

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Description of the assignment: Final Evaluation National Consultant

Project title: UNDP Re-granting Partnership Phase II: Towards Sustainable Management of Belize's Seascape

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): One and Half Month (30 Working Days)

BACKGROUND

Belize is a natural resource-based economy. Fisheries in 2015 contributed 17% to the Belizean economy. Belize's fisheries sector supports the livelihoods of an estimated 3,000 artisanal or small-scale fishers. The country's coast and seascape feature also support a vibrant tourism sector which is the largest contributor to national GDP and the largest creator of jobs in Belize. Belize's coastal and marine resources, however, are under significant threats of overexploitation and unsustainable use, degradation due to the stresses of development and pollution. These fragile resources now also face emerging threats of climate change. The proposed initiative supports a community approach to conservation and seascape management.

The goal of the OAK Regranting Partnership initiative was designed to utilize the small granting modality for fund disbursement. The project seeks to **support the participation of local communities in conservation and shared governance of the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site**. The initiative stipulated the use of OAK foundation funds for the co-financing of community small grants in support of the conservation and sustainable use of the resources. The Small granting window supports projects that adopt community landscape and seascape approach to conservation.

Priority actions in regranting processes included the:

- Consolidation and empowerment of a local CSO network contributing to sustainable growth and development;
- Enhanced sustainability of marine and coastal ecosystems which support national development, local livelihoods and provision of environmental services;
- Entrepreneurial and innovative actions expanding opportunities for sustainable livelihoods of vulnerable and marginalized coastal communities.

The evaluation will be conducted in Belize covering the sites where the projects have been implemented. Depending on the restrictive measures related to COVID-19, the evaluation is subject to virtual mode including possible travels to selected communities. All work of the Individual consultant shall be done within the guidelines and protocols set by the local and national government. Coordination/meetings shall be done through phone or online communication until such time that the restrictions are lifted.

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project title	UNDP Re-granting Partnership Phase II: Towards Sustainable Management of Belize`s Seascape	
Atlas ID	SLV10: 0094261 – BLZ10: 00124336	
Corporate outcome and output	<p>CPD Outcome No. 2. Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources.</p> <p>Indicative Output(s) with gender marker²:</p> <p>Output 2.1 Local livelihood opportunities expanded through the sustainable use of common natural resources.</p>	
Country	Belize	
Region	RBLAC	
Date project document signed	June 29 th 2017	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	March 2016	December 2020
Project budget	USD 500,000	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	USD 398,009.78	
Funding source	OAK Foundation (12081)	
Implementing party¹	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	

¹ [It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project \(award\), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.](#)

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The UNDP/ OAK Regranting Programme is approaching the end of its implementation cycle and as consistent with UNDP project management policies and procedures, the project must undergo an assessment of its performance in relation to previously prescribed objectives and intended results. The planned evaluation is to be seen as the terminal evaluation for the current 2nd Phase of UNDP/OAK regranting partnership, and serves the purpose of capturing lessons learnt, assessing the impact of interventions of beneficiaries and the natural resource base demonstrating accountability for results (assessing sustainability and replicability features) and is meant to inform future best programming approach and strategy.

EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The project was designed to engage local communities in conservation and shared governance of the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site. The OAK foundation funds co-financed community level projects supported under the GEF SGP OP6 priorities with an aim of conservation and sustainable use of the resources by implementing a community landscape and seascape approach to conservation. The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines².

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. In order to attain this objective, the evaluation will cover the 2 project outputs as identified in the Project Document.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with beneficiary institutions, in addition to the core personnel involved in the project implementation activities.

Therefore, the evaluation should be able to:

- Provide guidance on the current status of the programme intervention in order to inform future decisions regarding the strategic direction of possible future programme and a possible future programme;
- Assess the extent to which the programme has addressed the issues of gender inclusion, women's equality and empowerment, and the extent to which gender perspectives have been mainstreamed into the design and implementation of the project;
- Identify any activities which should be expanded; and any "quick win" initiatives that UNDP should engage in; determine whether there are certain activities that UNDP should not be engaged in or pursue;

² http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

- Identify risk factors which may hinder progress and propose risk mitigation/management strategies to ensure success and effective implementation.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS

Questions should be grouped according to the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; (d) sustainability; and (e) impact (and/or other criteria used).

The evaluation will be guided by the following questions: The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit final questions as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

Relevance:

1. How does the project relate to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
2. What is the effectiveness and efficiency of the of the OAK regranting scheme in delivering localized sustainable development benefits?
3. What overall lessons have been learned?

Effectiveness:

1. To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?
2. What observed changes can be attributed to UNDP's activities and outputs?

Efficiency:

1. Have resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the project been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?
2. Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?
3. How did partnerships influence the efficiency of the project in delivering against its portfolio?
4. To what degree has UNDP incorporated and fostered South-South cooperation, knowledge management in the implementation of this project? How beneficial have they been?

