*DRAFT*

In-Depth Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Type of Evaluation (E.G. FINAL/MID-TERM In-Depth EVALUATION)

OF

Name of the Projects/ProgramMES

Project/programme numbers



UNITED NATIONS

Vienna, YEAR

Please consult templates and guidelines on IES website:
<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html>

Or contact IES directly for more guidance and for initiating the In-Depth Evaluation: unodc-ies@un.org

Replace yellow highlighted text with text specific to this evaluation. If pasting text, be sure to use destination formatting. Then remove highlighting.

After confirmation by IES that this In-Depth Evaluation process can be started, please submit the draft ToR per email to IES once all parts have been completed in this document, please delete all the beige boxes of instructions like this.

Keep all standard text.

Subsequently, IES will initiate this evaluation in Unite Evaluations (evaluations.unodc.org) and revert back comments to you through Unite Evaluations.

The Unite Evaluations User Manual for Project Managers is available [here](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Unite-Evaluations/Unite_Evaluations_User_Manual_for_Programme_Managers.pdf).

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project/programme duration (dd/mm/yy-dd/mm/yy): |  |
| Location (Country/ies and sub-national focus areas, if relevant): |  |
| Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes & UNODC Strategy 2021-2025: |  |
| Linkages to the SDG targets to which the project/programme(s) contribute(s): |  |
| Executing Agency (UNODC office/section/unit): |  |
| Implementing partner: |  |
| Donor(s): |  |
| End Beneficiaries/Recipients: |  |
| Total Approved Budget (USD): |  |
| Total Overall Budget (USD): |  |
| Total Expenditure by date of initiation of evaluation (USD): |  |
| Name and title of Project/Programme Manager(s) and implementing UNODC office(s)/section(s)/unit(s): |  |
| Time frame of evaluation: (planned start and end date of the evaluation process) |  |
| Budget for this evaluation in USD[[1]](#footnote-2): |  |
| Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation[[2]](#footnote-3):  |  |
| Type and year of past evaluations (if any):  |  |

1. Project overview

MAXIMUM LENGTH: 1 PAGE

Please include a brief description of the project(s)/programme(s). This description should include information regarding the target population/beneficiaries, mode of delivery, relevant partnerships as well as information on how gender, disability inclusion and human rights aspects have been mainstreamed into the project.

Write your text over this to create the correct format and style.

Please enter the objective of the project(s)/programme(s) and all outcomes as per the project/programme document in the tables below. Please use one table per project/programme.

|  |
| --- |
| Project/programme title: XXXXXX |
| **Objective:**  |
| Outcome 1: Outcome 2: Outcome 3: Etc. |

|  |
| --- |
| Project/programme title: XXXXXX |
| **Objective:**  |
| Outcome 1: Outcome 2: Outcome 3: Etc. |

1. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

Please fill in below table and provide information on the evaluation purpose and scope.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Planned utilisation of the evaluation results[[3]](#footnote-4): |  |
| Main users of the evaluation results[[4]](#footnote-5): |  |
| Unit of analysis (full projects/segment/etc.) |  |
| Time period covered by the evaluation:  |  |
| Geographical coverage of the evaluation:  |  |

Please keep the below standard text as it is.

All findings and recommendations as well as the management response pertain solely to the UNODC project(s)/programme(s) being evaluated and is not in any way targeted to Member States, implementing partners or other entities that took part in this project/programme.

1. Evaluation criteria

Please keep the below standard text as it is.

The evaluation will be conducted based on the below selected relevant DAC criteria[[5]](#footnote-6). All evaluations must include gender, human rights, disability inclusion and no one left behind. Ideally these are mainstreamed within the evaluation questions. Moreover, the evaluation needs to identify lessons learned[[6]](#footnote-7) and good practices. The evaluation questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team in the drafting of the Inception Report.

**Note:** Please note that you are not obliged to address all seven criteria but only those that are most relevant to your needs for this evaluation While the evaluation must include the criterion of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and no one left behind, all other criteria are optional and dependent on the project/programme information needs. Consider which criteria are required to satisfy the purpose of the evaluation; take into consideration if this is a mid-term (formative) or a final (summative) evaluation; etc.

