TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANCY
For the evaluation of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy (GGCRS) implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>External vacancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
<td>Evaluation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Environment and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Station:</td>
<td>Kigali, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract:</td>
<td>Individual Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected starting date:</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of assignment:</td>
<td>26 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background and Context
In 2011, Rwanda introduced the national Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy (GGCRS). This groundbreaking policy document now guides the country’s sustainable development agenda and response to climate change. Since that time, the Government of Rwanda has taken a number of steps to integrate green growth into policy making and planning as well as institutional development. This guiding policy document is planned up to 2050.

Rwanda is now embarking on the next stage of its development through the National Strategy for Transformation, and the GGCRS will be central to achieving the goals of the strategy.

The Ministry of Environment is coordinating the implementation of the GGCRS, and the strategy is being implemented by a number of institutions and organizations to achieve greater environmental and climate change resilience, mainly through Programmes of Actions within the GGCRS and monitored by their indicators.

Here below are the Programmes of Actions being implemented under the GGCRS;

1. Sustainable intensification of small scale farming
2. Agricultural diversity for local and export markets
4. Sustainable Land Use Management and Planning
5. Low carbon mix of power generation for national grid  
6. Sustainable small-scale energy installations in rural areas  
7. Green industry and private sector investment  
8. Climate compatible mining  
9. Efficient resilient transport systems  
10. Low carbon urban settlements  
11. Ecotourism, Conservation and PES Promotion  
12. Sustainable forestry, agro-forestry and biomass energy  
13. Disaster Management and Disease Prevention  
14. Climate data and projections

As the Second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II) is approaching its end, the Ministry of Environment together with UNDP aims to evaluate the implementation of the GGCRS by different partners and government institutions. The results of the evaluation will facilitate in orienting the strategy implementation into the upcoming NST-1.

One UN Rwanda is looking for an individual consultant to undertake the evaluation of the GGCRS implementation since its launch in 2011 up to the end of the EDPRS II.

2. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation
The GGCRS implementation evaluation is a backward looking and will effectively capture lessons learnt and provide information and guidance on the future implementation of the strategy.

The evaluation will assess the way GGCRS has been used to inform the EDPRS and other planning documents, relevance of the indicators set for the Programmes of Actions, relevance of the sectors implementing the Programmes of Actions, and the way it has contributed to the achievement of the outcomes. This will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the next phase of the implementation during the NST-1.

The main objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Assess the level of GGCRS implementation and achievement by the sectors and other stakeholders
- Assess the proposed Programmes of Actions (PoA) against the proposed implementers
- Assess the relevance of the indicators proposed under each PoA
- Analyse the GGCRS implementation monitoring systems
- Assess the alignment of the GGCRS indicators against the SDG, NDCs and SSPs indicators
- Assess future GGCRS implementation strategy
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
- Document lessons learnt;
- Inform to facilitate the design of the monitoring targets of the upcoming NST-1

The lessons learnt will outline what went well and what did not, and serve as a guide for implementation and monitoring of the GGCRS in the future.
The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders in the Government of Rwanda, including the Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), Rwanda Meteorology Agency, FONERWA, Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM), Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry (MINAGRI), Ministry of Land and Forestry (MINILAF), Ministry of Disaster Management (MIDIMAR), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), as well as the Private Sector Federation (PSF), UNDP, GGGI and others partaking in the GGCRS implementation.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the level of the GGCRS implementation by the government sectors and other stakeholders since its approval by the cabinet in 2011 until the end of the EDPRS II. Implementation of all the 14 PoAs will be assessed and evaluated together with their indicators.

4. Methodology

General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. UNDP’s Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among the strategy implementing staff, the evaluator and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluator, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives.

The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Further data on the GGCRS PoA indicators will be used by the evaluation to assess the GGCRS progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of GGCRS Document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of High Level Policy Dialogue and compiled Status reports);
(ii) Interviews with the implementing Focal Points of the institutions, and high-level officials from implementing and coordinating institutions
(iii) Interviews with One UN officials and other partners involved in the implementation and coordination of the strategy
(iv) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders
5. Deliverables
This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluator will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:

- **Evaluation inception report**: An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the implementing unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with UNDP and MoE. **(Timeline: 1 week after signing the contract)**

- **Draft evaluation report**: Submission of draft evaluation report to UNDP for comments and inputs. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will then review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.

- **Presentation of Draft evaluation report (PPT presentation)** to the beneficiaries for inputs and comments.

