

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE



Date: Nov 28, 2019

<b>Post Title:</b>	Individual Contractor (IC) – Evaluation Consultant
<b>Starting Date</b>	15 December2019
<b>Duration:</b>	21 working days for over period of 1.5 months
<b>Location:</b>	Home-based. Part of the assignment would require travel to Amman and Dubai to be decided in consultation with UNDP.
<b>Project:</b>	Arab Knowledge Project (AKP)
<b>Requisition Number:</b>	R4710-
<b>Is this an LTA (yes/no)?</b>	No

### I. **CONTEXT/BACKGROUND**

UNDP's regional project on Arab Knowledge (AKP) is part of the UNDP Regional Programme for the Arab States. The first phase of the project was launched in 2007 through a partnership with Mohammed Bin Rashid Al Maktoum Knowledge Foundation (MBRF), which was followed by phase II in (2016-2020).

AKP aims to promote knowledge societies and policies as transformational means to achieve sustainable development. The project contributes to driving active conversation and raise awareness on the importance of knowledge and knowledge-based policies for sustainable development. Hence, it encourages using knowledge production as advocacy tools, aiming to widely disseminate and embed in policy debates.

More specifically, AKP strives to achieve two key outputs:

- i) Arab Knowledge Index (AKI) and Knowledge4all digital portal to provide easily accessible data on knowledge accumulation, production and consumption within a development framework;
- ii) Participatory platforms to maximize outreach and dissemination of knowledge products developed, and building educational capacities (ministries, universities, regional research institutions, etc.) to improve the state of knowledge in Arab countries.

Over the course of phase II, AKP focused on designing, launching and enhancing new knowledge products, namely the Global Knowledge Index (GKI), Arab Knowledge Index (AKI) and digital portal [Knowledge4all], to provide easily accessible data on knowledge within a development framework. This includes measuring performance of countries in the Arab region on knowledge acquisition, dissemination and production.

Through its outputs and associated knowledge products and activities, the project has been visibly contributing to the objective of supporting and promoting “knowledge for human development” in the Arab region. The ultimate objective has been to support the region’s efforts towards establishing the aspired knowledge societies and economies. This is in line with the major objectives and expected outcomes of RBAS/Regional Programme Document (2018-2021) particularly in relation to accelerating structural transformation of productive capacities in a sustainable and inclusive manner (RPD outcome 1).

As the project has been extended to 2030, UNDP seeks the recruitment of an international consultant to conduct a mid-term project evaluation.

## **II. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK**

### ***Objectives of the Evaluation***

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent consultant. It will assess the project’s progress (and challenges), taking the linkages to the broader initiative into consideration, at the outcome level, with measurement of the output level achievements and gaps and in particular, what changes were achieved as a result of the project towards fostering knowledge, and ultimately the promotion of knowledge societies and policies as transformational means to achieve sustainable development.

The purpose of the external evaluation is foremost to assess how the project impacted the progress towards the achievement of the objectives. Moreover, the contribution of the project in enabling a coherent development engagement and to identify the factors that have affected its implementation will be assessed.

The evaluation will consist of a desk review-based research, a mission to Amman and Dubai to meet with the project team and key stakeholders, and in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. It will document results achieved, the challenges faced, and how those challenges were addressed.

The evaluation is expected to identify success stories, good practices, challenges, constraints, and lessons learned, as well as to provide recommendations on substantive and process issues to inform the future direction, implementation, and the next steps of the project for the upcoming phase 2020-2030.

The external evaluation will cover the period from January 2016 till August 2019. It will be based on the activities financed by the Mohammed Bin Rashid Al Maktoum Knowledge Foundation (MBRF).

The specific evaluation **objectives** are to:

1. Analyze the relevance of the project strategy and approaches;
2. Validate the project results in terms of achievements and/or weaknesses toward the targeted results;
3. Assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts and commitment to help promote knowledge societies and policies as transformational means to achieve sustainable development;
4. Document key lessons learned, good practices, success stories and challenges to inform future work of various stakeholders in addressing the area of fostering knowledge; and
5. Document and analyze possible weaknesses in order to improve next steps of project interventions in the mentioned area.

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

In assessing the project, the evaluation will take into consideration the following criteria:

### ***Relevance and appropriateness***

1. Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to *fostering knowledge for sustainable development* goals and challenges?
2. Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the mandate, strategy, functions, roles, and responsibility of the key actors?
3. Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the *UNDP development goals*?

### ***Effectiveness and efficiency***

4. Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
5. Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently?
6. How did the project deal with issues and risks?
7. Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner?
8. Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?
9. Were the resources (time, funding, human resources) sufficient?

### ***Impact and sustainability***

10. Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?
11. Were the actions and result owned by the partners and stakeholders?
12. Was the capacity (individuals, institution, and system) built through the actions of the project?
13. What is the level of contribution of the project management arrangements to national ownership of the set objectives, result and outputs?
14. Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote regional / national ownership and sustainability of the result achieved?
15. Did the project address cross-cutting issues including gender?