**Note:** Please **adapt the standard evaluation questions below to your information needs. Please do not exceed a total of 14 evaluation questions**. Please note that the evaluation questions should be worded in a gender-responsive manner, e.g. asking for sex-disaggregated information.

| Criteria | Evaluation question |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance[[7]](#footnote-8): Is the intervention doing the right thing? | To what extent has the project been relevant to stakeholder’s (e.g. governments, Member States, etc.) needs and priorities? To what extent was the project designed in a results-oriented, inclusive and participatory manner? To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Coherence[[8]](#footnote-9): How well does the intervention fit? | To what extent has the project delivered results in line with organisational, regional and international priorities? To what extent has the project established and maintained appropriate partnerships, including with UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Efficiency[[9]](#footnote-10): How well are resources being used? | To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?[[10]](#footnote-11) | To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective? What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of results?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Impact[[11]](#footnote-12): What difference does the intervention make? | To what extent did the project achieve societal changes? To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Sustainability[[12]](#footnote-13): Will the benefits last?  | To what extent are the benefits of the projects likely to continue after it ends?To what extent has local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders been achieved?Please write on top of this to add a new question |
| Human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind[[13]](#footnote-14): Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights based?  | To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?Please write on top of this to add a new question |

1. Evaluation METHODOLOGY

Please keep the below text as it is.

All evaluations of the United Nations system are guided by the principles of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind. Gender-sensitive and disability inclusive evaluation methods and gender-sensitive and disability inclusive data collection techniques are therefore essential to identify key gender issues, address marginalized, disabled, hard-to-reach and vulnerable population.

**The methods used to collect and analyse data**

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 that evaluation conclusions, findings, recommendations, and lessons learned are substantiated by evidence and based on sound data analysis and triangulation; as well as a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues. Special attention will be paid to: (i) ensuring that voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalised groups, such as people with disabilities are heard (including gender related and disaggregated data, (e.g. by age, sex, countries etc.); (ii) ensuring an **unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories**. 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 included. The evaluation team will be asked to present a dedicated methodology 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, guidance, tools and templates. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys and/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 stakeholders of the project/ programme. The final evaluation report as well as optionally the draft report will be externally independently assessed (facilitated by IES). Based on this assessment, the report may not be published if it does not meet minimum quality standards.

All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html>

1. TIME FRAME AND DELIVERABLES

| Evaluation stage | Start date[[14]](#footnote-15) (dd/mm/yy) | End date(dd/mm/yy) | Subsumed tasks, roles | Guidance / Process description |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Finalisation ToR (3-5 weeks) | Dd/mm/yy | Dd/mm/yy | Submit the ToRs to IES per email; upload revised ToR in Unite Evaluations and finalise draft ToR based on IES feedback; IES shares final draft with CLPs; PM to finalise ToR based on CLPs feedback.  | IES initiates the evaluation in Unite Evaluations; includes 1 week review by IES and 1 week review by CLPs; multiple revisions by PM based on IES and CLPs feedback; final clearance by IES; in parallel, consultation on evaluation team and outreach by PM and IES to qualified evaluators; identification of additional management arrangement (e.g. Evaluation Reference Group) may be proposed by IES. |
| Recruitment(3-4 weeks) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Consult with IES on potential evaluators; PM manages full recruitment process[[15]](#footnote-16) | Review and clearance of evaluators by IES before recruitment can be initiated by PM. **Note: please follow the usual process for recruiting international/national consultants.**  |
| Inception Report, incl. desk review(4-5 weeks) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Kick-off meeting with PM and evaluators; desk review by evaluators, followed by draft Inception Report; Review by IES; clearance of revised Final Inception Report by IES; logistical preparations by PM in consultation with evaluators for interviews and other data collection efforts. | Includes 1 week review and clearance by IES; IES participates in the kick-off meeting; engagement between IES, PM and evaluators as necessary.  |
| Data collection (incl. field missions)(4-6 weeks)[[16]](#footnote-17) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Field missions; observation; interviews; etc. by evaluators and IES (if applicable). | Coordination of data collection dates and logistics by PM; IES may participate in any data collection efforts, including interviews or field missions. |
| Data validation workshop (1 day) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Preliminary findings presentation to project staff  | Presentation/workshop with project staff to validate findings following data collection  |
| Analysis and draft report(4-6 weeks) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Data analysis and drafting of report by evaluators | Includes 1 week review by IES, followed by 1 week review by PM |
| dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Review by IES; review by PM; revision of draft report by evaluators |
| Draft report for CLP comments(1 week) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | CLPs review and provide comments to IES | CLP comments are compiled and shared by IES with evaluators  |
| Final report, evaluation brief, PowerPoint slides, and External Quality Assessment(1-2 weeks) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Revision by evaluators; Evaluation report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides are finalised by evaluators based upon feedback by IES and PM; external quality assessment of report; completion of MR and EFP by PM; editing/publishing of final report | Includes 1 week review and clearance by IES of Final Report and Brief and 1 week review by PM of Brief and PowerPoint slides; 1 week for external quality assessment facilitated by IES |
| Presentation (1 day) | dd/mm/yy | dd/mm/yy | Presentation organised by PM and IES jointly at key event within 4 weeks of finalisation of the evaluation. | Date of presentation of final results to be agreed between PM, IES and evaluators; IES to open the presentation together with Senior Manager of the project/programme under evaluation. |

