

## Annex 1

### Terms of Reference

#### Independent Evaluation of the “Supporting the Yearly Trainings Program of the Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMP)” project

#### Background

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges.
2. UNITAR’s first Strategic Objective calls to “Promote peace and just and inclusive societies”. The sub-objective SO 1.1 “Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace” focuses on increasing institutions and individuals’ capacities to prevent and resolve violent conflicts, restore the rule of law, and build lasting peace. Special focus is placed on strengthening knowledge and skills of women as change agents in conflict analysis, negotiation and mediation; and strengthening engagement of men and boys as agents of change in efforts to work towards ending sexual and gender-based violence and reducing the stigmatization.
3. Since 2016 UNITAR has been implementing projects to strengthen the capacities of the [Ecole Maintien de la Paix "Alioune Blondin Bèye"](#) (EMPABB) or in collaboration with EMPABB through four distinct phases of the project:
  - “Sustaining Peace in Mali and the Sahel region through strengthening regional Peacekeeping training capacities” (2017-2019, implemented in two phases);
  - “Strengthening Operational Capabilities of Francophone Police Contributing Countries” (2020);
  - “Strengthening Operational Capabilities of Police Contributing Countries” (2021); and, the current project phase
  - “Supporting the Yearly Trainings Program of the Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMP)” (2022).
4. The project’s 2022 phase aimed to strengthen the impact of peace operations (UN and non-UN) by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient preparation of deployed personnel. It planned to reinforce the Ecole de Maintien de la Paix "Alioune Blondin Bèye" (EMPABB) to host training of African personnel (men and women) deploying to UN and non-UN operations. The training center aimed to consider the specific needs of female personnel, complement the activities of existing centers in the region, and act as reference for high-impact training.<sup>1</sup>
5. By leveraging on the experience acquired by UNITAR working with EMPABB since 2017, the 2022 project aims at:

---

<sup>1</sup> High-impact training is based in six principles: i) performance, ii) human-centeredness; iii) innovation; iv) transformation; v) inclusivity; vi) interactivity; and vii) sustainability.

Long term outcome of the project:

- Expanded access to high-impact training for personnel (men and women) in (West) Africa.

Short-term outcomes of the project:

- Increased accessibility to the regional training center.
- Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact training.
- Strengthened capabilities and motivation of personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments.

The project will entail the following components:

- Review of the internal operating framework of EMPABB (including overall environment; culture; strategy; structure; systems; people; inputs and resources; outputs and performance; and considering cultural and gender aspects), based on which a medium-term strategy will be developed, in line with the UNITAR strategic framework.
  - Establishment of a roster of certified trainers – temporarily or permanently associated with EMPABB- in line with UNITAR quality standards.
  - Delivery of pre-deployment training of African personnel in preparation for UN assignments.
  - Delivery of training on cross-cutting topics of Malian and ECOWAS Member States representatives (at EMPABB or through mobile training teams).
6. By reinforcing the capacities of EMPABB to host training of African personnel and by stressing the importance of coordination with relevant stakeholders, the project contributes to the harmonization and standardization of training, which in turn is expected to have a positive impact on performance in the field.
7. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Evaluation Policy. The evaluation shall also build on two independent evaluations undertaken of the earlier phases of the project (click [here](#) for the evaluation of phase I and [here](#) for phase II and III). Lessons from the evaluation shall not only inform possible future phases of the project but also be of use for similar projects in other countries.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

8. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; to identify good practices as well as any challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation's purpose is thus to meet accountability requirements, and provide findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project's improvement, strategic direction, and broader organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the project has performed, but also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results.
9. While the evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria and gender, disability and human rights, and environmental considerations, the evaluation's emphasis will be placed on assessing the impact of the intervention, which may include an assessment of the impacts from the 2017-2019 and 2020-2021 phases without duplicating the findings from the earlier evaluations. In addition to serving as accountability function, the evaluation's purpose is also to be as forward-looking as possible to inform strategic decisions on the design and planning of possible future

phases and focus areas of this or similar projects, with emphasis on institutional assessment and support.

### Scope of the evaluation

10. The evaluation will cover the project's phase IV (April 2022 to December 2022). Although the scope of the evaluation does not include the previous project phases (2017-2019 and 2020-2021) also funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, the evaluator should take the other into account when framing the evaluation's findings and conclusions. In addition to assessing the results achieved from 2022 with a particular focus on the impact criterion, the evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases or the development of similar projects under the PDTA programming, with particular focus on institutional assessment and support.

### Evaluation criteria

11. The evaluation will assess project performance using the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation questions related to gender equality and the empowerment of women dimensions are marked with "GEEW". Questions related to environmental sustainability are marked with "ENVSUSE". Disability and human rights considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.

