Guidelines for UNODC
Evaluation Terms of Reference

These Guidelines are to be used along with the Template for Evaluation Terms of Reference\(^1\) (ToR) when developing the draft ToR. The ToR are a written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the indicative methods to be used, the issues to be addressed, and the resources, schedule and reporting requirements. Moreover, they are the “contract” between UNODC and the Evaluator(s) and should be tailored to the needs of each project or programme being evaluated. The ToR template can be accessed on the Independent Evaluation Section (IES) website (here: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html). The exact roles and responsibilities for preparing the ToR for Independent Project as well as In-Depth Evaluations can be found on the IES website: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation-step-by-step.html

These Guidelines also include the standard text from the UNODC Evaluation ToR template for ease of reference.

Please see below the sections of these guidelines. These are also the section to be included in any evaluation ToR.

Please consult the IES Handbook:
or contact IES directly for more guidance.
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I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This section is particularly important in order to have an overview of the specifics of the project/programme. First, a table outlining all basic project/programme information needs to be completed. Different aspects and facts about the project/programme have to be provided in a summarized, concise fashion.

In addition, the main objectives, outcomes and also challenges should be discussed. A thorough analysis of the gender and human rights mainstreaming efforts should also be part of this section. Furthermore, the project/programme will also be described in the context of other regional or thematic programmes as well as in relation to the SDGs.

This section includes:

(a) Table which provides an overview of the project and its evaluation.
(b) Project overview and historical context;
(c) Main challenges during implementation;
(d) Project documents and revisions of the original project document;
(e) Main objectives and outcomes
(f) Contribution to UNODC’s country, regional or thematic programmes;
(g) Linkage to UNODC’s strategy context and to the Sustainable Development Goals.

Project overview and historical context

MAXIMUM LENGTH: 1 PAGE
Please also include how gender as well as human rights aspects have been mainstreamed into the project

Main challenges during implementation

MAXIMUM LENGTH: 0.5 PAGES.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project document</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Please provide general information regarding the original project document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reason &amp; purpose (max. 2)</th>
<th>Change in (please</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main objectives and outcomes

*Please also describe whether or not baselines have been established and used.*

**Objective of the project/programme (as per project document/revision):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective:</th>
<th>Performance indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outcomes of the project/programme (as per project document/revision)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1:</th>
<th>Performance indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Performance indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
<td>Performance indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4:</td>
<td>Performance indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5:</td>
<td>Performance indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6:</td>
<td>Performance indicators:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution to UNODC’s country, regional or thematic programme

**Contribution to the following UNODC country and regional programmes:**

---

2 Please add further rows as needed
3 Please delete or add rows below as needed for the different outcomes. *Do not include outputs.*
Contribution to the following thematic programme(s):

Linkage to UNODC strategic framework, UNDAFs and to Sustainable Development Goals

Kindly specify which target and performance indicator of the SDGs this project or programme contributes to. Further specify, if at all, whether this project has made a contribution to nationally agreed indicators or strategies and how this project is positioned in light of the 2030 agenda. For reference, please use the list of indicators related to SDG goals and targets of which UNODC is the custodian agency in Annex III of this guidance note. In case the project or programme contributes to other SDG targets or indicators other than those listed in Annex III of this guidance note, please use the classification of SDG targets and indicators included in Annex III of the ECOSOC Report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (E/CN.3/2017/2*).

MAXIMUM LENGTH: 0.5 pages

II. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

This section aims at providing a quick overview of the financial history of the project/programme and in particular the funding commitments. Also, in particular of the period under evaluation.

Two short tables are provided in the evaluation ToR and need to be filled in for this section in order to present the requested information in a concise and clear way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time periods throughout the life time of the project (MMYYYY – MMYYYY) (add the number of rows needed)</th>
<th>Total Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period that will be covered by the evaluation (MMYYYY – MMYYYY)</th>
<th>Total Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This section is particularly important in order to outline the reasons behind the evaluation taking place, to explore the expected accomplishments and consider the main users of the evaluation results. The following guiding questions should be considered for this section of the ToR.

(a) Who commissioned the evaluation?

TIP The evaluation might have been foreseen in the project document, decided on by UNODC senior management, requested by donors or identified for strategic reasons by IES.

(b) Why is the evaluation being undertaken at this point?

TIP E.g. to present at the CND or at an annual donor meeting.

(c) What does the evaluation seek to accomplish?