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

1. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Kindly specify the number and the respective role of the evaluation team members (Evaluation Expert, Substantive Expert, international/national etc.). **Geographic as well as gender balanced teams are recommended**. Please note that the recommendation for an in-depth evaluation is at least three independent evaluators, i.e. one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project to be evaluated as well as one evaluation and human rights and gender equality expert.

IES proposes evaluators as well as reviews and, when suitable, clears the qualifications and experience of the proposed candidates to ensure that they meet the requirements as per the approved ToR, and that no potential conflicts of interest are observed.

Kindly note that IES is managing, supervising and quality assuring the evaluation process, including reviewing and approving the qualifications of the proposed candidates in terms of evaluation experience as required per the approved ToR.

However, all administrative processes for In-Depth Evaluations (IDEs), including recruitment of consultants, are managed directly by the project/programme team. The recruitment process of international, regional and/or national evaluators follows the official procedures established by the UNODC Human Resources and Management Services (HRMS) for consultants.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role | Number of consultants[[17]](#footnote-18) (national/international) | Specific expertise required[[18]](#footnote-19) |
| Evaluation Expert | 1 (international/national consultant) | Evaluation methodology |
| Substantive Expert | XXX (international/national consultant) | Expertise in XXX  |

Please keep the below text as it is.

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial and 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 evaluation team shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluation team member 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.

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations.

The payment will be made by deliverable and only once cleared by IES. Deliverables which do not meet UNODC and UNEG evaluation norms and standards will not be cleared by IES. 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 result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

1. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Please ensure that the full evaluation process is managed through Unite Evaluations (evaluations.unodc.org)[[19]](#footnote-20). All communication of preliminary, draft or final evaluation results needs to be reviewed and cleared by IES before dissemination.

Please carefully read the information below in order to be informed about your role during the evaluation process.

| Evaluation stage | Project Manager | IES | Evaluation team |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall | Provide management, administrative and logistical support to the evaluation process, as per IES’s tools, guidance and templates, in line with UNODC Evaluation Policy, UNEG Norms and Standards, and DMSPC Guidelines for evaluation. | Ensure the independence, participation, and quality of the evaluation process, as per UNODC Evaluation Policy, UNEG Norms and Standards, and DMSPC Guidelines for evaluation –including the review and approval of all evaluation deliverables. | Submit deliverables on time and meeting quality standards, as per IES’s tools, guidance and templates, in line with UNODC Evaluation Policy, UNEG Norms and Standards, and DMSPC Guidelines for evaluation. |
| ToR | Draft, submission per email to IES and subsequent uploading to Unite evaluations and finalising | Conversation with PM on evaluation scope, questions, etc. as needed; multiple rounds of comments |  |
| Identify stakeholders and CLPs | Share ToR with CLPs for comments (1 week)Collaborate with the PM in the identification of suitable evaluation team; reach out to evaluators as necessary. |
| Compile the desk review material |
| Identify, jointly with IES, potential evaluators and experts |
| Recruitment | Propose evaluators and experts after consultation with IES | Review & clear proposed evaluation team before recruitment process starts | Submit all required documentation for the selection and recruitment process |
| Administrative process and recruitment (in line with organisational rules and regulations for consultants) |
| Finalise the compilation of the desk review material |
| Inception Report | Engage with the evaluation team and provide all required information, documents, stakeholder lists, schedule kick-off meeting in consultation with IES; .  | Open the kick-off meeting, and provide relevant templates and guidance, review draft Inception Report in line with UNODC and UNEG norms and standards | Participate in kick-off meetingDraft Inception Report in line with UNODC templates and guidelines[[20]](#footnote-21) |
| Provide Final Inception Report  |
| Release payment once requested by IES | Clear Final Inception Report before any data collection can start |
| Data collection and analysis | All logistical arrangements for the evaluators and IES, if applicable, including travel arrangements, set-up of interviews as requested, note verbales, etc.  | Provide guidance on the evaluation process to the evaluation team and/or the project team, as needed; engage with the evaluation team on a regular basis, participate in evaluation team meetings, briefings, etc. as necessary and oversee data collection process. | Conduct an independent, participatory and high-quality data collection, ensuring that IES has full access to all primary and secondary data collected.  |
| Timely travel arrangements, payments of DSAs, etc.  | Implement the methods and tools developed in the Inception Report. |
| Participate in de-briefings, as necessary | Engage with Project Management to request further information and assistance as required.Conduct de-briefings to PM and IES, as necessaryConduct a preliminary findings workshop for validation with project staff |
|  | Provide further data, documents, stakeholders, etc. as requested by the evaluation team. | Conduct a thorough analysis to ensure triangulation of evidence.  |
| Draft report | Provide further information to evaluators as requested |  | Provide a high-quality draft report, in line with UNODC and UNEG N&S |
| Release payment, once draft report is cleared by IES | Review of the draft report  | Incorporate comments of IES and consider those of PM |
| 1 review of the draft report for factual errors, once cleared by IES | Initial clearance or rejection of draft report |
| Share draft report with CLPs (1 week) | Incorporate comments of CLPs. |
| Final report, Brief and Presentation | Complete Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan | Facilitation of external quality assessment of the report. | Finalise the report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides. |
| Review the 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides and organize a presentation of the results to internal and external stakeholders in consultation with IES | Final review by IES and either 1) clearance for publication or 2) non-clearance for publication if it does not meet UNODC & UNEG norms and standardsIES to consult with PM on the date and time of event and provide introductory remarks at final presentation  | Present the results as agreed with Project Management and as cleared by IES within 4 weeks of approval of the final evaluation report.  |
| Release all outstanding payments, as requested by IES | Clear all deliverables for payment, once they meet UNEG Norms and Standards and UNODC evaluation policy, templates and guidelines.  |
|  |
| Follow-up | Yearly update on the implementation of recommendations.  | Report on the implementation of recommendations to Member States and the Executive Director on an annual basis. |  |

ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCES FOR EVALUATORS



Terms of Reference

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | Evaluation Consultant (Evaluation Expert) |
| Organizational Section/Unit: | UNODC Independent Evaluation Section |
| Name and title Supervisor: | Ms. Katharina Kayser, Chief |
| Duty Station or Home-based: | Home-based with travel to (all places and (tentative) dates for travel should be specified. If there is no travel, only indicate Home-based) |
| Proposed period: | ……. to …… |
| Actual work time: | 55-70 working days  |
| Fee Range: | C[[21]](#footnote-22) |

1. Background of the assignment:

Please provide a short background of the project/programme to be evaluated in line with the same information as in the main body of the ToR. This should not exceed 1-2 paragraphs.

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

2. Purpose of the assignment:

Please provide a short information on the purpose of the assignment for the evaluator in line with the same information as in the main body of the ToR, including project title, project number and implementing UNODC office(s). This should not exceed 1-2 paragraphs.

The purpose of this assignment is to lead and conduct the in-depth evaluation of project/programme XXX, fully complying with the UNODC Evaluation requirements[[22]](#footnote-23), as well as the UN Evaluation Groups norms and standards.

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

3. Specific tasks to be performed by the Evaluation Expert:

The below text should be kept as it is. In case of changes, please indicate these in track changes.

Under the guidance and supervision of the Chief or the Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section at Headquarters (Vienna, Austria), the key responsibilities of the Evaluation Expert include:

* Conduct a desk review of relevant documents and engage with Project Management from the onset for requesting further documentation, etc.
* Develop the evaluation design, in line with requirements of the Inception Report template, with detailed method, tools and techniques that are gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive, generating information from and about men, women and other marginalized groups, as well as key gender, disability inclusion and human rights issues;
* Conduct a high-quality data collection phase, based on the approved Inception Report, by implementing all approved data collection tools and methods in an inclusive and participatory manner. Ensure that all requirements as per the approved Inception Report are met.
* Conduct a high-quality data analysis, including using related tools and software (e.g. NVivo), and ensure that IES has access to all raw data at any given point in time.
* Conduct a preliminary findings workshop for validation with project staff
* Ensure adherence to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates and the full evaluation terms of Reference (ToR) and participate in kick-off meeting;
* Lead and guide the independent evaluation team, having clear work plans developed and ensuring high-quality deliverables fully meeting UNODC evaluation norms and standards.
* Ensure that all deliverables mentioned in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner, and in line with the quality criteria checklist;
* Ensure that the identified IES focal point is fully informed of the evaluation process, is invited to all meetings of the evaluation team and has access to all collected data throughout the evaluation process.
* Provide various presentations/briefings throughout the evaluation process, as requested;
* Effectively coordinate and interact, throughout the entire evaluation process, with the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team. Request drafted inputs (and revisions of such) from the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team for all deliverables.

4. Expected tangible and measurable output(s)/deliverable(s):

The below text should be kept as it is., In case of changes, please indicate these in track changes.

The Evaluation Expert is responsible for the quality and timely submission of his/her specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English and have a clear, transparent and verifiable analysis process. The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or the Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (IES).

The Evaluation Expert will interact with the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team and IES throughout the entire evaluation process, requesting drafted inputs (and revisions of such) from the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team for all deliverables. The Evaluation Expert is responsible for the following deliverables:

* Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. This includes a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation matrix and limitations to the evaluation (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings). Submission to IES through *Unite Evaluations* for review and clearance and IES may share it with Project Management for a review of factual errors;
* Implement a high-quality data collection based on the instruments from the cleared Inception Report, ensuring that ethical considerations for evaluations in the UN are fully met;
* A detailed overview of data collection efforts (e.g. per email) with dates and times of field missions, number of stakeholders interviewed, survey respondents, etc.
* Implement a high-quality data analysis, ensuring that all evaluation results are based on triangulated evidence and that the standards for evaluation in the UN and at UNODC are fully met;
* Oral briefing of initial observations to project team and IES (if applicable);
* Conduct a preliminary findings workshop for validation with project staff;
* Draft report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. This also includes an analysis of the performance of the project to adequately address gender equality, disability inclusion as well as human rights issues, with concrete findings, conclusions and recommendations. Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance); A briefing on the draft report with project/programme management together with IES may also be organized. This will be based on discussion with IES and project/programme management.
* Revised draft report based upon comments received from the various consultative processes (IES, Project Management and Core Learning Partners), including full proof reading;
* Finalization of the Final Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. In addition, a 2-page evaluation brief and PowerPoint presentations on final evaluation results, including full proofreading and editing. Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance). Final presentations of evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders, as requested by IES. This may also include a separate briefing with IES.

According to UNODC rules and UNEG Norms and Standards, the Evaluation Expert shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation or supervision of any of the projects, programs or policies that he/she is evaluating and/or have benefited from the programme or project or theme under evaluation. The UNODC Independent Evaluation Section is the sole clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products. The Evaluation Expert must respect the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. IES can at any point in time change the evaluation type, process, structure or approach as needed.

5. Dates and details of deliverables/payments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverables | Outputs  | Total amount of working days  | To be accomplished by date |
| 1. | Inception Report (including desk review) | 15-17 |  |
| 2.  | Data collection (including field missions), preliminary findings workshop, data analysis and draft evaluation report | 35-45 |  |
| 3. | Final Evaluation Report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides (including full proof reading) and presentations of final evaluation results | 5-8 |  |

Payments will be made upon satisfactory completion and submission of outputs/deliverables as assessed by IES. Project Management is requested to release all payments within 5 working days after IES clearance.

The final evaluation report – as well as the draft report, if decided by IES - will be independently assessed by external evaluation experts and in case it does not meet UNEG norms and standards, it will not be published. The final rating may be attached to the report.

Please note that last payment must coincide with the end of the contract and must be identical to payment phases in the engagement of consultant/IC request. Please note that Project Management is responsible for all administrative processes around the recruitment of international/national consultants, including to release the payment after IES clearance.

6. Indicators to evaluate the Evaluation Expert’s performance

Timely, satisfactory and high-quality delivery of the abovementioned outputs as assessed by IES (in line with UNODC norms, standards, guidelines and templates as well as UNEG Standards and Norms).

7. Qualifications/expertise sought (required educational background, years of relevant work experience, other special skills or knowledge required)

* Advanced university degree (Master’s degree or equivalent) in ………………………………or related field is required. A first level university degree (Bachelor’s degree or equivalent) in similar fields in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.
* A minimum of 10 (ten) or 15 (fifteen) years professional technical experience in in the field of evaluation or related field, including a track record of conducting various types of evaluation at the international level, preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations is required;
* Experience in leading a team is required;
* Knowledge and experience of the UN System and in particular of UNODC is desirable;
* Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative methods is required;
* Experience in gender sensitive evaluation methodologies and analysis, and understanding of human rights, disability inclusion and ethical issues in relation to evaluation is desirable;
* Experience in presenting and communicating complex evaluation or research results in a structured manner (in reports, briefs, presentations, etc.) is required;
* English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this post, fluency in oral and written English is required. Knowledge of another official United Nations language is an advantage.



Terms of Reference

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | Evaluation Consultant (Substantive Expert) |
| Organizational Section/Unit: | UNODC Independent Evaluation Section |
| Name and title Supervisor: | Ms. Katharina Kayser, Chief |
| Duty Station or Home-based: | Home-based with travel to (all places and (tentative) dates for travel should be specified. If there is no travel, only indicate Home-based) |
| Proposed period: | ……. to …… |
| Actual work time: | 28-42 working days  |
| Fee Range: | C[[23]](#footnote-24) |

1. Background of the assignment:

Please provide a short background of the project/programme to be evaluated in line with the same information as in the main body of the ToR.

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

 2. Purpose of the assignment:

Please provide a short information on the purpose of the assignment for the evaluator in line with same information as in the main body of the ToR, including project title, project number and implementing UNIDC office(s)..

The purpose of this assignment is to lead and conduct the in-depth evaluation of project/programme XXX, fully complying with the UNODC Evaluation requirements[[24]](#footnote-25), as well as the UN Evaluation Groups norms and standards.

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

3. Specific tasks to be performed by the Substantive Expert:

The below text should be kept as it is., In case of changes, please indicate these in track changes.

Under the guidance and supervision of the Chief or the Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section at Headquarters (Vienna, Austria), the Substantive Expert, in close coordination and cooperation, will collaborate with the Evaluation Expert and the evaluation team throughout the entire evaluation process, and contribute to the following tasks:

* Provide substantive inputs in relation to the area of expertise to the whole evaluation process and to all deliverables, and participate in kick-off meeting;
* Contribute to a desk review of relevant documents, research products, etc.;
* Contribute, in particular with expert knowledge, to the development of the evaluation design, in line with requirements of the Inception Report template, with detailed method, tools and techniques that are gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive, generating information from and about men, women and other marginalized groups, as well as key gender, disability inclusion and human rights issues;
* Contribute to conducting a high-quality data collection phase, based on the approved Inception Report, by implementing all approved data collection tools and methods in an inclusive and participatory manner. Ensure that all requirements as per the approved Inception Report are met.
* Contribute to conducting a high-quality data analysis, including using related tools and software (e.g. NVivo), and ensure that IES has access to all raw data at any given point in time.
* Contribute to conducting a preliminary findings workshop for validation with project staff
* Contribute to ensuring adherence to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates and the full evaluation terms of Reference (ToR) and participate in kick-off meeting;
* Ensure that all deliverables mentioned in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner, and in line with the quality criteria checklist;
* Contribute to various presentations/briefings throughout the evaluation process, as requested;

4. Expected tangible and measurable output(s)/deliverable(s):

The below text should be kept as it is., In case of changes, please indicate these in track changes.

The Substantive Expert will be responsible for the quality and timely submission of his/her specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English, and have a clear, transparent and verifiable analysis process. The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or the Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section.

The Substantive Expert, in close coordination and cooperation, will collaborate with the Evaluation Expert and the evaluation team throughout the entire evaluation process, and contribute to the following tasks:

* Draft inputs in relation to the area of expertise to the inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. This includes a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation matrix and limitations to the evaluation (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings). Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail various rounds of comments). Revise inputs in relation to the area of expertise to required changes.
* Contribute to a high-quality data collection based on the instruments from the cleared Inception Report, ensuring that ethical considerations for evaluations in the UN are fully met;
* Contribute to an Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. This includes a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation matrix and limitations to the evaluation (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings). Submission to IES through *Unite Evaluations* for review and clearance and IES may share it with Project Management for a review of factual errors;
* Contribute to the implementation of a high-quality data collection based on the instruments from the cleared Inception Report, ensuring that ethical considerations for evaluations in the UN are fully met;
* Contribute to a detailed overview of data collection efforts (e.g. per email) with dates and times of field missions, number of stakeholders interviewed, survey respondents, etc.
* Contribute to implementing a high-quality data analysis, ensuring that all evaluation results are based on triangulated evidence and that the standards for evaluation in the UN and at UNODC are fully met;
* Contribute to an oral briefing of initial observations to project team and IES (if applicable);
* Contribute to conducting a preliminary findings workshop for validation with project staff;
* Draft inputs and contribute to a draft report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. This also includes an analysis of the performance of the project to adequately address gender equality, disability inclusion as well as human rights issues, with concrete findings, conclusions and recommendations. Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance); A briefing on the draft report with project/programme management together with IES may also be organized. This will be based on discussion with IES and project/programme management.
* Contribute to the revised draft report based upon comments received from the various consultative processes (IES, Project Management and Core Learning Partners), including full proof reading;
* Contribute to the finalization of the Final Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. In addition, a 2-page evaluation brief and PowerPoint presentations on final evaluation results, including full proofreading and editing. Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance). Contribute, as necessary, to the final presentations of evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders, as requested by IES. This may also include a separate briefing with IES.