Sustainability:

- 1) To what extent will the benefits of UNDP's work in this area continue?
- 2) Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?

- 3) Is there a resource mobilization strategy in place for the programme to ensure the continuation of benefits? Are national partners contributing financial and other resources towards the continuity of the results? Are there public/private partnership in place?
- 4) Is there an exit strategy for the project and how feasibly is it?

Impact:

- 1) Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?
- 2) What has been the impact of UNDP's engagement? What are the direct or indirect, intended or unintended changes that can be attributed to UNDP's assistance?
- 3) To what degree has UNDP advocated for equality and inclusive development, and contributed to empowering and addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups and vulnerable populations?
- 4) What are the key factors contributing to OAK results?
- 5) To what extent have OAK results been up-taken or mainstreamed by communities or beneficiary groups? What are the factors favoring or hindering this?

Evaluation cross-cutting questions

Human rights

1. To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

1. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
2. Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
3. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives and community members.

The evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determine causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported and observed progress in the achievement of expected results at national and local levels. The

evaluator(s) will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to the expected changes.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The evaluation should also adopt other approaches and methods likely to yield most reliable and valid feedback to the evaluation questions and scope. In consultation with the program units, evaluation managers and key stakeholders, the evaluator(s) should develop the most appropriate, objective and feasible methods to address objectives and purpose of the evaluation. It is expected that the evaluation will take into consideration both the qualitative and quantitative approaches, and will therefore encompass a number of methods including:

- Desk review of relevant documents such as the studies relating to the country context and situation, project documents, progress reports, and other evaluation reports.
- Discussions with senior management and programme staff.
- Interviews and focus group discussions with partners and stakeholders.
- Field visits to selected areas (if possible, taking into consideration the guidelines and protocols set by the local and national government)
- Questionnaires and participatory techniques for gathering and analysis of data.
- Consultation and debriefing meetings.

DELIVERABLES

The consultant will be expected to generate the following deliverables:

1. Evaluation Inception Report: (10-15 pages) The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluations interviews, survey distribution or field visits). Prior to embarking on the data collection exercise, the consultant will be required to prepare an inception report which details the understanding of what is being evaluated and why, and how he/she proposes to answer the evaluation questions. The inception report will provide a more detailed methodological approach, identification of data availability, sources and collection method as well as the evaluation plan that includes the schedule of activities to be performed and the respective results.

2. Draft Evaluation Report: The consultant will be required to submit a draft evaluation report for review to UNDP to ensure that it meets the required quality criteria. A report template structure of the evaluation report to meet the minimum standard requirements is attached as **Annex A**

3. Final Evaluation Report: The final evaluation report will include all comments/inputs provided to the draft report to ensure that all concerns that may had been raised are addressed.

In order to accomplish these deliverables, the consultant is expected to perform the following activities:

- Review documents and consult with UNDP team to better understand the project, including its design process, implementation aspects and expected results;
- Review the project results and resources framework, progress and financial reports, monitoring reports and contribution agreements signed with partners;
- Prepare and conduct interviews with key stakeholders and project beneficiaries;
- Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the results reported vis a vis evidence data collected in the field in order to assess its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact;
- Conduct a project SWOT (strengths-weaknesses-opportunities-threat) analysis on the basis of findings from the documents review and collected information;
- Asses the project approach to communication and knowledge management and make on how to strengthen these aspects;
- Organize a session to present the final evaluation report for validation by the key stakeholders, including donor, beneficiaries, project stakeholders and civil society organizations.

Deliverables	Estimated Duration to Complete	Review and Approvals Required
Inception Report including overall methodology and tools for data collection and analysis	5 Working Days	Review by CO Evaluation Focal Point and approved by Program Unit
Draft Evaluation Report: The consultant will be required to submit a draft evaluation report for review to UNDP to ensure that it meets the required quality criteria.	15 working days.	Review by CO Evaluation Focal Point and approved by Program Unit
Final Evaluation Report: The final evaluation report will include all comments/inputs provided to the draft report to ensure that all concerns that may had been raised are addressed	10 working Days	Review by CO Evaluation Focal Point and approved by Program Unit

EXPERTISE REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The evaluation will be conducted by a qualified consultant with proven experience of projects and programs evaluations particularly those implemented by UNDP. The consultant must meet the below detailed skills, knowledge and expertise:

Academic Qualification:

- Master's degree in natural resource management, environmental management or other related fields;
- Certification in Evaluation is desirable:

Experience and knowledge

- Proven 5 years' experience in managing or/and evaluating development programs/projects, especially with UNDP;
- Experience in project development, result based management and portfolio evaluation will be considered an asset
- Good understanding and knowledge of the Belizean context with regard to coastal zone management, community management of natural resources
- Technical knowledge and experience in cross-cutting issues such as gender, capacity development; and rights-based approaches to programming is an asset;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of development portfolios and projects
- Strong analytical skills;
- Strong oral, communications and writing skills;
- Excellent writing, research, analysis and presentation skills
- Experience in the use of computers and office software packages as well as web based management systems
- Fluency in English and Spanish

Key Competences

Functional:

- Strong analytical, negotiation and communication skills, including ability to produce high quality practical advisory reports and knowledge products,
- Professional and/or academic experience in one or more of the areas of the Development or knowledge management field.

