



## CALL FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

### Thematic Evaluations UNDP Evaluation Office

In seeking support in the conduct of thematic evaluations in 2009-2010, the UNDP Evaluation Office (EO) solicits *expressions of interest* from highly qualified:

- Individual consultants  
*and/or*
- Consulting companies

Some thematic evaluations will be conducted with the support of teams of individual consultants that will be constituted by EO. Other thematic evaluations will be conducted with the support of consulting companies that will be expected to provide a comprehensive package of services. Depending on the nature of the evaluation and the quality of expressions of interest received, EO will determine the most appropriate approach for each evaluation.

The following *assessment criteria* will be applied in reviewing expressions of interest:

- Experience and expertise in conducting thematic evaluations and applying appropriate methodological approaches
- Experience in leading an evaluation team or participating as a team member in evaluations
- Experience and expertise in evaluating one or more substantive issues addressed by EO's planned thematic evaluations
- Knowledge of UNDP and the UN System

Shortlisted individual consultants will be invited to participate in interviews.

Shortlisted consulting companies will be invited to submit full technical and commercial proposals.

\*\*\*

The *deadline* for the submission of expressions of interest is 18 January 2009.

Expressions of interest should be submitted to, and any questions may be addressed to, Michelle Sy at [michelle.sy@undp.org](mailto:michelle.sy@undp.org). Tel: +1 212 906 5637. Fax: +1 212 906 6008

#### 1. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON UNDP THEMATIC EVALUATIONS**

In line with UNDP's Evaluation Policy (see <http://www.undp.org/eo/policy.htm>) and the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (see <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>), the Evaluation Office (EO) conducts independent evaluations that are submitted to the Executive Board. Evaluations are issued in the name of EO, which is responsible for assuring their quality and independence. Based on the EO's work programme, which is developed in consultation with key stakeholders and mandated by the Executive Board, EO conducts evaluations covering broad thematic areas of a substantive or management-related nature.

The overall objective of thematic evaluations is to provide feedback to the UNDP Executive Board and management regarding the performance of UNDP's efforts. They are also a forward-looking exercise and assess opportunities for strengthening further UNDP's contribution to the achievement of development results. Thematic evaluations thus support both accountability and learning. Examples of UNDP thematic evaluations can be found at <http://www.undp.org/eo>.

## **2. THEMATIC EVALUATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE UNDP EVALUATION OFFICE IN 2009-2010**

Based on the EO's work programme, as approved by the UNDP Executive Board in September 2008, EO will conduct the following thematic evaluations in 2009-2010:

- UNDP's Contribution to Strengthening *National Capacities* in Managing for Development Results including the MDGs (to be conducted between January-May 2009);
- Joint Evaluation of *Partnership Agreements* with United Nation Agencies, Funds and Programmes (to be conducted between January-June 2009);
- UNDP's Support to *Recovery Efforts* of Countries Affected by Natural Disasters (to be conducted between January-September 2009);
- UNDP's Contribution to *Decentralization and Local Governance* (to be conducted between January-September 2009);
- UNDP's Contribution to *Environmental Management for Poverty Reduction* (to be conducted between January-September 2009);
- Evaluation of UNDP's Effectiveness in Facilitating the Use of *Global Funds* to Achieve Development Results (to be conducted between June 2009-February 2010);
- Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of UNDP Support to Strengthening *Electoral Systems and Processes* (to be conducted between June 2009-February 2010);
- Evaluation of *UNDP's Regionalization Process* (to be conducted between July 2009-May 2010).

A more detailed description of the thematic evaluations is contained in Annex I.

## **3. KEY EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The primary deliverable of the evaluation is an evaluation report of not more than 70 pages in length (excluding annexes). At the outset of the evaluation, its scope, approach and methodology are defined in an inception report that reflects consultations with key stakeholders as well as lessons learned from a pilot case study. Findings obtained from case studies, at Headquarters and in country offices, as well as through surveys and questionnaires are compiled in distinct reports, which are annexed to the main evaluation report. Throughout the evaluation, there are opportunities for briefings and consultations with key stakeholders, including the Executive Board.

A more detailed overview of the thematic evaluation process and outputs is contained in Annex II.