According to UNODC rules and UNEG Norms and Standards, the Evaluation Expert shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation or supervision of any of the projects, programs or policies that he/she is evaluating and/or have benefited from the programme or project or theme under evaluation. The UNODC Independent Evaluation Section is the sole clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products. The Evaluation Expert must respect the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. IES can at any point in time change the evaluation type, process, structure or approach as needed.

5. Dates and details of deliverables/payments:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Output  | Total amount of working days  | To be accomplished by date |
| 1. | Inception Report (including desk review) | 8-12 |  |
| 2. | Data collection, analysis, preliminary findings workshop, and Draft Evaluation Report | 17-25 |  |
| 3. | Final Evaluations Report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides (including full proof reading)  | 3-5 |  |

Payments will be made upon satisfactory completion and submission of outputs/deliverables as assessed by IES. Project Management is requested to release all payments within 5 working days after IES clearance.

The final evaluation report – as well as the draft report, if decided by IES - will be independently assessed by external evaluation experts and in case it does not meet UNEG norms and standards, it will not be published. The final rating may be attached to the report.

Please note that last payment must coincide with the end of the contract and must be identical to payment phases in the engagement of consultant/IC request. Please note that Project Management is responsible for all administrative processes around the recruitment of international/national consultants, including to release the payment, after IES clearance.

6. Indicators to evaluate the Substantive Expert’s performance

Timely, satisfactory and high-quality delivery of the abovementioned outputs as assessed by IES (in line with UNODC norms, standards, guidelines and templates as well as UNEG Standards and Norms).

7. Qualifications/expertise sought (required educational background, years of relevant work experience, other special skills or knowledge required)

* Advanced university degree (Master’s degree or equivalent) in ………………………………………or related field is required. A first level university degree (Bachelor’s degree or equivalent) in similar fields in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.
* A minimum of 7 (seven), 10 (ten) or 15 (fifteen) years professional technical experience in …. (please add the most relevant substantive topic under evaluation) is required;
* Professional technical experience in the field of evaluation or related field, including a track record of conducting various types of evaluation at the international level, preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations is desirable;
* Experience in working in a team is required;
* Knowledge and experience of the UN System and in particular of UNODC is desirable;
* Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative methods is desirable;
* Knowledge of ………………………………………is desirable;
* Experience in gender sensitive evaluation methodologies and analysis, and understanding of human rights, disability inclusion and ethical issues in relation to evaluation is desirable;
* Experience in presenting and communicating complex evaluation or research results in a structured manner (in reports, briefs, presentations, etc.) is required;
* English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this post, fluency in oral and written English is required. Knowledge of another official United Nations language is an advantage.

ANNEX II: LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS FOR THE DESK REVIEW

The below table should be completed by the PM to contain all the necessary internal and external documents that the evaluation team will need to undertake for the desk review of the project/programme being evaluated. These documents should include e.g. project documents, organisational and strategic documents, progress reports, research, needs assessments, analyses, financial reports, minutes of meetings, etc.

Please ensure to include full document titles and their respective years of completion/publication.

Please however note that the list is only indicative and will be further refined by the evaluation team and additional documents and materials may be requested by the evaluation team in the evaluation process.

Please further note that the desk review list should include data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups.

|  |
| --- |
| Document – name |
| Project document |
| Full ToR of the project under evaluation |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| [UNOV/UNODC’s Strategy for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (2018-2021)](https://www.unodc.org/documents/Gender/Summary_UNOV-UNODC_Gender_Strategy.pdf) |
| [UNODC Strategy 2021-2025](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/strategy/index.html) |