### ***Project design***

16. To what extent did the design of the project help in achieving its own goals?
17. Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the project?
18. Were there clear objectives and strategy?
19. Were there clear baseline indicators and/or benchmark for performance?
20. Was the process of project design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?
21. Was there coherence and complementarity by the project to other entities in the field of fostering knowledge?
22. Was there coherence, coordination and complementarity by the project with other donor funded activities in the field of fostering knowledge?

### ***Project management***

23. Are the project management arrangements appropriate at the team level and project board level?
24. Was there appropriate visibility and acknowledgement of the project and donor?
25. The Final Evaluation should be aligned with the principles established in UNDP's [Evaluation Policy](#) and the UN Evaluation Group's [Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#).

## **METHODOLOGY**

Based on the UNDP guidelines for evaluations, the evaluation will be inclusive and participatory, involving principal stakeholders into the analysis. During the evaluation, the consultant is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis.

- **Desk review** of relevant documents, including progress reports and any records of the various opinion surveys conducted during the life of the project.
- **One field visit** (including to Amman and Dubai) to meet with the project team and stakeholders in the field (3 working days) to conduct key informative interviews.
- An **analytical report**, which should contain an executive summary (mandatory), be analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative), be structured around issues and related findings/lessons learned; and include conclusions and recommendations.

During the process, the consultant will report to the Director of the Regional Hub, who will provide overall guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of the deliverables. There will be close coordination with the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and project team who will assist in connecting the consultant with senior management, development partners, beneficiaries and key stakeholders. In addition, the CTA will provide key project documentation prior to fieldwork, and project staff will assist in developing a detailed programme to facilitate consultations as necessary.

### III. **EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES**

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs:

- Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report;
- A draft preliminary evaluation report, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with UNDP;
- Final report including a 2-3 pages' executive summary.

Please refer to "Annex 1: Proposed Evaluation Workplan" for a detailed view of the Deliverables/Outputs with the corresponding Activity, Estimated Duration, Due Dates, Review and Approvals Required.

S/he will work with the AKP Chief Technical Advisor based in Dubai under the supervision of the Regional Hub Director based in Amman, based on the workplan enclosed as Annex 1.

### IV. **INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

- The individual is required to exhibit his or her full-time commitment with UNDP-RBAS;
- S/He shall perform tasks under the general guidance and the direct supervision of the Arab Knowledge Portal (AKP) project manager. The supervision of the (AKP) project manager will include approvals/acceptance of the outputs as identified in the previous section;
- The individual is expected to liaise and collaborate in the course of performing the work with other consultants, suppliers and UN colleagues;
- The individual is required to provide periodical progress reports on regular and needed basis throughout the assignment in order to monitor progress;
- The individual is required to maintain close communication with UNDP-RBAS on regular and needed basis at any period throughout the assignment in order to monitor progress. In the event of any delay, S/he will inform UNDP promptly so that decisions and remedial action may be taken accordingly;
- Should UNDP deem it necessary, it reserves the right to commission additional inputs, reviews

or revisions, as needed to ensure the quality and relevance of the work.

**V. DURATION OF THE WORK**

The duration of the assignment is expected to be one month and a half from the start of the contract. Actual number of days to be spent on the assignment is up to 21 working days: Desk review and inception (5 days); field work and preliminary report (11 days); final report (5 days). The work is expected to be completed by 31 January 2020.

**DUTY STATION**

This is a home-based assignment with possible travel to Amman and Dubai.

**VI. TRAVEL PLAN**

The Consultant will conduct one field visit (including to Amman and Dubai) to meet with the project team and stakeholders in the field (3 working days) to conduct key informative interviews (Please refer to Annex 1, Deliverable 2: “Draft evaluation report” for the timeframe of the field visits).

**VII. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR**

I. Academic Qualifications:

- At least a master’s degree in social sciences, management or related discipline;

II. Years of experience:

- A minimum of 7 years of experience in implementation / evaluation of projects/programmes on democratic governance / fostering knowledge; preferably some experience of these in the Arab countries;
- Experience in cooperation with multilateral agencies
- Strong background experience including familiarity with UN systems, requirements, procedures, and rules & regulations;
- Solid understanding of international knowledge standards and experiences in programming on related issues;
- Proven work experience in use of participatory evaluation methods for identifying measurable target indicators and in particular for identifying outcome / impact – positive change of behavior, policy or law made;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues.
- *Excellent analytical and report writing skills*

IV. Language Requirements:

- Language proficiency in both English and Arabic, written and oral is required.

III. Competencies:

- *Functional*  
Good teamwork and interpersonal skills;

- Flexibility and ability to handle multiple tasks and work under pressure;
- *Knowledge Management and Learning*
  - Ability to strongly promote and build knowledge products;
  - Seeks and applies knowledge, information and best practices from within and outside of UNDP;
  - Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
- *Judgment/Decision-Making*
  - Mature judgment and initiative;

## VIII. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Interested candidates should provide lump sum fees for requested services with detailed breakdown. This amount must be “all-inclusive”. Please note that the terms “all-inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal. Also, please note that the contract price will be Deliverables/Outputs based - not fixed - subject to change in the cost components.