## **4. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION**

An EO Task Manager is assigned to each evaluation. He/she is responsible for coordinating the evaluation on behalf of EO, is closely involved in all methodological and substantive discussions, has the overall responsibility for management and logistical arrangements, and ensures that the quality assurance and stakeholder consultation process is fully adhered to.

Evaluations are conducted with the support of evaluation teams which typically include a **Team Leader** and one or several core **Team Members**. In addition, depending on the nature of the evaluation, regionally or country-based Team Members may conduct specific evaluation tasks at the regional or country level. In constituting evaluation teams, EO strives to ensure gender balance, as well as a balanced representation of evaluators from the North and the South. All team members must abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

Team Leaders and Team Members should:

- Have an advanced degree in public administration, economics, social sciences or a related field
- Be familiar with UNDP and the UN System
- Have proven knowledge and experience in the thematic area under evaluation
- Be fluent in, and have excellent writing skills in, English; knowledge of other UN languages is highly desirable.

Specific aspects of the Team Leader and Team Member positions can be described as follows:

#### Team Leader

The Team Leader, in close collaboration with the evaluation team, plays a lead role in conceptualizing and designing the evaluation and has a central responsibility in shaping the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report. Typically, the Team Leader is a high level international development expert with:

- At least 15-20 years of relevant experience in international development
- Proven experience in leading evaluation teams
- At least 10 years experience in development evaluation in multilateral settings.

#### Team Member

Team Members are expected to contribute both substance and evaluation-related expertise. Under the overall guidance of the Team Leader, Team Members will contribute to designing the evaluation approach and methodology, participate in the inception and pilot case study missions, collect data and draft components of the evaluation report. Typically, the Team Member is an international development expert with:

- At least 10 years of relevant experience in international development
- At least 5 years experience in development evaluation in multilateral settings.

### **5. GUIDANCE ON EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST**

Interested applicants are requested to provide to EO the following:

#### Individual Consultants

- CV (no page limitation)
- Daily rate
- Availability
- Specify for which evaluation(s) you wish to be considered
- Specify for which evaluation team function you wish to be considered (i.e. Team Leader and/or Team Member).

#### Consulting Companies

- Company profile or background information
- Specify which evaluation(s) your consulting company wishes to be considered for
- For each evaluation, a capability statement of no more than 4 pages (US letter) which illustrates the consulting company's skills and experience in evaluation as well as expertise in the topic(s) to be evaluated
- For each evaluation, a set of abridged CVs (less than 2 pages) of evaluation consultants who would be expected to undertake the evaluation
- Availability.



## CALL FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

**Thematic Evaluations  
UNDP Evaluation Office**

### ANNEX I

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON EVALUATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE EVALUATION OFFICE IN 2009-2010**

#### **1. Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to environmental management for poverty reduction**

The strategic plan underlines the need for UNDP support “...to strengthen national capacity to manage the environment in a sustainable manner while ensuring adequate protection of the poor”, including “...expanded access for the poor to fundamental environmental and energy services”. The first and second MYFFs also emphasized the UNDP aim of promoting environmental sustainability in areas critical for poverty reduction, including water governance, energy services, sustainable land management and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The evaluation will build on findings of the evaluation of the role and contribution of UNDP in the environment and energy (DP/2008/46) recently completed by the Evaluation Office. Among other findings, this broad study of UNDP activities in the environment and energy reported that “mainstreaming of environment” into other UNDP practice areas, including into poverty reduction programmes, has met with only very limited success to date. In light of the primacy of poverty reduction among UNDP strategic goals, it will be valuable to examine in much greater detail the experience of the organization in trying to link its environmental management and poverty reduction efforts.

While focusing on the period since 2004, the evaluation will clearly situate the issues in a longer-term perspective. It will encompass, inter alia, a detailed analysis of UNDP policies, strategies and programmes for integrating the principles of sound environmental management into its poverty reduction programmes and for integrating the principles of effective poverty reduction into its environment and energy programmes, at the global, regional, national and local levels. The evaluation will also assess the extent to which UNDP has contributed to this sort of integration among its partners at the national and local levels. The evaluation will seek close collaboration with the Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), including joint evaluation of the experience of the Poverty and Environment Initiative.

The evaluation will enhance the strategic positioning and performance of UNDP with respect to the poverty-environment nexus, in particular with regard to its role within the United Nations system. It will also strengthen UNDP and broaden international understanding of the most effective ways of addressing the poverty-environment nexus and overcoming practical barriers to better integration of

sound environmental management and poverty reduction. The findings will be timely, as UNDP and the global community accelerate their efforts to enhance capacities among the world's poorest and most vulnerable for adapting to the environmental degradation associated with climate change.

## **2. Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to strengthening national capacities in managing for development results, including the Millennium Development Goals**

The strategic plan, 2008-2011 highlights the urgent need for additional efforts by the international community to make the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals a reality for all developing countries by 2015. Working with developing countries to achieve human development and poverty reduction is the prime goal of UNDP efforts, as outlined in the strategic plan, 2008-2011. Achieving this goal will depend to a large degree on national ownership and the acquisition of capacities by institutions, organizations and individuals to perform critical functions for policy, planning, management, and aid coordination, in an efficient, effective and sustainable manner. Enhancing national capacities has been central to the UNDP approach to supporting development results. A key objective of UNDP under the strategic plan is to continue and expand on efforts started under the first and second MYFFs, covering the periods 2000-2003 and 2004-2007, to enhance national and local capacities to plan, monitor, report and evaluate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and related national development priorities, including within resource frameworks.

The evaluation will determine the appropriateness, effectiveness and sustainability of UNDP efforts in strengthening national capacities for policy, planning, management, monitoring and evaluation, and aid coordination. It will identify factors of success, including intervention design, national contextual factors, partnership, and global factors, as well as United Nations and UNDP institutional factors. The focus of the evaluation will be on UNDP support between 2000 and 2007. The evaluation will build on two previous evaluations – the evaluation of the role of UNDP in the poverty reduction strategy process (DP/2003/24); and the assessment of the Millennium Development Goals reports (2004), both of which provide general baseline information dating back to 2000 on the nature and quality of UNDP support in the areas of focus of this evaluation. The Evaluation Office will explore the possibility of partnership with existing analytical institutions in the South to carry out the evaluation.

This evaluation will combine the previously proposed evaluations of UNDP initiatives and approaches in strengthening national capacity and the UNDP contribution to strengthening national capacity to manage for development results”.

## **3. Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to decentralization and local governance**

Decentralization and local governance have been integral themes of the first and second MYFFs, covering the periods 2000-2003 and 2004-2007, respectively. The new strategic plan, 2008-2011, advances the work of UNDP in decentralization and local governance. UNDP support in this area encompasses the review and reform of legislation and policies; capacity development (especially for local government planning and fiscal management); and inclusive systems of consultation with local communities, also involving women and ethnic minorities. The issue of local governance is given significant importance under all four goals of the strategic plan. The proposed evaluation will review the work of UNDP since 2000 in supporting programme countries in these areas.

At the request of programme countries, a number of UNDP country offices are engaged in supporting decentralization and local governance. It is expected that extensive evaluative evidence will be

available for assessing the achievement of their contribution to development results. The contribution of other UNDP units, including the Bureau for Development Policy, the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery and regional bureaux in providing support or managing initiatives in these areas will also be reviewed. The evaluation will build on the joint UNDP-German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development evaluation of the UNDP role in decentralization and local governance conducted in 2000. The evaluation will be carried out in close cooperation with UNDP partners involved in supporting programme countries on decentralization and local governance-related issues, particularly the United Nations Capital Development Fund and the United Nations Volunteers programme.

#### **4. Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to recovery efforts in countries affected by natural disasters**

The evaluation will focus on UNDP contributions to recovery efforts following natural disasters. Roughly 3,000 natural disasters have struck Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and Oceania since the turn of the century. The increasing frequency and scale of these events pose mounting economic and humanitarian challenges, particularly in countries with medium to low levels of human development, where disasters compound existing problems of poverty and inequality.

The strategic plan emphasizes the need for UNDP to contribute to global assistance for preventing and mitigating the effects of natural disasters. It calls for support to develop the government capacities needed to manage recovery and ensure renewed progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals while reducing vulnerability to future disasters. This evaluation will also provide results of value to UNDP in its emerging work of supporting partner countries in their adaptation to climate change, which consists in part of reducing their vulnerability to natural disasters.

Like the strategic plan, the first and second MYFFs also included UNDP support for recovery from natural disasters and reduction of vulnerability to future events. Focusing on the period since 2004, this evaluation will follow up and build on the results of the recent joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami. The evaluation will include detailed analysis of UNDP policies, strategies and programmes for helping countries to resume public service delivery as early as possible; to restore security and revive local economies following disasters; and to reduce the risk of future disasters. The evaluation approach will comprise broad background research, project and programme data collection and analysis, and a series of country-level case studies.

#### **5. Evaluation of UNDP effectiveness in facilitating the use of global funds to achieve development results**

UNDP has played a range of roles to assist programme countries in accessing global and vertical funding sources such as the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the Gates Foundation and the Turner Foundation. The evaluation will assess the performance and contribution of UNDP through its engagement with such funding modalities.

#### **6. Evaluation of the role and contribution of UNDP support to strengthening electoral systems and processes**

Strengthening electoral systems and processes is a major area of UNDP work, accounting for a consistently high proportion of resources within the democratic governance practice area. UNDP has supported the conduct of elections as well as strengthening electoral laws, processes and institutions. The evaluation will assess the results of UNDP support in this area.

**7. Evaluation of the UNDP regionalization process**

In line with the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review, UNDP has strengthened its regional presence. Among other strategies, regional service centres were established to combine policy, programme and administrative support to country offices with the management of regional programmes and global knowledge management. They also provide support to the regional directors' teams of the United Nations agencies, funds and programmes. The evaluation will assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of this approach to regionalization.

**8. Joint evaluation of partnership agreements with United Nations agencies, funds and programmes**

UNDP has signed memoranda of understanding and/or joint action plans with other United Nations partners, such as UNEP and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), that stipulate evaluations after a period of time. The evaluations will assess the partnership and its contribution to development results. As in the case of the earlier assessment conducted of the UNDP-UNIDO partnership agreement, evaluations will be conducted jointly with the evaluation office of the partner organization. UNDP has also played a major role in managing large, multi-donor trust funds in countries affected by conflict. As requested by partnership protocol, the Evaluation Office, together with the evaluation offices of other organizations, will assess the performance of those funds.



## CALL FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

### Thematic Evaluations UNDP Evaluation Office

## ANNEX II

### AN OVERVIEW OF THEMATIC EVALUATION PROCESS AND OUTPUTS

#### I. Introduction

The EO is an independent unit within UNDP accountable to the Executive Board directly. The evaluation policy approved by the Executive Board in its decision 2006/20 spells out the responsibility of EO directly to “[c]onduct evaluations and develop an agenda for independent evaluations, based on consultations with the Board, senior management, the associated funds and programmes and other stakeholders..”

The programme of work of EO is approved by the Executive Board and is aligned with the Strategic Plan. All UNDP evaluations support both **accountability and learning**. UNDP’s evaluation policy provides the broad framework within which all UNDP evaluations are conducted.

The **overall objective of thematic evaluations** is to provide the necessary feedback to UNDP to manage for development results. The results identified in the development and institutional results frameworks of the Strategic Plan and the multi-year funding frameworks (MYFF), when relevant, will provide the basis for assessing performance, accountability, and contributions to development results.

Thematic evaluations address the **organizational effectiveness** of UNDP and its **contribution to development results**. The range of issues addressed by thematic evaluations include, focus areas (poverty reduction, crisis prevention etc), cross-cutting themes (gender mainstreaming, capacity strengthening, etc), policies, strategies, approaches, cooperation modalities, partnerships, business models and organizational innovations.

These evaluations often deal with thematic areas which do not always have a well-defined programmatic framework of inputs and results chain. This is a challenge and has implications for the design and conduct of thematic evaluations.