TIP To learn lessons for a possible extension of project; to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized; to identify areas of improvement in a project; to highlight and resolve disagreements; to clarify and tackle problems; to get feedback, appraisal and recognition; to attract resources toward a project.

(d) What decisions may the evaluation guide you to? How will the completed evaluation and its report be utilised?

TIP To set different priorities and goals; to suggest new strategic directions; to decide whether to extend the duration of a project; to decide whether the project feeds into a regional programme.

(e) Who are the main evaluation users and how will they be involved?

TIP CND Member States; the beneficiary Government, the Project Manager; the donors etc.

The following DAC criteria will be assessed during any evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, established partnerships and cooperation as well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming will be assessed. Furthermore, lessons learned and best practices will be identified and recommendations based on the findings formulated. In case previous evaluations of the project/programme were conducted, the evaluation will also assess to what extent the recommendations were implemented.

IV. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In clarifying the scope of the evaluation, the following points should first be determined:

(a) The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

TIP A project, a cluster of related projects, a programme, a subcomponent, or a process within a project.
(b) The time period to be covered by the evaluation

**TIP** The period MM/YY - MM/YY.

(c) The geographical coverage of the evaluation. Please state the rationale of your selection

**TIP** Global, regional, sub regional or national.

Please note that a short table is provided in the evaluation ToR template in order to assist in a concise presentation of these points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of analysis (full project/programme/ parts of the project/programme; etc.)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage of the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This section identifies the key evaluation questions to be answered by the evaluation, along with their related evaluation criteria. The questions need to address the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) and the criteria of partnerships and cooperation. The evaluation will further specifically assess how gender and human rights aspects were mainstreamed into the project. In addition, lessons learned will be assessed and best practices as well as recommendations derived. In case previous evaluations of the project/programme were conducted, the evaluation will also assess to what extent the recommendations were implemented.

First of all, it should be considered which information is required in order to satisfy the purpose of the evaluation; consider which questions are particularly important also taking into account if this is a mid-term (formative) or final (summative) evaluation.

Please note that standard questions need to be tailored to the particular project/programme and to the specific context; they should not simply be copied and pasted. Evaluation questions should be formulated in a way that they are open, comprehensive but also specific as well as relevant to the project/programme.

Moreover, questions should be worded in a gender-responsive and inclusive manner and ask for sex-disaggregated information if applicable in order to provide information for an assessment of how gender and human rights aspects were mainstreamed into the project.

**TIP** Standard evaluation criteria:

Relevance
- Relevance is the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

Efficiency
- Efficiency is the extent to which the resources and inputs were converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Effectiveness
- Effectiveness assesses if and to what extent the planned objectives and outcomes in the project document have been achieved.

Impact
- Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It is assessed if and to what extent the project has contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project.

Sustainability
- Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether project results/ benefits (impact if any, and outcomes) are likely to continue after the project has been concluded and donor funding has been withdrawn.

Partnerships and cooperation
- The extent to which partnerships and cooperation have been sought and established (including UN agencies) and synergies in the delivery of assistance have been created.

Human rights
- The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming of human rights aspects into the project/ programme and the overall human rights based approach of the project/ programme.

Gender
- The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming the extent of gender mainstreaming throughout the project/ programme.

Additional assessments:
Lessons learned
- Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme.

Best practices:
- Best practices aim at formulating helpful principles to guide practice. They are context specific and based on the evaluation findings that they have achieved success during the implementation of the respective project/ programme.

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind as well as lesson learned and best practices. The questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

**Design**

*The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical*
framework approach was adopted.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevance**

Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant to implementing the Sustainable Development Goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**

Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.

| 5. |  |

**Effectiveness**

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

| 6. |  |

**Impact**

Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent did the project/programme contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability**

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partnerships and cooperation**

The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/programme as well as their functioning and value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind**

The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent were human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender Equality**

17. To what extent were gender equality considerations included in the project design and implementation?
| 18. |  
| Leaving no one behind (optional)  

| 19. | To what extent were under-represented and vulnerable groups included in the project design and implementation?  

| Lessons learned and best practices  
Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.  

| 20. | To what extent did the project/programme implement recommendations of relevant previous evaluation(s)?  

| 21. | 

VI. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The section on the evaluation methodology is particularly important because this will guide the whole process of the evaluation and especially the data collection as well as the analysis. A mixed-methods approach is always needed and the evaluation team should employ quantitative as well as qualitative methods and tools. An standard text is provided in the ToR template – to be reviewed and if necessary further refined by Project Manager. It is of utmost importance to adjust the proposed text to any specific evaluation ToR.