- **Relevance:** *Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
- **Coherence:** *To what extent is the project coherent with relevant policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?*
- **Effectiveness:** *How effective has the project been in delivering results and in increasing accessibility to the regional training center, strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact training and strengthened capabilities and motivation of personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments?*
- **Efficiency:** *To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?*
- **Likelihood of Impact:** *What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes? (This criterion shall be considered the focus of this evaluation)*
- **Likelihood of Sustainability:** *To what extent are the project's results likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?*

### Principal evaluation questions

12. The following questions are suggested to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project's future orientation. The focus of the evaluation shall be on the impact criterion and the questions falling under it.

#### Relevance

- a. *To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute's efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the UNITAR strategic framework (2022-2025), and particularly SO 1.1. and SDG 16?*

- b. To what extent is the project aligned with UN and international frameworks in the peace and security area, including the 2017 Report on [“Improving Security of United Nations Peacekeepers”](#) (“Cruz Report”), the [Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing](#), the [UNSC Resolution 2242 \(2015\) on Women and Peace](#), the [Policy on United Nations Police \(2014\)](#) and the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda, the Call to Action for Human Rights, the SG’s Data Strategy, the Behavioural Science Guidance Note and the Human Rights Due Diligence Policy and the (2018) [report on Forced Police Unit Command Staff Training Needs Assessment](#)?<sup>2</sup> How well does the project align to environmental frameworks, e.g., Blue Marble principles? (**ENVSUSE**)
- c. How relevant are the project components (i.e., operating framework, trainer roster, pre-deployment and cross-cutting training delivery) to the needs and priorities identified at EMPABB, including related to human resources, skills needed, type of training or mentoring required to be able to deliver on its mandate?
- d. How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the peace and security field? (**GEEW**)

*Note: In order to avoid repetition and duplication, it is recommended to consult the previous independent evaluation report as with regards to the relevance criteria related questions that may apply equally to the 2021 phase and 2022 phase.*

### **Coherence**

- e. How well does the project complement other UNITAR programming in the area of pre-deployment training funded by the same or other donors, including those aiming at strengthening the deployment-related training offerings of training centers in the African continent, e.g., Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces in East Africa or the KAITPC in Ghana (West Africa)? How well is the project building on results from the previous three phases?
- f. How well is the project aligned with UNITAR standards for training of trainers?
- g. How well does the project complement and foster synergies with other existing capacity building programmes and projects by other actors, such as training by the Department of Peace Operations (DPO) once personnel is being deployed, training delivered by other national or regional centres, the Regional Conflict Research Center (CARESS) Master programmes for Malian and other ECOWAS Member States participants, the funding provided by Germany to EMPABB through other means, the European Union Training Mission (EUTM / MLI), the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (IAPTC) and work from the German political foundations Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES)?

### **Effectiveness**

- h. To what extent did the project achieve planned outputs and outcomes? What are the factors positively or negatively affecting the project’s, organisation’s and the individual’s performance?
- i. To what extent was the institutional support provided by UNITAR to the internal operating framework of EMPABB effective?
- j. Have the project’s structure and partnerships been effective, including the performance of the implementing partner EMPABB?
- k. How well do the project pre-deployment activities complement further national induction and in-mission training?

<sup>2</sup> A non-exhaustive list of relevant frameworks is included in Annex C.

- l. To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disabilities and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project, including in the design and delivery of training events? (GEEW)*
- m. How effective were the training events delivered by previously certified EMPABB trainers?*
- n. To what extent have certified trainers delivered gender sensitive training? (GEEW)*
- o. To what extent have recommendations from previous independent evaluations been taken into account/implemented?*
- p. To what extent is environmental sustainability taken into account when designing the internal operating framework of EMPABB, when designing the pre-deployment training, etc.? (ENVSUSE)*

**Efficiency**

- q. To what extent has the project been able to link to other initiatives and collaborated with UN DPO, ECOWAS member states as well as EMPABB's Governing Board members?*
- r. To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through partnership arrangements (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)? Were the project's resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?*
- s. How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been? (ENVSUSE)*

**Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact (the following questions shall be considered the focus of this evaluation)**

- t. To what extent has the project contributed to expanded access to high-impact training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in Africa?*
- u. To what extent and how is the project contributing to increased accessibility to the regional training center, strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact training and strengthened capabilities and motivation of personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments?*
- v. What real difference does the project make to the role of female participants and trainers? (GEEW)*
- w. To what extent has the project strengthened EMPABB's capacities and the autonomy of trainers?*
- x. What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred or are likely to occur?*

**Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability**

- y. To what extent are the project's results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term and under which conditions?*
- z. To what extent did the institutional support provided by UNITAR contribute to the sustainability of the project?*
- aa. What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability, of the project and can be mitigated by project stakeholders?*
- bb. To what extent are the current design and exit strategies likely to contribute to sustained capacity of EMPABB?*
- cc. To what extent can the approach be replicated elsewhere?*
- dd. What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming, particularly in the area of institutional assessment and support?*



### **Gender equality and women empowerment (GEEW)**

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with “**GEEW**” in the above. Disability considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.