- **Final evaluation report**: The final report should be completed **1 week after receipt of consolidated comments from stakeholders.**

6. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies
The Individual consultant should have the following skills/competencies and characteristics:

- At least Master’s degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences or related area;
- At least 7 years accumulated experience in strategy implementation evaluation;
- At least 10 years accumulated experience in Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategies related formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;
- Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of green growth and Climate Resilience initiatives;
- Experience in at least two similar assignments
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-right based approach and environmental sustainability concepts;
- Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English; working knowledge of French an advantage
Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:

1. The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%.

2. A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and compared. Only proposals that achieve at least 49 points (i.e. at least 70% of the total 70 points) on the technical proposal shall have their financial proposals reviewed.

3. Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)

4. If the technical proposal achieves at least 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial proposal will be considered in the following manner:

5. The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees;

   e.g. [30 Points] x [US$ lowest]/ [US$ other] = points for other proposer’s fees.

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal which will be ultimately weigh 70% of the overall evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least master’s degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences;</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 7 years accumulated experience in strategy documents implementation evaluation;</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of green growth and Climate Resilience initiatives;</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Methodology (clear demonstration of evaluation methodology and understanding of the ToR)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10 years experience in Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategies related formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in written and verbal English; knowledge of French an advantage</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How to apply
Candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

(i) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

(ii) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects as well as the contact details (e-mail and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

(iii) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology, if applicable, on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment

(iv) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

All interested applicants should submit the above to UNDP CO Rwanda by emailing procurement.rw@undp.org. Application deadline:.......... of.......... 2018

8. Evaluation Ethics
The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation‘. The critical issues evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation include evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, (for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality)

9. Implementation Arrangements
This section describes the organization and management structure for the evaluation and defines the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

**UNDP**
UNDP is responsible for the management of the final evaluation and will contract an independent consultant to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. UNDP will be the focal point for the evaluation and will facilitate the logistical requirements and provide technical assistance during all phases of the evaluation process, including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

**UNDP Programme focal point**

---

1UNGEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation‘. Available at [www.uneval.org/ethicalguidelines](http://www.uneval.org/ethicalguidelines)
Day-to-day management of the Evaluator will be provided by UNDP programme focal point as well as the Focal Point of the Ministry of Environment (MoE) overseeing the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy. They will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluator, including payments, are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluator. They will provide all documentation to the Evaluator for the desk review, set up interview appointments, coordinate field visits, and convene focus group meetings.

Evaluation Management Team
An Evaluation Management Team led by UNDP composed of a representative of MoE, UNDP Environment Head of Unit and GGCRS focal point will oversee the conduct of the evaluation at the technical level. The team will provide quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria. The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, ensure wide stakeholder consultations, will be in charge of verifying all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final report and the drafting and implementation of follow up actions.

10. Time Frame for the Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks and deliverables</th>
<th>Time-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review and Inception report phase</td>
<td>• Desk review conducted</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefings of evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators detailing the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultations and Interviews</td>
<td>• The evaluator will consult with all relevant stakeholders and conduct a series of interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits in order to collect the required data.</td>
<td>15 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data and drafting report</td>
<td>• Once the data is collected, the evaluator will analyse them and draft the evaluation report.</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting</td>
<td>• Once the draft final evaluation report submitted, it will be presented to all stakeholders for reviewing. The comments shared by the stakeholders will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>• The evaluator will revise the final evaluation report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP.</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of working days</td>
<td>26 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Financial Proposal and Schedule of Payments
The consultancy fee will be paid as a Lump Sum (inclusive of all expenses related to the consultancy), and will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components of the consultancy. The consultancy fee will be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

- 30% after presentation and adoption of the inception report
- 30% after presentation and approval of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final report

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and person with disabilities are equality encouraged to apply. All applicants will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Approved by: Mr. Stephen Rodriques,
UNDP Country Director

Signature: .................................................................
### Annex 1: Key stakeholders and partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatina MUKARUBIBI</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmukarubibi@environment.gov.rw">fmukarubibi@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Hodari</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodari@environment.gov.rw">jhodari@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Kayumba</td>
<td>Green Economy Joint Programme Specialist</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TKAYUMBA@environment.gov.rw">TKAYUMBA@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent Musabyimana</td>
<td>SPIU Coordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imusabyimana@environment.gov.rw">imusabyimana@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Bonishuli</td>
<td>Transport SWAp Engineer</td>
<td>MININFRA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clay.bonishuli@mininfra.gov.rw">clay.bonishuli@mininfra.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent Bisangwa</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change Specialist</td>
<td>MINAGRI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:innocentbisangwa@gmail.com">innocentbisangwa@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niyonzima Steaven</td>
<td>Coordinator for RRECPC</td>
<td>MINICOM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:niyosteve12@gmail.com">niyosteve12@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonse Hishamunda</td>
<td>Ag. Director, Disaster Risk Reduction &amp; Preparedness</td>
<td>MIDIMAR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hialph@yahoo.fr">hialph@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesphore Ngoga</td>
<td>In charge of Conservation</td>
<td>RDB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Telesphore.ngoga@rdb.rw">Telesphore.ngoga@rdb.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy Kyazze</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Planning</td>
<td>MININFRA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eddyunited@yahoo.com">eddyunited@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nyanvumba</td>
<td>Principal Senior Engineer Energy, Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>MININFRA (Energy)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rnyavumba@edcl.reg.rw">rnyavumba@edcl.reg.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Ntare</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>FONERWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:b.ntare@fonerwa.gov">b.ntare@fonerwa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mugabo</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>REMA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmugabo@rema.gov.rw">pmugabo@rema.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain Ntenge</td>
<td>Director of</td>
<td>Rwanda Mining,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alainjos2@gmail.com">alainjos2@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MININFRA*: Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Housing

*MINAGRI*: Ministry of Agriculture

*MINICOM*: Ministry of Communication, Information and Innovation

*FONERWA*: Rwanda Environmental Research and Water Authority

*REMA*: Rwanda Environment Monitoring and Assessment Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Unit</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Marie Christine Gasingirwa</td>
<td>DG, Science, Technology and Research, Ministry of Education, MINEDUC/UR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgasingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw">cgasingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Biraro</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Specialist, MINILAF/Land</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sambiraro@yahoo.com">Sambiraro@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Beth Kaplin</td>
<td>Acting Director, Center of Excellence in Biodiversity &amp; Natl Res Management (CoEB), Rwanda, MINEDUC/UR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bkaplin@antioch.edu">bkaplin@antioch.edu</a> <a href="mailto:bkaplin@ur.ac.rw">bkaplin@ur.ac.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Rurangwa</td>
<td>Director of Forest Extension and Ecosystem Management Unit, MINILAF/Forestry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rurangwafelix@gmail.com">rurangwafelix@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois Tetero</td>
<td>Deputy DG, MoE/IWRM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fteterov@yahoo.fr">fteterov@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Twahirwa</td>
<td>Division Manager, Weather, Climate Services and Application, MoE/METEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twahirwa_anthony@yahoo.com">twahirwa_anthony@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Rodrigues</td>
<td>UNDP Country Director</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardin Uzayisaba</td>
<td>OIC, Poverty Reduction and Environment Unit, UNDP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bernardin.uzayisaba@undp.org">bernardin.uzayisaba@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Kwon</td>
<td>Programme Officer, UNDP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jaaeun.kwon@undp.org">Jaaeun.kwon@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Tillberg</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer, UNDP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gabrielle.tillberg@undp.org">Gabrielle.tillberg@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Documents to be consulted

The list below details the important documents that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. The list might include other relevant documents identified during the inception phase and the consultation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiled annual reports from PoAs Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting minutes for the High Level Policy Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAP 2013-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Strategic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Strategy for Transformation (NST – 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3: Evaluation matrix

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

The draft sample evaluation Matrix to be used by the evaluators is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample evaluation matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4: Evaluation report format

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports:

1. **Title and opening pages** - Should provide the following basic information:
   - Name of the evaluation intervention
   - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
   - Countries of the evaluation intervention
   - Names and organizations of evaluator
II. **Table of contents** - Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

III. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**

IV. **Executive summary** - A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

V. **Introduction**
- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

VI. **Description of the intervention**—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:
- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to national priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other strategies or country specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of strategy implementation) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic, weak indicators) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

VII. **Evaluation scope and objectives**—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- Evaluation scope: The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- Evaluation objectives: The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- Evaluation criteria: The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions: Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

VIII. **Evaluation approach and methods**—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- **Performance standards**—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- **Stakeholder engagement**—Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- **Ethical considerations**—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).
- **Background information on evaluators**—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- **Major limitations of the methodology**—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

**IX. Data analysis**—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

**X. Findings and conclusions**—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- **Findings**—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the strategy document that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- **Conclusions**—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

**XI. Recommendations**—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and recommend on the future implementation of the GGCRS by the Sectors.
XII. **Lessons learned**—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

XIII. **Report annexes**—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Strategy results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

**Annex 5: Code of conduct**

*Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System*