This section includes:

(a) The methods used to collect and analyse data on which the quality of the evaluation is dependent on;

**TIP** Desk review, questionnaires, surveys, structured interviews, discussions, workshops, field office visits, observations, retrospective baseline construction etc. All methods should be inclusive and gender-sensitive.

(b) The sources of data;

**TIP** Primary or secondary sources.

(c) The analysis of the collected data;

(d) Possible reference to an evaluation methodology summarized in an evaluation matrix by the evaluator.

*Standard text included in the ToR template:*

The methods used to collect and analyse data

This evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the evaluation team is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, internal review reports, programme files, evaluation reports (if available), financial reports and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which their conclusions will be based. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the
evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the project/programme, the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The present ToR provide basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an effective, efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, the evaluation team will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards.

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender-sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. Rival theories and competing explanations must be tested once plausible patterns emerge from triangulating data.

The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the evaluation team needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation, (Annex II of the evaluation ToR), as provided by the Project Manager and as further requested by the evaluation team, as well as relevant external documents (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; UN and global/regional strategies; etc.);
- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing preliminary findings of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to IES for review and clearance before any field mission may take place;
- Initial meetings and interviews with the Project Manager and other UNODC staff as well as stakeholders during the field mission;
- Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype), with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups/focus.
groups, as well as using surveys, questionnaires or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation;

- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on Guidelines for Evaluation Report and Template Report to be found on the IES website http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html). The lead evaluator submits the draft report to the Project Manager for the review of factual errors (copying IES) and the Project Manager shares with IES for review, comments and clearance. Subsequently the Project Manager shares the final draft report with all CLPs for comments.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager). The evaluation team incorporates the necessary and requested changes and finalizes the evaluation report in accordance with the feedback received from IES, the Project Manager and CLPs. It further includes a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary through Skype).
- In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account. All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html.

The sources of data
The evaluation will utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone), the use of surveys and questionnaires, field missions for case studies, focus group interviews, observation and other participatory techniques. Secondary data sources will include project documents and their revisions, progress and monitoring reports, external reports and strategies (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; country/regional/global strategies; etc.) and all other relevant documents, including visual information (e.g. eLearning, pictures, videos, etc.).

Desk Review
The evaluation team will perform a desk review of all existing documentation (please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex II of the evaluation ToR). This list is however not to be regarded as exhaustive as additional documentation may be requested by the evaluation team. The evaluation team needs to ensure that sufficient external documentation is used for the desk review.

Phone interviews / face-to-face consultations
The evaluation team will conduct phone interviews / face-to-face consultations with identified individuals from the following groups of stakeholders:
- Member States (including recipients and donors);
- relevant international and regional organizations;
- Non-governmental organizations working with UNODC;
- UNODC management and staff at HQ and in the field;
- Etc.

Questionnaire
A questionnaire (on-line) is to be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

VII. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The timeframe should be set as realistically as possible. Depending on the size of the project/programme as well as the amount of data to be collected, necessary working days differ from evaluation to evaluation. It is particularly important to also include days for IES’s reviews and provision of feedback to the deliverables into the overall timeframe.

This section includes:

(a) When the evaluation takes place

(b) When the field missions of the evaluation are planned for

(c) What the expected deliverables and respective timeframes are

TIP
Expected Deliverables

The Lead Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

- Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools;
- Data collection & analysis that the report will be based on;
- Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation policy and guidelines;
- Final Evaluation Report, including annex with management response;
- Evaluation Brief (2-pager)
- Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders.

In addition, the final version of the draft evaluation report will also be shared with the key stakeholders- similar to the ToR- in order to receive important feedback and to ensure an inclusive, participatory evaluation process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Duties</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time frame</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Deliverables</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and drafting of Inception Report</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX working days for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 12 working days for lead evaluator and 10 for team member)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Draft Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms and standards&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of draft Inception Report by IES</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (1 week for IES review)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on the draft Inception Report to the evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of comments from IES (can entail various rounds of comments from IES)</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team member) (1 week for IES review)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Revised draft Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable A: Final Inception Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates</strong></td>
<td><strong>By DDMMYYYY (overall XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) 4-6 weeks</strong></td>
<td>UNODC/HQ; Countries/Cities</td>
<td>Final Inception report to be cleared by IES at least one week before the field mission can get started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews with staff at UNODC HQ/FO (including by phone/skype); observation; focus</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX w/d for team)</td>
<td>UNODC/HQ; Countries/Cities</td>
<td>Interviews and data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to Project Management and IES;</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 15 w/d for lead evaluator and 13 for team member)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of IES for quality assurance and Project Management for factual errors</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (2 weeks for review)</td>
<td>Comments on the draft evaluation report to the evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of comments from the project manager and incorporation of comments from IES (can entail various rounds of comments from IES)</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 6 w/d for lead evaluator and 4 for team member + 1 week for IES review)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Revised draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates</strong></td>
<td><strong>By</strong> DDMMYYYY (overall XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) <strong>9-13 weeks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Comments of CLPs on the draft report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of comments from Core Learning Partners and preparation of draft Evaluation Brief</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 3 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for team member)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Revised draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final review by IES; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and Evaluation Brief (can entail various rounds of comments from IES)</td>
<td>DDMMYYYY – DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) (minimum 3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team member + 1 week for IES review)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Revised draft evaluation report; draft Evaluation Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IES)</td>
<td>Tentative: DDMMYYYY (XX w/d for lead evaluator) (minimum 1 w/d for lead evaluator)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; presentation of evaluation results; Evaluation Brief (2-pager)</strong></td>
<td>By DDMMYYYY (overall w/d for lead evaluator and XX for team member) 4-6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results, both to be cleared by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management:</strong> Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan in online evaluation application</td>
<td>By DDMMYYYY 4-6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management:</strong> Disseminate final</td>
<td>By DDMMYYYY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final evaluation report disseminated to internal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation report and external stakeholders

**IES**: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report

The *UNODC Independent Evaluation Section may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.*

**VIII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION**

This section includes:

(a) The number of evaluators needed;

**TIP** A minimum of two (up to five) independent evaluators is recommended for each evaluation.

(b) The role of IES;

(c) A standard sentence addressing conflict of interest which is provided in the ToR template;

**TIP** All independent evaluators in UNODC evaluations must not have been involved in or benefited from the project/programme under evaluation.

(d) Reference to the specific job descriptions detailing qualifications and responsibilities.

**It should be kept in mind that:**

(e) It is recommended that evaluations be conducted by an evaluation team with a lead evaluator with expertise in evaluation and a supporting consultant with expertise in the subject area of the project to be evaluated. The evaluation team should be gender balanced and respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting (as per UNEG ethical norms⁵). At least one of the evaluators should also have expertise in human rights and gender mainstreaming.

(f) Evaluation teams should be multicultural with appropriate gender balance and geographical representation.

The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

The evaluators report exclusively to the chief or deputy chief of IES in particular as IES is the sole clearing entity of all evaluation deliverables and products.

**TIP** Members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the project under evaluation.

The consultants are contracted by UNODC. The qualifications and responsibilities for each team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1).

IES has to be consulted before the recruitment process and will provide the evaluator database. Furthermore, the proposed candidates will be reviewed by IES and the final selection has to be cleared by IES before the official recruitment process. The evaluation team will report exclusively to the chief or deputy chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, who are the exclusive clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants/evaluators(^6) (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required(^7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team leader</td>
<td>1 (international/national consultant)</td>
<td>Evaluation methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>XXX (international/national consultant)</td>
<td>XXX; expertise in Gender Equality and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluator are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the chief or deputy chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, who are the exclusive clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products.

**Absence of Conflict of Interest**

---

6 Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 2 independent evaluators – at least one team leader and one team member.

7 Please add the specific technical expertise needed (e.g. expertise in anti-corruption; counter-terrorism; etc.) – please note that at least one evaluation team member needs to have expertise in human rights and gender equality.
According to UNODC rules, the evaluators must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Furthermore, the evaluators shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

IX. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This section includes:

(a) Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders, including responsibilities of the field offices and units and sections at headquarters (where appropriate)\(^8\);

(b) Logistical support responsibilities, such as arrangements for transportation, independent translation, office space etc.

(c) Reference to any agreements with other relevant stakeholders where relevant (for example, in the case of a joint evaluation).

TIP
Management Arrangements

The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC’s evaluation policy and UNEG Norms and Standards.