### **Environmental Sustainability in Evaluation (ENVSUSE)**

The evaluation questions with the evaluation sustainability dimension are marked with “**ENVSUSE**” in the above.

### **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

13. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy, the operational guidelines for independent evaluations](#) and the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation, and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#). The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME). PPME shall support the evaluation team in gathering background documentation and other data collection processes.
14. In order to maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project partners, the UN Country Teams, the participants, the donor and other stakeholders. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; review of the log frame (reconstructed) baseline data and the theory of change; key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.
15. It is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
  - **Individual dimension** relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
  - **Organizational dimension** relates to public and private organizations, civil society organizations, and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
  - **Enabling environment dimension** refers to the context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

**Table 1: Capacity areas within the three dimensions**

<b>Individual</b>	Skills levels (technical and managerial skills) Competencies	Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence, Professional identity, Norms, Values, Intentions, Emotions, Environmental barriers and enablers with specific focus on gender and disability inclusion (among others)
<b>Organizations</b>	Mandates	Organizational priorities

	Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms Motivation and incentive systems Strategic leadership Inter/intra institutional linkages Programme management Multi-stakeholder processes	Gender and disability inclusion Processes, systems and procedures Human and financial resources Knowledge and information sharing Infrastructure
<b>Enabling environment</b>	Policy and legal framework Political commitment and accountability framework Governance	Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power Legal, policy and political environment

16. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

**Suggested data collection methods:**

*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C. If baseline data available allows for it, the evaluator should consider using quantitative approaches to assess the impact assessment related evaluation questions.

The evaluator should also consider whether [Outcome mapping / Outcome harvesting / outcome evidencing, process tracing, contribution analysis, episode study, or other theory-based approaches to evaluate outcomes](#), are suitable tools for answering the evaluation questions.

*Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

- Implementing and beneficiary partner institutions in Mali (EMPABB);
- The donor (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany);
- Other partners such as DPO;
- Beneficiaries/participants (trainers and participants);
- UNITAR and EMPABB trainers;
- IPOs, FPU, project consultants serving as expert trainers/facilitators;
- UN Country Teams;
- Host (local and national) governments;
- UNITAR project implementation team (local coordinator based in Mali, operations officer, learning solutions specialist, technical advisor, monitoring and evaluation specialist).
- Etc.

### *Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

### *Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of contacts is available in Annex A. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level.

### *Focus groups*

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the local levels to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

### *Field visit*

A field visit for interviews and focus groups with logistical support from Project Management shall be organised to Mali. A combination of field visits with another ongoing evaluation may be considered.

Observation may also prove useful if activities are being implemented simultaneously to the local field visit.

17. The evaluation shall look for synergies and benefit from the evaluation undertakings of the projects “Training and Advanced Training of West African Security Forces” and “Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces”, taking place in parallel. PPME will be liaising with the evaluation teams and schedule joint meetings that allow for exchange.

## **Gender and human rights**

18. The evaluator should incorporate [human rights](#), [gender](#), [disability](#), and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, country status/classification, disability, and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on **gender equality**.
19. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow **ethical** and professional standards ([UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#)).

## **Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

20. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from November 2022 (initial desk review and evaluation design) to June 2023 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.



21. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.
22. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
23. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex D. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.
24. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex G by 2 May 2023. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 29 May 2023. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

## Indicative timeframe: November 2022 – June 2023

Activity	November 2022	December 2022	January 2023	February 2023	March 2023	April 2023	May 2023	June 2023
Evaluator selected and recruited								
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis								
Evaluation design/question matrix								
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit								
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR								
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management								
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned								
Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations								
Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management								
Dissemination and publication								

### Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline*
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	9 December 2022
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	16 December 2022
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	10 April 2023
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	24 April 2023
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	2 May 2023
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	To be defined
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	15 May 2023
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	29 May 2023
Dissemination and publication of report	Evaluation manager		June 2023

\*To be adjusted depending on the contract signature and to be agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager.

**OPTIONAL:** A reference group is considered a good practice in independent evaluations. Members of the reference group could be a representative from project management, from the donor and several representatives from the implementing partners for example. These stakeholders would then be included throughout the evaluation phases and would e.g., be able to provide comments on the draft report.

### Communication/dissemination of results

25. The evaluation report shall be written in English with the Executive Summary both in English and French. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

### Evaluation management arrangements

26. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) ('evaluation manager').

27. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

28. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g., accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

## Evaluator Ethics

29. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

## Professional requirements

30. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, peace and conflict studies, evaluation, or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, including training of trainers approaches and in areas related to peacekeeping and police training.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building or peace and security thematic evaluations. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of peacekeeping related topics, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts to develop policing capacities in broader peacekeeping missions. Knowledge of or experience in institutional assessments/support.
- Field work experience in Africa, especially West Africa.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in oral and written French and English.

