. Unit and INGC at the beginning of the mission before proceeding with the collection of data and interviews with the project stakeholders/beneficiaries.

VI. EXPERTISE REQUIRED

The evaluation team should be composed of two specialist consultants (one international, one national) with the following expertise:

1. International Consultant

- Relevant advanced university degree or first level degree combined with 10 years of progressive experience in Disaster Risk Reduction;
- Seven (7) years of progressively responsible position in DRR/CCA;
- Extensive experience in implementation of donor funded projects;
- Minimum ten (10) years' Experience in evaluation of projects (experience with evaluation of DRR/CCA, especially UNDP led DRR projects would be a distinct advantage);

- Adequate experience in working in multi-cultural environments, with Government officials as well as civil society organizations;
- Good command of written and spoken English; working knowledge of Portuguese will be a distinct advantage.

2. National Consultant

- Relevant advanced university degree or first level degree combined with at least 5 years of progressive experience in Disaster Risk Reduction;
- Five (5) years of progressively responsible position in DRR/CCA;
- Extensive experience in implementation of donor funded projects;
- Five (5) years' Experience in project evaluations (Experience with evaluation of DRR projects would be an advantage);
- Adequate experience in working in multi-cultural environments, with Government officials as well as civil society organizations;
- Fluent Portuguese (spoken and written) is highly desirable; good command of written and spoken English is an advantage.

VII. Competencies

Core Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Demonstrates experience in gender equality.
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.
- Excellent analytical and organizational skills.
- Demonstrates substantial experience in gender equality. Actively promotes gender equality in all Project activities.

Functional Competencies:

- Demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter.
- Maturity and confidence in dealing with senior and high-ranking members of international, regional and national institutions.
- Excellent written communication skills, with analytic capacity and ability to synthesize project outputs and relevant findings for the preparation of quality project reports.
- Demonstrates transparency and provides feedback to all those who will contribute to the evaluation.
- Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback.

- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Ability to work independently as well as part of a big team.
- Ability to operate under strict time limits.

The international consultant will lead the evaluation and the national consultant will provide necessary support. The evaluation team must be independent from both the policy making process and the delivery and management of assistance.

VIII. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The consultants will report and be accountable to UNDP, through the Country Director and the HoU CPR/E&P. They will work with programme staff from UNDP, the Government Coordinating Agency in this case INGC, other Government Departments and national institutions implementing various components of the DRR/CCA project. UNDP will organize all logistical arrangements including field travel, as and when required.

UNDP Mozambique will:

- Provide the consultants with all the necessary support (not under the consultant's control) to ensure that the consultant(s) undertake the evaluation with reasonable efficiency.
- Appoint a focal point in the programme section to support the consultant(s) during the evaluation process.
- Collect comprehensive background documentation and inform partners and selected project counterparts.
- Support and identify key stakeholders to be interviewed as part of the evaluation.
- The programme staff members will be responsible for liaising with partners, logistical backstopping and providing relevant documentation and feedback to the consultants
- Organize inception meeting between the consultants, partners and stakeholders, including Government prior to the scheduled start of the assignment.

IX. DELIVERABLES

The consultants will be expected to prepare and present the following set of deliverables within a total of **30 working days**.

International consultant deliverables will be supported by 21 working days input from the national consultant:

1. Inception report: It should contain the proposed theory of change for UNDP work under the project. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. Annex 3 provides a simple matrix template. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The **inception report** will also include

the proposed theory of change for the project. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP country office before the evaluators proceed with site visits. **(5 days-home based)**

2. Draft DRR Project evaluation report: The report shall analyse the areas presented in the present ToRs, evaluate and provide clear and practical recommendations where necessary to inform the new DRR/CCA programming. The two copies of the draft reports (English and Portuguese versions) shall be submitted ten days before a presentation with UNDP, the Government Coordinating Authority and other stakeholders who have been part of the evaluation process. **(15 days in country)**
3. Final project evaluation report, which should include **(10 days home based)**:
 - An assessment of the progress in achieving the project outcomes and outputs and their contributions to, and associated impact on UNDAF (2012-2016) outputs and outcomes and, importantly, national development and DRR/CCA priorities;
 - Documentation of best practices and challenges encountered in the implementation of the DRR/CCA project, including an assessment of the appropriateness of the project's implementation arrangements;
 - An assessment of present and emerging national development and DRR/CCA priorities and how the project can be better positioned to respond to these priorities.
4. UNDP will provide comments within 5 working days

| Products | Submission | Review and approvals |
|---|---|---|
| Inception Report: work methodology, staffing, list of literature (requested documents), list of institutions / individuals to meet etc. Work plan, indicating the timetable for the tasks to be conducted and by whom. | Within 5 days from the start of the assignment. | 3 days from the submission – to be approved by UNDP Mozambique and INGC |
| Draft report: including the elements stipulated per the ToRs. | Within 20 days from the start of the assignment | 5 days from the submission of inception workshop – to be approved by INGC and UNDP Mozambique |
| Full final report, incorporating the inputs provided to the draft report from the main implementing partners. | Within 30 days from the start of the assignment | 10 days from the submission of the draft report– to be approved by UNDP Mozambique and INGC |