Thematic evaluations are also a **forward looking** exercise and assess if UNDP is on the right course to where it aims to be; whether the past results represent a sufficient foundation for future progress; or if in certain areas corrective measures should be taken. In addition, it is important to note that thematic evaluations are not an assessment of a country’s development or of government actions, nor a compilation of the evaluations of the UNDP projects and programmes in different countries under review.

## II. Scope of Thematic Evaluations

Thematic evaluations have broad geographic coverage of UNDP's regions, as well as broad institutional coverage across UNDP's country, regional or headquarters-based programme units, as appropriate. The scope of thematic evaluations include UNDP's:

- Contribution to national development results during UNDP's past two programme cycles;
- Responsiveness and alignment to country, regional and global challenges and emerging priorities;
- Strategic positioning including identification of missed opportunities;
- Use of comparative advantage;
- Engagement with partners;
- Operational efficiency.

These evaluations attempt to capture intended and unintended results of UNDP's development interventions (both positive and negative).

## III. Criteria Used in Conducting Thematic Evaluations

Evaluation criteria applied in thematic evaluations, and the evaluation questions based on such criteria, seek to capture the following guiding principles:

- Inclusive participation
- National ownership
- Capacity development
- Gender equality
- Effective aid management
- South-South cooperation
- Managing for results

The primary evaluation criteria applied include relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

- (a) Thematic evaluations place a strong emphasis on assessing the *relevance* of UNDP in addressing programme country priorities in the area under consideration, and the *appropriateness* of UNDP's initiatives in the country context, as well as in terms of its comparative advantage.
- (b) In analyzing UNDP's *effectiveness* in addressing a particular theme, thematic evaluations focus on UNDP's contribution to the achievement of outcomes (i.e. changes in specific development conditions) in the thematic area under review. The emphasis is on improving the understanding of outcomes, their status and the factors that influence or contribute to achievement of these outcomes.
- (c) In analyzing *efficiency*, thematic evaluations examine human and financial resources utilized to achieve results in a changing environment. In this regard, the evaluation assesses operational arrangements, including financial mechanisms, in delivering UNDP's work, coherence and

complementarities with other development assistance, and alignment with government systems to limit transaction costs.

- (d) Thematic evaluations also seek to analyze the extent to which UNDP’s interventions build *sustainable* capacities while ensuring that its own support can remain sustainable and relevant to programme countries in the medium to long term. In this regard, a review of UNDP’s efforts in positioning itself strategically as an organization that can add value to the developmental efforts of programme countries is of critical importance. Where, due to the transitional nature of particular development initiatives (e.g. in support to early recovery in disaster or conflict situations), in lieu of sustainability, the criteria of *connectivity* is applied.

#### IV. Thematic Evaluation Methodology

Thematic evaluations do not use a rigid set of evaluation methods but identify the appropriate methods responsive to evaluation questions and the specific context. Thematic evaluations seek to apply a theory of change in developing the parameters of the evaluation and uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods. This includes broad-based surveys, incident or country case studies for more in-depth analysis and understanding of selected issues, and synthesis across all evidence. Its data collection methods include document reviews, questionnaires, focus groups, structured and non-structured interviews, and site observations. The choice of design and data collection methods is guided by a number of factors. These include, the questions for the evaluation, information from the evaluability assessment, secondary data availability, appropriate bases for the development of data collection instruments, resources, and contextual, cultural and political factors.

#### V. Overview of the Thematic Evaluation Process and Key Outputs

The thematic evaluation process comprises the following five phases: (i) initiation, (ii) design, (iii) implementation, (iv) reporting, and (v) use and outreach. Throughout all phases of the evaluation, considerable importance is placed on quality assurance through internal (e.g. EO Quality Assurance Team) and external (e.g. Advisory Panel) review mechanisms.

##### *Phases, Key Deliverables and Time Frame for Thematic Evaluations*

Phase	Deliverable/activity	Timeframe
(i) Initiation	<i>Initiation Brief</i> , delineating a tentative proposal regarding the evaluation’s scope developed in consultation with select UNDP HQ stakeholders	Month 1
(ii) Design	Headquarters <i>inception mission</i> , during which the evaluation is designed	Month 2
	<i>Draft design report</i> (detailed evaluation approach and methodology) and <i>draft terms of reference</i> (summary evaluation approach and methodology) for the evaluation	Month 2
	<i>Informal briefing to the Executive Board</i> on the evaluation approach and methodology	Month 2
(iii) Implementation	<i>Headquarters data collection</i>	Month 3
	<i>Country pilot study</i> (including stakeholder feedback workshop) and pilot study report	Month 3
	<i>Final design report and terms of reference</i>	Month 3

Phase	Deliverable/activity	Timeframe
	<i>Country case studies</i> (including stakeholder feedback workshops at the end of each country case study) and case study report	Month 4
	<i>Reports on survey or questionnaire results</i> , as appropriate	Month 5
(iv) Reporting	<i>Synthesis workshop</i> to identify emerging key findings and conclusions <i>and validation of emerging results</i> during a presentation to stakeholders	Month 6
	<i>Draft evaluation report</i> prepared in accordance to EO/UNEG standards	Month 6-7
	<i>Presentation</i> of the draft evaluation report <i>to the Advisory Panel</i>	Month 8
	<i>Presentations to stakeholders</i> , during feedback workshops at Headquarters	Month 8
	<i>Informal briefings to the Executive Board</i> on preliminary findings	Month 8
	<i>Final report and Executive Board Paper</i> (summary report, based on the Executive Summary)	Month 8
	<i>Informal presentation to the Executive Board</i> on conclusions and recommendations	Month 9
	An <i>evaluation brief</i> including key messages and recommendations, intended for a lay-audience	Month 9
	A <i>methodology brief</i> including key lessons learned regarding the evaluation process and the methodology, intended for EO	Month 9
(v) Use and Outreach	Publication and Dissemination Strategy	Month 10-12

## VI. Additional Description of Outputs

### Initiation Brief:

The initiation brief is a planning document, which helps crystallize conceptual issues surrounding the theme, identify relevant stakeholders within UNDP, identify emerging evaluation issues and specify key skill sets required for evaluation team and advisory panel. It also sets parameters for work plan that reflects the deadlines associated with the Executive Board session to which the evaluation is to be submitted.

### Design Workshop and Design Report:

The purpose of the *design workshop* is to design and plan the evaluation. To this end, the Evaluation Team, in consultation with UNDP stakeholders, establishes a logic model or theory of how the intervention will lead to development results, defines the scope of evaluation, specifies evaluation criteria and questions, outlines the evaluation approach and methods, roles and responsibilities, and work plan. The workshop is also intended to strengthen team-building and orient the team to UNDP evaluation standards, requirement and procedures. If the evaluation adopts a theory-based approach, consultations with the stakeholders at UNDP HQ is held to agree on and finalize the theory. Informal consultations with the Executive Board of UNDP may also be held as part of the inception workshop to shape the evaluation. The duration of the workshop should be at 5-10 working days to accommodate the necessary consultations and to carry out the full agenda of the mission and workshops.

The purpose of the *design report* is to document the agreement between EO and the Team on the design of the evaluation and the proposed work plan. The design report includes detailed evaluation questions for each group of stakeholders, to be included as annexes in the final evaluation report. The report is subject to internal and external quality assurance processes and provides the basis for drafting the final Terms of Reference for the evaluation. The principal author of the report is the Team Leader with contributions from the team. The report is submitted to the Task Manager no later than a week after the design workshop and should be approved before the implementation of the evaluation commences.

#### Terms of Reference (TOR):

The purpose of the TOR of the evaluation is to provide the basis for the conduct of evaluation by documenting the scope, approach and methods of the evaluation, the quality assurance processes as well as the expected deliverables and time line. The TOR will be in accordance to the UNEG standards and EO guidance and will be based on the Inception Report and where, possible, will be shared with the relevant UNDP electronic networks. The TOR are included as an annex in the final evaluation report.

#### Country Pilot Study:

The main purpose of conducting a pilot case study is to ensure that:

- the scope and approach outlined in the draft inception report and TOR are realistic, and
- the methodology and instruments are appropriate and effective in addressing the evaluation questions.

All evaluators in the team as well as the Task Manager will participate in the country pilot study, prepared in line with the standard procedures for country case studies (see below). At the end of pilot mission, the team assesses the operationalization of the design and makes necessary revisions to the design and TOR. Immediately following the pilot study, a stakeholder feedback workshop will take place in the country pilot to share results and validate the appropriateness of conclusions.

#### Country Studies:

Primary evaluative evidence is gathered from in-depth studies conducted at selected countries, regional service centers and UNDP Headquarters. These in-depth studies operationalize the final TOR and the inception report. The team conducts the evaluation in accordance to UNEG standards and recognizing the role and mandate of UNDP and the UN system within programme countries. In general, not all team members participate in country studies. At the minimum, the team is comprised of one international consultant and one regional or national consultant. The preparations for the country mission involve external actors including the Country Office and relevant government ministries. After the respective country studies, stakeholder feedback workshops take place to share results and validate the appropriateness of conclusions.

#### Country Reports:

The purpose of the country reports is to document the key findings and conclusions emerging from the country study as well as the evaluation approach. Country reports are written by the mission team with

input from a regional or national consultant. Based on country missions and secondary evidence, team members prepare country reports. Reports are reviewed by the Task Manager and quality assured by the Internal Review Group. The reports reflecting the feedback from EO are shared with country stakeholders for factual corrections. The final country report is up-loaded on the EO website along with the final evaluation report. The summary of the report will constitute part of the annexes of the thematic evaluation report.

#### Surveys or Questionnaires:

The purpose of data collection instruments in general, and surveys in particular is to broaden the evidence base. The need for surveys to collect data is determined in the inception report. Where surveys are found to be necessary, the survey questions are linked to the evaluation questions. The surveys usually target select staff categories in all UNDP country offices and at times may involve “claim holders” in relevant programme countries. The full design of the surveys must be finalized and incorporated as part of the inception report prior to the commencement of the implementation phase. The Team Leader has overall responsibility for the design of the survey.

#### Synthesis Workshop:

The purpose of this workshop is for the Evaluation Team is to do a systematic synthesis of data sets and experience from all in-depth studies. An outcome of this exercise is the identification of emerging key findings, and conclusions of the study. The workshop takes up to five working days and is held within two weeks after completing the final mission or upon completion of the first draft of country reports. Participation of the entire team is essential and the Task Manager also participates. Towards the end of the workshop, the Evaluation Team makes a presentation of the proposed key findings and conclusions to EO.

#### Evaluation Report:

The main purpose of the report is to communicate to the stakeholders the essential elements of the the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation as well as the approach and methods adopted by the evaluation to obtain evaluative evidence. The report will be owned by UNDP Evaluation Office and shall adhere to the UNEG standards and international standards of evaluation. To this end, the report will be subject to a rigorous quality assurance process involving internal as well as external review and stakeholder feedback.

The draft evaluation report will be submitted to the Task Manager no later than four weeks after the key messages workshop. The report is subject to internal and external quality assurance, that includes EO review, stakeholder validation of findings and Advisory Panel review. Feedback from the quality assurance process is addressed in the report and the conclusions and recommendations of the revised report are shared with the Executive Board in an informal session. The final report is shared with the HQ stakeholders and UNDP senior management to facilitate the management response. Eventually the final report is officially submitted to the Executive Board for its review.

### Evaluation Brief

The main purpose of the evaluation brief is to present the evaluation and its key messages and recommendations to a lay-audience. The Team Leader will be responsible for the preparations of this document.

### Methodology Brief

The main purpose of the methodology brief is to provide the Evaluation Office staff with a brief note outlining the evaluation process and the methodology used. The Team Leader will be responsible for the preparations of this document.

### Publication and Dissemination Strategy:

The purpose of the dissemination plan is to enable the evaluation to reach the full range of stakeholders and its messages understood to facilitate organization-wide learning. The plan is included as an annex to the Inception Report

## **V. Stakeholder Consultations**

Throughout the evaluation, there are opportunities for stakeholder consultations and inputs. The table below provides an overview of consultation milestones:

Capacity Development Evaluation: Opportunities for Stakeholder Consultations and Inputs