## UNODC EVALUATION DOCUMENTS AND TEMPLATES

* [UNODC evaluation guidelines, templates, handbook, policy](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html)
* [Evaluation Inception Report Template](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Tools/Evaluation_Inception_Report_Template_IDE.docx)
* [Evaluation Report Template](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Tools/Evaluation_Report_Template_IDE.docx)
* [Evaluation Brief Template](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Tools/Evaluation_Brief_Template_IDE.docx)
* [Evaluation Quality Assessment Template](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/external-evaluation-quality-assessments.html)
* [Gender-Responsive Evaluations in the Work of UNODC (2018)](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/HumanRights-GenderEquality/Gender-Responsive_Evaluations_at_UNODC_Guiding_Document.pdf)
* [UNODC Gender Guidance for Project Managers](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/HumanRights-GenderEquality/Evaluation_Gender_Mainstreaming_Guidance_Project_Managers.pdf) and [Evaluators](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/HumanRights-GenderEquality/Evaluation_Gender_Mainstreaming_Guidance_Evaluators.pdf)
* IES Guidance for inclusive evaluations
* [UNODC Toolkit for Evaluating Interventions on Preventing and Countering Crime and Terrorism](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Tools/UNODC_Toolkit_for_Evaluating_Interventions_on_Preventing_and_Countering_Crime_and_Terrorism.pdf)
* [UNEG: Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616)
* [UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)](https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/evaluation/UNEG-Norms-Standards-for-Evaluation-2016.pdf)

ANNEX III: LIST OF CORE LEARNING PARTNERS (CLPs) AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS

**Please select from all key stakeholders, up to 15 Core Learning Partners**. These CLPs should represent all key stakeholders that are expected to be directly involved with the evaluation process by providing feedback to key evaluation deliverables (i.e. to the draft evaluation report) and/or participating in the evaluation results reporting session. Key stakeholders included in the list of CLPs typically represent categories such as donors, partners, beneficiaries, other UN entities, as well as key UNODC staff at HQ and the field other than project staff.

Please note that the CLPs should represent a balance of men, women and other under-represented groups.

## LIST OF CLPs

| Type[[25]](#footnote-26) | Organisation[[26]](#footnote-27) | Name | Designation[[27]](#footnote-28) | Location | Email |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UNODC HQ/FO | UNODC | XX | Head/Chief/Regional Representative (responsible for the project/programme) |  |  |
| Key UNODC HQ staff | UNODC | XX |  |  |  |
| Key donor(s) | XX | XX |  |  |  |
| Key UN agency/partner |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key partner |  |  |  |  |  |

Please include a comprehensive fully detailed list of all relevant stakeholders (excluding CLPs), 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).

Please, also include if possible any potential stakeholders that may be identified among entities with no previous engagement with the project, but whose future engagement, if possible, is deemed relevant and/or expected.

**Note:** The list of stakeholders will be further refined by the evaluation team, in consultation with project/programme management and IES. The evaluation team may also request interviews with other additional, relevant stakeholders.

## LIST OF NON-CLP STAKEHOLDERS

| Type**[[28]](#footnote-29)** | Organisation**[[29]](#footnote-30)** | Name | Designation**[[30]](#footnote-31)** | Location | Email | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Donors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner organisations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recipients |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Member States |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beneficiaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NGOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Including fees for evaluation team, travel (incl. IES staff as required), printing, editing, translation, interpretation, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Please note that the recommendation for any UNODC In-Depth Evaluation is at least two independent evaluators, i.e. one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project/programme to be evaluated. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. e.g. inform the future development of the project/programme or similar projects/programmes, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project/programme etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. e.g. senior management, programme management, stakeholders, beneficiaries, donors etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. The extent to which the project/programme has mainstreamed human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups, including those with disabilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Required preparations before the start: completed ToR; 1 week review of ToR by the Core Learning Partners; finalised ToR based upon comments received; clearance by IES; assessment of qualified evaluation team candidates; clearance by IES; recruitment (Vienna HR for international consultants requiring a minimum of 2 weeks; UNDP for national consultants which may take up to several weeks); desk review materials compiled. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Please follow the official recruitment process for international, regional or national consultants at UNODC. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Data collection is currently likely to take longer than usual due to competing priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries due to COVID-19. Data collection phase may imply on-line interviews, surveys etc instead of travel/face-to-face interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 1 independent evaluator – the Evaluation Expert – and at least one Substantive Expert. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. The Unite Evaluations user manual for Project Managers is available [here](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Unite-Evaluations/Unite_Evaluations_User_Manual_for_Programme_Managers.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Please refer to ST/AI/2013/4 Annex III for further information on the fee range. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Please refer to ST/AI/2013/4 Annex III for further information on the fee range. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Please include the information, if this person is e.g. an implementing partner, donor, recipient, UNODC HQ, UNODC field, UN agency, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Please include the name of the organisation the person is working for. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Please include the designation/job title of the person. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Please include the information, if this person is e.g. an implementing partner, donor, recipient, UNODC HQ, UNODC field, UN agency, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Please include the name of the organisation the person is working for. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Please include the designation/job title of the person. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)