The report must be produced in line with UNDP evaluation report format and quality control checklist for its content, with an executive summary describing key findings and recommendations. The assessment will entail, *inter alia*:

- 1) A report containing (Hard copy, a soft copy in MS Word and Acrobat reader, Times New Roman, Size 12, Single Spacing):

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation reports is as follows (more guidance on the report template is provided under annex 2):

Title

Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

Executive Summary

Introduction

Background and context

Evaluation scope and objectives

Evaluation approach and methods

Data analysis

Findings and conclusions

Lessons learned

Recommendations

Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc

X. Selection process

The selection of the evaluation team will be done following UNDP procurement rules and regulations. UNDP will assess the consultants' profile, qualifications and skills to ensure high level consultants are recruited using the below evaluation criteria. Consultants are requested to submit a technical proposal illustrating the methodology and approach that will be used to conduct the assignment.

| 1. | Profile of the Evaluation Team Leader | Max points 70 |
|----|--|----------------------|
| | Relevant advanced university degree or first level degree combined with 10 years of progressive experience in Disaster Risk Reduction; | 10 |
| | Seven (7) years of progressively responsible position in DRR/CCA | 15 |
| | Minimum ten (10) years' Experience in evaluation of projects (experience with evaluation of DRR/CCA, especially UNDP led DRR projects would be a distinct advantage); | 15 |
| | Adequate experience in working in multi-cultural environments, with Government officials as well as civil society organizations | 10 |
| | Experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis, including interview techniques and sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies | 10 |
| | Team management, process management and facilitation skills as well as excellent reporting and communication skills in English and Portuguese | 10 |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------|-----------|
| 2. | Adequacy of Technical Proposal | Max points | 30 |
| | Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail in the technical proposal? | 8 | |
| | Are the different components of the evaluation mission adequately weighted relative to one another? | 7 | |
| | Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR? | 7 | |
| | Work plan - Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project? | 8 | |

XI. Work Plan and Timetable

The duration of the contract will be 30 working days for the international consultant and 21 days for the national consultant, including the preparation of the work-plan, collection of data, interviews, analysis, report drafting, feedback, editing and report finalisation.

XII. Application Evaluation Process

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the cumulative analysis methodology (weighted scoring method), where the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical Criteria weight: [70%].

Financial Criteria weight: [30%]

Only Individual Consultants obtaining a minimum of 70 points on the Technical evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Financial Criteria

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

$p = y (\mu/z)$, where

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

UNDP is applying fair and transparent selection process that would consider both the technical qualification of Individual Consultants as well as their price proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores.

UNDP retains the right to contact references directly.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

Due to large number of applications we receive, we will be able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

XII. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Presentation of Offer

- Duly accomplished letter of confirmation of interest and availability
- Personal CV or P11, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs. If an offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

XIII. Schedule of payments:

The following payment schedule is foreseen:

| Key Deliverables | Payment schedule/amounts |
|---|--|
| 1. Inception Report Includes detailed Evaluation Work Plan, Evaluation Matrix & Tools, List of Interviewees. | 20% of total value of contract (upon approval of inception report) |
| 2. Draft Evaluation Report | 40% of total value of contract (upon approval of draft report) |
| 3. Final Evaluation Report | 40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |

XIV. Signature and approval of the ToRs:

This ToRs is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name and Designation: Lúcia Simão (Head of CPR/E&P Unit a.i)

Date: _____

04/04/17

Annex 1: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. 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.
5. 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 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.
6. 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.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁵

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: _____

⁵ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 2. Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards

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

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

Title and opening pages - Should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents - Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary - A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction - Should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention - Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.

- Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives - The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- **Evaluation scope**—The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- **Evaluation objectives**—The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- **Evaluation criteria**—The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- **Evaluation questions**—Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods - The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- **Data sources**—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- **Sample and sampling frame**—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample; if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- **Data collection procedures and instruments**—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- **Performance standards**—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).

- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis - The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions - The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Recommendations - The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned - As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes - Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited

- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators