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# I. Desk Review Summary

#### Intervention logic of the project/programme

Building on the information from the full evaluation ToR:

1. Provide additional information and analyses of the key features of the evaluation subject. This should include strategic objectives, outcomes, outputs, activities, budget, modalities of engagement, donor, beneficiaries, partners, etc.

2. Explain the gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the subject evaluated, including relating to disability.

**Please do not exceed 1 pages.**

WRITE YOUR TEXT ON TOP OF THIS IN ORDER TO CREATE THE CORRECT FORMAT AND STYLE

## Desk review summary, including areas for further exploration during data collection

Based on the desk review summary:

1. Please add here the key takings for each evaluation criterion that should be taken into consideration for further triangulation in the context of the evaluation questions, as stated in the evaluation ToR.

2. Kindly remove headings of evaluation criteria that are not covered by this evaluation, if any.

**Please do not exceed 3 pages.**

WRITE YOUR TEXT ON TOP OF THIS IN ORDER TO CREATE THE CORRECT FORMAT AND STYLE

### RELEVANCE

### EFFICIENCY

### COHERENCE

### EFFECTIVENESS

### IMPACT

### SUSTAINABILITY

### HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY INCLUSION AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

## Summary of main changes proposed

Based on the desk review summary:

1. Please describe the main changes proposed in relation with the evaluation ToR - e.g. to the evaluation scope, questions (including revision or proposed deletion of questions), methodology, data collection, work plan etc.

2. In case there are any proposed changes to the original evaluation questions please also explain the reason/s for each proposed change in the table below.

**Please do not exceed 1 pages.**

WRITE YOUR TEXT ON TOP OF THIS IN ORDER TO CREATE THE CORRECT FORMAT AND STYLE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question[[1]](#footnote-2) | In case the question was changed, added, etc. please justify |
| E.g. Relevance | E.g. 1. To what extent is the project aligned with the national strategy on terrorism prevention? | No change |
| E.g. 2. To what extent is the project relevant to the recipients’ needs? | New question added – the questions in the ToR did not sufficiently address the needs of the recipients. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, APPROACH AND SAMPLING

## Methodological Approach

1. Describe the overall conceptual and methodological approach.

2. Describe how your methodological approach will include the perspective of key stakeholders and minimize threats to validity and ensure reliability and credibility of the evaluation.

3. Specify a mixed methods approach will be used and the specific tools that will be applied as well as how data will be triangulated in order to improve the quality of the data collection and analysis.

4. Specify how independence and impartiality will be safeguarded in the evaluation’s design.

5. Ensure that the evaluation fully includes organizational requirements, norms and standards on human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion, and that the evaluation process is inclusive and participatory. Different methods for data collection can be found in the UNODC Evaluation Handbook, 2017, p. 136ff.

**Please note that the actual tools/instruments to be used for the data collection need to be included in Annex IV.**

**Please do not exceed 2.5 pages.**

WRITE YOUR TEXT ON TOP OF THIS IN ORDER TO CREATE THE CORRECT FORMAT AND STYLE

## Stakeholder Analysis

Building on the information from the evaluation ToR:

1. Provide an analysis of the key stakeholder groups and their inter-relationships

2. Explain how stakeholder analysis was conducted, what groups were identified, and how vulnerable groups will be included.

**Please note that the detailed list of stakeholders should be provided in Annex II.**

**Please do not exceed 0.5 pages.**

WRITE YOUR TEXT ON TOP OF THIS IN ORDER TO CREATE THE CORRECT FORMAT AND STYLE

## data collection tools, sampling, analysis and triangulation[[2]](#footnote-3)

In the table below:

1. Please explain briefly the rationale for the suggested data collection tools, sampling approach

2. Describe how data will be analysed and triangulated.

3. Provide detailed information on each data collection tool in the table below.

**Please note that the detailed tools (i.e. surveys, interview guides, etc.) need to be added in Annex IV in full.**

**Please do not exceed 1 page.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Data collection tool[[3]](#footnote-4) | Which sampling technique will be used and why?[[4]](#footnote-5) | How and with what tools will data be analyzed?[[5]](#footnote-6) | Number of stakeholders to be consulted |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Field missions

In the table below:

1. Please add the proposed field missions, including country, city/region, data collection method (i.e. interviews, observation, focus group discussion, beneficiary interviews, etc.), start and end date, and key interviewees/observation/organisations that are engaged.

2. In case no field mission is planned, please just add a short sentence elaborating why no field mission will take place.

**Please do not exceed 0.5 pages.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **City/region** | **Data collection method** | **Proposed start and end date** | **Key interviewees/ organisations** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Limitations

In the table below, please add all key limitations to the evaluation and related mitigating measures

**Please do not exceed 0.5 pages.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Limitations to the evaluation | Mitigation measures |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# III. EVALUATION MATRIX

In the table below:

1. Please adapt the evaluation questions from the ToR to ensure evaluability

2. Develop the sub-questions/indicators to respond to the evaluation questions and allow valid findings

**Please make sure to fully consider human rights, gender equality and disability inclusion provisions for the evaluation process.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question[[6]](#footnote-7) | Indicators/sub- questions[[7]](#footnote-8) | Data collection method(s) and triangulation[[8]](#footnote-9) | Sources of information |
| E.g. 1. To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner? | How will the evaluation team know the response to the broader evaluation question? | How will the data for responding to this question be collected? | What sources of information will be used to respond to this indicator/sub-question? |
| E.g. What is the relationship between input costs and delivered outputs/ outcomes? | E.g. Document/literature review  Online survey | E.g. financial reports; programme documents; donor reports |
| E.g. Did the project use cost-effective tools and processes? (e.g. use of national trainers, cooperation between HQ and Field offices, etc.) | e.g. Face-to-Face and Skype interviews  Focus group discussion | Donor(s); implementing partner(s); UNODC staff; |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# ANNEX I. Desk Review List

In the tables below:

1. Please indicate all internal and external documents reviewed for the preparation of the Inception Report

2. Indicate additional documents requested from the project team.

**Please feel free to provide an aggregate number of documents of the same type (e.g. Annual Project Progress Reports – 2017-2021 – 4 documents).**

## UNODC DOCUMENTS

|  |
| --- |
| Document – name |
| Project document |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

|  |
| --- |
| Document – name |
| UNDAF country/region |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS REQUESTED

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Document – type/name | Comments, if applicable |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# ANNEX II. UPDATED LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

Based on the stakeholders lists in the annexes to the evaluation ToR and the sampling strategy developed in this inception report, please include a selection of all key relevant stakeholders involved with the project, including: donors, partners, beneficiaries, other relevant UN entities, NGOs, academia, as well as project team members and other relevant UNODC staff involved with the project at HQ and the field (e.g. FRMS, HRMS, CPS, Procurement, SPIA etc).

**Note: Stakeholders need to represent a balance of men, women and other under-represented groups.**

## LIST OF Stakeholders

| Type[[9]](#footnote-10) | Organisation[[10]](#footnote-11) | Name | Designation[[11]](#footnote-12) | Location | Email | Type of engagement[[12]](#footnote-13) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UNODC HQ/FO | UNODC | XX | Head/Chief/Regional Representative (responsible for the project/programme) |  |  |  | Indicate e.g. if a stakeholder has been indicated as a CLP in the annexes to the evaluation ToR |
| Key UNODC HQ staff | UNODC | XX |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key UNODC FO staff | UNODC | XX |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key donor(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Donor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key UN agency | UN Country Team | Xx | Resident Coordinator |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC | XX | Project staff members |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC |  | FRMS |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC |  | HRMS |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC |  | CPS |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC |  | SPIA |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC HQ | UNODC |  | Procurement |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC FO | UNODC | XX |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key recipient (Member States) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key beneficiary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recipients |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Member States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beneficiaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NGOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# ANNEX III. WORK PLAN EVALUATION TEAM

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation deliverables and associated activities | | Start date (dd/mm/yy) | End date (dd/mm/yy) | Roles and responsibilities within evaluation team[[13]](#footnote-14) |
| Inception Report, incl. desk review (4-5 weeks) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | EE + SE: Prepare draft Inception Report  EE: Revise Inception Report in line with IES comments |
| Data collection (incl. field missions) (4-6 weeks)[[14]](#footnote-15) | Survey | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | EE + SE: Conduct survey |
| Key informant interviews | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | EE + SE: Conduct key informant interviews during field mission to XXX |
| Focus group discussions | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | EE + SE: Conduct focus group discussions during field mission to XXX |
| Observation | Dd/mm/yy | Dd/mm/yy | EE + SE: Conduct of observation of event XX during field mission to XXX |
| Data analysis and preparation of draft report  (4-6 weeks) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy |  |
| Data validation workshop (1 day) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | EE+SE: provide a preliminary findings presentation to project staff for data validation |
| Draft report for CLP comments  (1 week) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy |  |
| Final report, evaluation brief and PowerPoint slides  (1-2 weeks) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy |  |
| Presentation (1 day) | | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy |  |

# ANNEX IV. EVALUATION TOOLS

**Please ensure that all data collection instruments from the main body of the Inception Report and the indicators/sub-questions from the Evaluation Matrix are included in this section and are fully aligned with the identified methodology.**

Applied methods and tools must be gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory to capture disability and gender equality issues, as well voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalized groups, ensuring gender related and disaggregated data (e.g. age, sex, countries etc.) for compilation and analysis.

For further information and guidance on developing this tool, please refer to the [UNODC Evaluation Handbook](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Evaluation_Handbook_new/UNODC_Evaluation_Handbook.pdf).

Note: data collection tools not included here will not be approved by IES for utilisation during the evaluation process.

## Semi-structured interview guides by stakeholder group

Add the semi-structured interview guides for each stakeholder group, ensuring that the evaluation questions were translated into concrete questions and adapted to the specific group of interviewees.

The Independent Evaluation Section of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is in the process of conducting a Final/Mid-Term In-Depth Project Evaluation of UNODC’s “…” Project. The evaluation is undertaken in line with UNODC and UNEG norms and standards for evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation is to …

The evaluation is carried out by a team of external independent evaluators, consisting of an Evaluation Expert (Ms./Mr. …) and a Substantive Expert (Ms./Mr. …).

Confidentiality and informed consent: This interview is confidential, with all information received being aggregated and anonymised. No individual will be quoted nor will the organization they represent be identified. The data collected will only be used for evaluation purposes. Your participation in the interview is voluntary and you may withdraw from it at any moment.

### Interview questions for Project staff:

### Interview questions for government representatives (recipients):



### Interview questions for donors:

### Interview questions for CSOs:

### Interview questions for partners:

### Interview questions for direct beneficiaries:

## Online survey/questionnaire

Please include a complete introductory message and add the full survey (or link to the survey) and identify how the survey will be disseminated (e.g. survey software; during meetings in hard copy; etc.). Please note that the evaluation questions need to be tailored to be used for data collection through a survey.

Please, ensure that all questionnaires to be used for the evaluation comply with UNEG Ethical Standards for Evaluation –i.e. by including a description of the purpose of the evaluation, foreseeable risks or discomforts because of participation in the survey, how the information will be used and an option to freely withdraw consent at any stage of the survey.

## Focus group guides and arrangements

In the table:

1. Add the focus group discussion guides for each stakeholder group

2. Ensure that the evaluation questions are translated into concrete questions and adapted to the specific stakeholder groups.

3. Specify in the arrangements for the focus group discussion with each stakeholder group.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder group | Number of participants | Facilitator | Note taker | Expected duration and modality |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Guide for the Focus group discussions (including introduction, consent, questions and finalization note):

Text

Confidentiality and informed consent: Your participation in this focus group is confidential, with all information received being aggregated and anonymized. No individual will be quoted nor will the organization they represent be identified. The data collected will only be used for evaluation purposes. Your participation in the focus group is voluntary and you may withdraw from it at any moment.

## Overview observation of workshops/events

In addition to filling out the table below, please include the tool/checklist that will be used during the observation of workshops, activities or events.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title & date of the event | Objective of the observation | Who will observe it | How will data be collected? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Please state all evaluation questions. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Details to be included in the evaluation matrix. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. E.g. survey, semi-structured interview, desk review, focus group discussion, observation, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. E.g. Purposeful sampling= selection of key informants among all potential key informants based on specific areas of interest for the evaluation;

   Convenience sampling = selection of key informants based on their accessibility and on the limitations encountered to access other potential key informants. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. E.g. content analysis using NVivo. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Please include all evaluation questions in the evaluation matrix. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Please state the sub-questions and indicators that will guide your data collection to respond to the evaluation question. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Please state the data collection and triangulation methods that will be used to answer the respective evaluation question and the respective data sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Please include the information, if this person is e.g. an implementing partner, donor, recipient, UNODC HQ, UNODC field, UN agency, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Please include the name of the organisation the person is working for. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Please include the designation/job title of the person. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. E.g. through interview, focus group, survey, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. EE = Evaluation Expert; SE = Substantive Expert. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Please split by type of data collection. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)