Phase	Opportunities for Consultations and Inputs	Indicative Timeline 2009	Stakeholders				
			UNDP Senior Management	UNDP Programme Units*	Other Stakeholders (partners, donors, etc.)	Advisory Panel	Executive Board
Design of the evaluation	Review and provide inputs to the Terms of Reference	Jan-Feb	X	X	X	X	
	Provide inputs to designing the evaluation (inception report)	Feb	X	X	X		X
	Review and provide comments on the draft Inception Report outlining evaluation methods and approach	Feb-Mar	X	X	X	X	
Implementation of evaluation	Provide evaluative inputs to the country case studies	Feb-Mar		X	X		
	Respond to surveys and questionnaires	Feb-Mar	X	X			
Report preparation	Verify facts, provide comments on possible errors of interpretation, and identify issues of political sensitivity in the draft report	Apr-May	X	X	X		X
	Review and provide comments on the quality of the draft report	May				X	
Dissemination of evaluation findings	Presentation of messages in UNDP and international fora	Jun-Sep	X	X	X		

\* Programme units includes Country Offices and HQ-based bureaux

## **VI. Management Arrangements**

EO evaluations are issued in its own name and are submitted directly to the Executive Board. EO is responsible for assuring the quality and independence of its evaluations.

An EO Task Manager is assigned to each evaluation. He/she is responsible for coordinating the evaluation on behalf of EO, is closely involved in all methodological and substantive discussions, has the overall responsibility for management and logistical arrangements, and ensures that the quality assurance and stakeholder consultation process is fully adhered to.

All evaluations should conform to pre-established norms and standards including UNEG norms and standards, the EO guiding principles and standards formulated in the UNDP Evaluation policy, UNEG guidelines to code of conduct for UN evaluations and to EO guidelines for thematic evaluations to enhance the credibility, validity and utility of evaluation evidence. During all stages of the thematic evaluation process, quality assurance is highly important. The task manager is responsible for putting in place the quality assurance mechanisms. For each thematic evaluation, an external Advisory Panel and an EO Internal Review Group is established.

- *The Advisory Panel* includes a combination of experienced evaluators, country or regional experts in the theme under review. The Panel reviews the inception report and mature drafts of the thematic evaluation, thereby providing guidance and contributing external perspectives and expertise.
- *The EO Review Panel* consists of two members of the EO, from different EO Teams, and reviews key evaluation processes, and products.

Further quality assurance is provided by stakeholders to the evaluation who verify accuracy of facts presented and interpretations of evidence. They also check for serious omissions in data-gathering that could materially change the findings and for political sensitivity.

## **VII. The Evaluation Team**

Thematic evaluations are conducted by EO with support from an independent team of external evaluators contracted either directly by EO, or as provided through a consulting company. Team composition varies from evaluation to evaluation but typically the Evaluation Team comprises: a) designated EO staff including a Task Manager, Evaluation Associate and Programme Associate; b) an externally-contracted Team Leader and Team Members; and c) externally-contracted regional or country-based Team Members who support in-depth country studies and bring the national perspective into the evaluation. EO determines the most appropriate approach for each evaluation.

The externally-contracted Evaluation Team members must bring different types of expertise and experience to the team. The Team Leader leads the design of the thematic evaluation process, provides leadership throughout the evaluation process and for drafting the final evaluation report. At least one member of the Team should be experienced in the sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation, or have a sound knowledge of the subject to be evaluated. Another should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the particular evaluation methodologies that are employed for the evaluation. The evaluation team should also possess a broad knowledge and understanding of the major economic and social development issues and problems in the countries where the evaluation takes place or in similar countries across the world.

Overall, the composition of evaluation teams should be gender balanced, geographically diverse (balanced representation of evaluators from the North and South) and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned. All team members must abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, as approved by members of UNEG. Special efforts are made to ensure that the selection process is truly independent and that there is no conflict of interest.

Members of the Evaluation Team must conform to the **basic evaluation ethics** set out in Norm 11 of the UNEG “*Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*” and elaborated in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines:

- Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity. All evaluators are required to sign the UNEG code of conduct.
- Evaluators must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators must take care that those involved in evaluations have a chance to examine the statements attributed to them.
- Evaluators must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work.
- In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
- Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Also, the evaluators are not expected to evaluate the personal performance of individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with due consideration for this principle.