PPME may also hire a team of up to two evaluators (local and international) or an evaluator (team leader, evaluation methodological approach) and a subject matter expert (team member, training and contextual expertise).

- **Annexes:**
  - A. List of contact points**
  - B. Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
  - C. List of documents and data to be reviewed**
  - D. Structure of evaluation report**
  - E. Project logical framework**
  - F. Audit trail**
  - G. Evaluator code of conduct**

## **Annex A: List of contact points**

### **Project Management to complete as no contacts available on EMS**

- Implementing Partner EMPABB : Point focal, Baba Mariko, ( +22320228676, [IP5-EMP@empbamako.org](mailto:IP5-EMP@empbamako.org))
- Donor : Germany MFA
- Trainers (UNITAR and EMPABB including mobile training teams), certified trainers
- Other EMPABB staff
- Participants
- Malian and ECOWAS Member States representatives (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d' Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Senegal and Togo)
- List of communities served by peace operations
- UNITAR project team personnel

**B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.4.2022-31.12.2022**

Admin entity	Start date (Y-m-d)	End date (Y-m-d)	Event title	Event ID	Thematic Area	Pillar	Type of Location	Location city	Location country
--------------	--------------------	------------------	-------------	----------	---------------	--------	------------------	---------------	------------------



### Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Annual narrative and finance reports
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data
- Implementing Partner deliverables and interim report(s) – *Annexes missing*
- Training material
- Documents related to the 2017-2020 and 2020-2021 earlier project phases, including evaluation reports.
- Relevant international frameworks including [Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing](#), [Women, Peace and Security \(WPS\) Agenda](#), [the UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy](#), [Cruz Report](#), [Action for Peacekeeping \(A4P\)](#), [Integrated Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework](#), [Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations](#), [Africa Peace Support Trainers Association's values and objectives](#), [UNSC Resolution 2242 \(2015\) on Women and Peace](#), [the Policy on United Nations Police \(2014\)](#), [report on Forced Police Unit Command Staff Training Needs Assessment](#); and other relevant UN, AU or ECOWAS frameworks.
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

## **Annex D: Structure of evaluation report**

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
  - a. Terms of reference
  - b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
  - c. List of persons interviewed
  - d. List of documents reviewed
  - e. Evaluation question matrix
  - f. Evaluation consultant agreement form



<p><b>Project Objective 1 (Outcome)</b></p>	<p><i>Increased accessibility to the regional training center</i></p>	<p>% of increase of African personnel trained in / by the staff of EMPABB for deployment to UN and non-UN peace operations within 1 year from its establishment</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> (to be established at the beginning of the project) <u>Target:</u> 15%</p>	<p><i>Report of regional center's activities</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>			
<p><b>Result 1.1 (Output)</b></p>	<p><i>Action plan developed (based on the results of the review of the operating framework)</i></p>	<p>Number of action plans developed</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0 <u>Target:</u> 1</p>	<p><i>Report of regional center's activities</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>			
<p><b>Project Objective 2 (Outcome)</b></p>	<p><i>Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact training</i></p>	<p>% of trainers meeting the completion requirements of the certification program</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0% <u>Target:</u> 80%</p>	<p><i>Report of raining event</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>0%</p>	

<p><b>Result 2.1 (Output)</b></p>	<p><i>Training delivered to EMPABB trainers</i></p>	<p>Number of trainers certified</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0 <u>Target:</u> (to be confirmed at the beginning of the project)</p>	<p><i>Report from training event</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>	<p>15</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p><b>Project Objective 3 (Outcome)</b></p>	<p><i>Strengthened capabilities and motivation of personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments.</i></p>	<p>% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0% <u>Target:</u> 80%</p>	<p><i>Report from training event</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>0%</p>	
<p><b>Result 3.1 (Output)</b></p>	<p><i>Pre-deployment training delivered to personnel from Africa in preparation for UN assignments</i></p>	<p>Number of participants trained</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> (to be confirmed at the beginning of the project) <u>Target:</u> (to be confirmed at the beginning of the project)</p>	<p><i>Report from training event</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>	<p>25</p>	<p>0</p>	

<p><b>Result 3.2 (Output)</b></p>	<p><i>Training on cross-cutting topics delivered to personnel from Mali and ECOWAS Member States (either at EMPABB or locally, through mobile training teams)</i></p>	<p>Number of participants trained</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> (to be confirmed at the beginning of the project) <u>Target:</u> (to be confirmed at the beginning of the project)</p>	<p><i>Report from training event</i></p>	<p><i>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</i></p>	<p>25</p>	<p>0</p>	
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	-----------	----------	--





## Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form\*

### The evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. He/she must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

\*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)