*The following standard text is provided in the ToR template, but needs to be adjusted to the respective evaluation-process.*

**Standard text in the ToR template:**

**Roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager**

The Project Manager is responsible for:

- (for Independent Project Evaluations: managing the evaluation process)
- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role,
- recruiting the evaluation team following clearance by IES, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IES and the evaluation team are to be immediately notified,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluation team including the full TOR,
- liaising with the Core Learning Partners,
- reviewing the draft report for factual errors only,

• developing a follow-up plan for the usage of the evaluation results and recording of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations (to be updated once per year),
• disseminate the final evaluation report and communicate evaluation results to relevant stakeholders as well as facilitate the presentation of evaluation results;
• ensure that all payments related to the evaluation are fulfilled within 5 working days after IES’s request - non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may results in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

The Project Manager will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team, including but not limited to:
• All logistical arrangements for the travel (including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.)
• All logistical arrangement for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups (including independent translator/interpreter if needed); set-up of interview schedules; arrangement of ad-hoc meetings as requested by the evaluation team; transportation from/to the interview venues; scheduling sufficient time for the interviews (around 45 minutes); ensuring that members of the evaluation team and the respective interviewees are present during the interviews; etc.)
• All logistical arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results;
• Ensure timely payment of all fees/DSA/etc. (payments for the evaluation team must be released within 5 working days after the respective deliverable is cleared by IES).

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are identified by the project managers. The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

Roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Section

The Independent Evaluation Section (IES) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools on the IES web site http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html. Furthermore, IES provides guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise, as well as interacts with the project manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. IES may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

IES reviews, comments on and clears all steps and deliverables during the evaluation process: Terms of Reference; Selection of the evaluation team, Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report; Final Evaluation Report and an Evaluation Brief; Evaluation Follow-up Plan. IES further publishes the final evaluation report and the Evaluation Brief on the
UNODC website, as well as sends the final evaluation report to an external evaluation quality assurance provider. Moreover, IES may decide, in consultation with Project Management, to upgrade any Independent Project Evaluation to an In-Depth Evaluation considering e.g. an unforeseen higher involvement of IES staff in the evaluation process.

X. PAYMENT MODALITIES

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contract is a legally binding document in which the consultant agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. It is the responsibility of the requesting office to carefully consider and determine the estimated number of days that the evaluation team would need, to be able to produce quality work and fully complete all the expected deliverables on time. IES will review the proposed days to ensure that sufficient working days are provided. If this is not the case, IES will not be able to clear the ToR.

It is particularly essential that sufficient time is planned for the desk review and development of the methodology (Inception Report), as well as drafting and finalizing of the report, including the process of consultation and incorporation of comments and changes.

IES will provide an evaluation cost matrix in order to assist in calculating the minimum requirements (number of evaluators, working days as well as evaluation budget) for a full-fledged evaluation of the project/ programme. Project managers can use a pull-down menu selecting the specific criteria for the respective project/ programme.

Payment is connected to the expected deliverables and three installments are typically planned for. Payments will be initiated and released by the project management upon IES clearance of the Inception Report, the Draft Evaluation Report and the Final Evaluation Report, including the final presentation.

**Standard text in the ToR template:**

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contracts are legally binding documents in which the evaluation team agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three instalments are typically foreseen:

1. The first payment upon clearance of the Inception Report (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) by IES;
2. The second payment upon clearance of the Draft Evaluation Report (in line with UNODC norms, standards, evaluation guidelines and templates) by IES;
3. The third and final payment (i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report, Evaluation Brief (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) and clearance by IES, as well as presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations.

75 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

IES is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluation. Project/Programme Management must fulfil any such request within 5 working days to
ensure the independence of this evaluation-process. Non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may results in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

I. TOR ANNEXES

The annexes are already provided in a complete format as part of the evaluation ToR, to be filled out/updated in accordance with the planned project/programme evaluation.

Annex I. Job descriptions of evaluators
These outline the expertise sought for the evaluators of the respective project/programme.

Annex II. List of background documents for the desk review
This list has to be reviewed and amended for each evaluation. In particular, more specific resources regarding the thematic area if the project/programme have to be provided. However, essential references regarding the evaluation process as well as human rights and gender are already indicated. Evaluation teams need to be gender balanced.

Annex III. List of Stakeholders
This list will propose the key stakeholders identified by project management who are to be consulted during the evaluation process regarding some deliverables but also as information sources for the evaluator(s). Please include all donors, key partners, other relevant UN agencies, Resident Coordinator, etc. Please also include stakeholders that you did not yet engage with but are relevant for the project/programme or who you would like to engage with in the future. Please also note that the CLPs should represent a balance of men, women and other under-represented groups. Further stakeholders will be requested by the evaluation team.

Annex IV. List of Sustainable Development Goals and Targets