Project and Resource Management:

- Ability to produce high quality outputs in a timely manner while understanding and anticipating the evolving client needs.
- Ability to focus on impact and results for the client, promoting and demonstrating an ethic of client service.
- Ability to work independently, produce high quality outputs.

Communications and Advocacy:

- Strong ability to write clearly and convincingly, adapting style and content to different audiences and speak clearly and convincingly.
- Strong presentation skills in meetings with the ability to adapt for different audiences.
- Strong analytical, research and writing skills with demonstrated ability to think strategically.
- Strong capacity to communicate clearly and quickly.
- Strong inter-personal, negotiation and liaison skills.

EVALUATION ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

- The consultant will report to the Programme Analyst on a weekly basis as work against deliverables progress. He/she will be accountable to UNDP on the timeliness and quality of the deliverables.
- The consultant will be required to conduct interviews with UNDP staff, counterparts, implementing partners, donor representatives, beneficiaries and other parties relevant to this evaluation, as identified by UNDP. All work of the Individual consultant shall be done within the COVID -19 guidelines and protocols set by the local and national government.
- UNDP will assist in the facilitation of introduction letter
- The consultant is responsible for providing his/her own computer and mobile phones for use during this assignment.

DUTY STATION

This consultancy will be in the Belize with mission travel to some of the locations as deemed appropriate for the purpose of this evaluation if necessary. The consultant may be required to travel to other Districts in Belize for the purpose of this evaluation. This will be determined by the Programme Analyst.

TIMEFRAME

- a) The contract will come into effect on 16 November 2020 and end on 31st December 2020

- b) The consultant will work for a period of 30 working days

PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The lump sum amount must be "all-inclusive". It will include consultancy fees based on a six day working week, and it will include per diem fees, food incidental and other expenses related to the execution of the assignment. The contract price is fixed.

The schedule and percentage payments will follow the timelines of the below-mentioned deliverables:

- Completion of first deliverables, 30% of the installment.
- Completion of second deliverables, 30% of the installment.
- Completion of third deliverables, 40% of the installment.

Notes:

The term "All inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Consultant are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal.

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications in one single PDF document:

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP
- Personal CV or P11, 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;
- **Financial proposal:** Financial proposal: that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

ATTACHMENTS TO TOR.

Annex A - UNDP evaluation report template a

Annex B - Inception report template

Annex C - Code of conduct for evaluation in the united nations system

ANNEX A- UNDP Evaluation Report Template

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 evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be 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:

1. 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.
2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions evaluation reports (non-GEF)³ on second page (as one page):

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title		
Atlas ID		
Corporate outcome and output		
Country		
Region		
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
Project budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source		
Implementing party ⁴		

³ GEF evaluations have their own project information template requirements.

⁴ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/ other		
Period under evaluation	Start	End
Evaluators		
Evaluator email address		
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion

3. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary (four-page maximum).

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

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) 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.
- Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction

- 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 of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—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.

7. 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. It should:

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results model 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.
- Identify relevant cross-cutting issues addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
- 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).

8. 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** 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.

9. 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 report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. 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:

- **Evaluation approach.**
- **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as 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 age 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 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, as well as gender-responsiveness.
- **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 participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women 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).⁴⁹
- **Background information on evaluator:** 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** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. 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 for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses 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.

11. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation 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. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. 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, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

13. Recommendations. The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be

reasonable in number. 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. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. Lessons Learned. As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, 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.

15. 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. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
- List of supporting documents reviewed.
- Project or programme results model or results framework.
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators⁵.

⁵

Access at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ANNEX B- INCEPTION REPORT TEMPLATE

The inception report should include:

Evaluation purpose and scope—A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

Evaluation criteria and questions—The criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale.

Evaluation methodology—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.

Evaluation matrix— The evaluation matrix is a tool to map, reference, planning and conducting the evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated (see Table A).

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-questions	Data Sources	Data collection methods/tools	Indicators / Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

Revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities.

ANNEX C: CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.
2. The UNEG1 Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.
3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.
4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, specifically to the following obligations:
5. Independence
Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
6. Impartiality
Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.
7. Conflict of Interest
Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form.
8. Honesty and Integrity
Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and

highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

9. Competence

Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

10. Accountability

Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

11. Obligations to participants

Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

12. Confidentiality

Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

13. Avoidance of Harm

Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

14. Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

15. Transparency

Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

16. Omissions and wrongdoing

Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

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

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Place and date: _____

Signature: _____