The contractor will be paid an all-inclusive Deliverables/Outputs based lump sum amounts over the assignment period, subject to the submission of Certification of Payment (CoP) duly certified and confirmation of satisfactory performance of achieved work (deliverables/outputs) in line with the schedule of payments table hereunder.

Milestone	Estimated due date	Expected number of working days for each deliverable	Payment
<b><u>Output:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Evaluation inception report (including evaluation workplan and timeframe, and using the Sample evaluation matrix-Table A below)</li> <li>• 2. Draft evaluation report Draft evaluation findings. Documented records of interviews and observations with stakeholders. Presentation of findings to key stakeholders Draft report delivered to UNDP for consideration and comments</li> <li>• 3. Final evaluation report A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables/graphs where appropriate will be submitted after the completion of the mission, incorporating</li> </ul>	6 days from contract signature date  32 days from submitting the Evaluation inception report  7 days from submitting the Draft evaluation report	6 days  10 days  5 days	100% of the contract value upon satisfactory completion of all Deliverables

comments made on the draft			
----------------------------	--	--	--

## RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF OFFER

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Candidates that fail to submit the required information will not be considered.

- a) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, including references to how she/he will approach and complete the assignment.
- d) **Submit technical proposal and methodology for this assignment**

Interested candidates shall submit above documents to the Job Advertisement Website: [https://jobs.undp.org/cj\\_view\\_jobs.cfm](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm) as one document not later than 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2019

Interested candidates can find Procurement notice, letter of confirmation of interest and availability and P11 <http://procurement-notices.undp.org/>

**Please do not submit financial proposal in this stage. Financial proposal shall be requested from Candidates who are considered technically responsive**

## EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

### **Step I: Screening and desk review:**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology.

Applications will be first screened and only candidates meeting the following minimum requirements will progress to the pool for shortlisting:

- **Criteria A:** At least a master's degree in social sciences, management or related discipline
- **Criteria B:** A minimum of 7 years of experience in implementation / evaluation of projects/programmes on democratic governance / fostering knowledge; preferably some experience of these in the Arab countries;
- **Criteria C:** Language proficiency in both English and Arabic written and oral is required.

Shortlisted Candidates will be then assessed and scored against the following evaluation criteria:

### **Technical evaluation Criteria** max 100 points (Weighted 70):

- **Criteria A** At least a master's degree in the social sciences, management or other relevant field of study (20 points);
- **Criteria B:** A minimum of 7 years of experience in implementation / evaluation of projects/programmes on democratic governance, in particular knowledge; preferably some

- experience of these in the Arab countries (25 points);
- **Criteria C:** Experience in cooperation with multilateral agencies would be a Strong background experience including familiarity with UN systems, requirements, procedures, and rules & regulations (10 points);
- **Criteria D:** *Excellent analytical and report writing skills; Knowledge of English and Arabic* (5 points);
- **Criteria E:** Quality of the proposed methodology and technical offer (40 points).

#### **Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation**

For those offers considered in the financial evaluation, the lowest price offer will receive 30 points. The other offers will receive points in relation to the lowest offer, based on the following formula:  $(PI / P_n) * 30$  where  $P_n$  is the financial offer being evaluated and  $PI$  is the lowest financial offer received.

#### **Step II: Final evaluation**

The final evaluation will combine the scores of the desk review and the financial proposal with the following weights assigned to each:

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 49 points (70%) on the Technical evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

#### **Annexes**

- Annex 1- Proposed Evaluation Workplan
- Annex 2- Structure of Evaluation Report
- Annex 3- Code of conduct

## Annex 1: Proposed Evaluation Workplan

Deliverables/Outputs	Activity	Estimated Duration	Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
<b>1. Evaluation inception report</b> (including evaluation workplan and timeframe, and using the Sample evaluation matrix- <i>Table A</i> below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of project document and progress reports</li> <li>Other relevant literature review</li> <li>Agreement on activities &amp; timeframes</li> <li>Preparation of schedule of interviews</li> <li>Development of assessment methodology</li> </ul>	6 days	6 days from contract signature date	Regional Hub Director
<b>2. Draft evaluation report</b> Draft evaluation findings. Documented records of interviews and observations with stakeholders. Presentation of findings to key stakeholders Draft report delivered to UNDP for consideration and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with selected stakeholders</li> <li>Field visit to Amman and Dubai</li> <li>Incorporate feedback into findings</li> <li>Draft the report</li> </ul> NB: See annex 2 for the report structure	10 days	32 days from submitting the <b>Evaluation inception report</b>	Regional Hub Director
<b>3. Final evaluation report</b> A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables/graphs where appropriate will be submitted after the completion of the mission, incorporating comments made on the draft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address comments provided by UNDP</li> <li>Submission of Final Report</li> </ul>	5 days	7 days from submitting the <b>Draft evaluation report</b>	Regional Hub Director
<b>Time allocated to the assignment</b>	21 working days			

**Table A. Sample evaluation matrix**

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

## Annex 2: Structure of Evaluation Report

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**, what kind of change was required and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.

- Explain the **expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi- year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals**.
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Briefly summarize 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.
- Briefly summarize the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

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

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

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

- Data sources—the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.

- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- 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).<sup>70</sup>
- 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 analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

**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 particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

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

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluator