Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Independent Endline Evaluation of the project titled "Strengthening Capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa"

(TARSA076.NORAD)

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 individual, institutional and organizational capacities 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. **The United Nations Satellite Centre (UNOSAT), hosted by UNITAR,** is a technology-intensive centre delivering imagery analysis and satellite solutions to humanitarian and development organizations within and outside the United Nations, with the aim to contribute to evidence-based decision-making in areas such as humanitarian relief, human security and resilience, strategic territorial and development planning using geo-spatial information technologies.

3. Since 2011, UNOSAT has been implementing, with the financial support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), in training and capacity development activities. UNOSAT operates in Asia with support from its regional office in Bangkok hosted at United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), and in East Africa with key contribution from its centre in Nairobi.

4. The project **Strengthening Capacities in the Use of Geospatial Information for Improved Resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa** aims to improve resilience in Africa and in the Asia-Pacific region using geo-spatial information technologies (GIT). This will be accomplished through capacity development that is comprised of technical training, awareness-raising activities, development of web applications solutions, provision of backstopping services and establishment of a knowledge platform, and climate finance.

5. The project aims to develop GIT capacities of beneficiary organizations in eight countries in Africa (Nigeria and Uganda), Asia (Bhutan, Bangladesh and Lao PDR) and the Pacific (Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu) to improve the national response to climate risk. Project beneficiaries are relevant government organizations responsible for disaster risk or natural resource management and/or climate finance.

6. The project is set to conduct technical capacity building through localized training, organizing awareness raising events, and providing technical backstopping assistance to pertinent stakeholders. Additionally, customized geospatial platforms and applications are being developed for beneficiary organizations to address needs across spheres like disaster risk management, climate resilience, land use management, etc. Climate finance advisers have also been stationed in the three Pacific countries to promote access to pertinent global funding mechanisms.

7. The expected impact of the project is to improve resilience to natural disasters and climate change in Africa and Asia and Pacific.

8. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Evaluation Policy. The evaluation plan calls for an endline evaluation of the project. The evaluation shall also build on the independent baseline evaluation and the midline review of the project. Lessons from the evaluation shall inform possible future phases of the project.

Purpose of the evaluation

9. The endline evaluation aims to systematically assess the performance and results of this project as it reaches its operational closure. Specifically, the evaluation will:

- Measure project results against the indicators in the logical framework to determine the extent to which intended outputs and outcomes have been achieved.
- Assess the likelihood of impact and sustainability of results based on mechanisms and strategies put in place by the project.
- Identify challenges, enabling factors and lessons learned from project implementation to inform future programming.
- Provide evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations to the project team, donors, and other stakeholders.

10. 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.

11. The evaluation will include an assessment of the OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project and cross-cutting topics such as gender, disability and human rights, and environmental considerations. 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.

12. In addition, the evaluation aims also to inform future phases of the project by comparing progress made with counterfactual countries and by collecting baseline data for countries that are selected for the next project phase.

Scope of the evaluation

13. The endline evaluation will cover the project's full timeframe starting from August 2021 to July 2024, building upon the results of the baseline evaluation and midline review. Data will be collected while the project is still being implemented and the evaluation may hence not be able to account for all activities implemented in June and July 2024. The evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases or the development of similar projects.

Evaluation criteria

14. 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: Has the project reached its intended users (beneficiary organizations) 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 (institutional and national) and complementing other projects or services available?*
- **Effectiveness:** *How effective has the project been in delivering outputs and achieving the intended outcomes?*
- **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 (positive or negative)?*
- **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

15. 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.

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 (particularly Goal 1, 13, 16 and 17) and the UNITAR strategic framework (2022-2025)?*
b. *To what extent does the project strategy and activities respond to the identified needs, priorities and capacities in applying geospatial information technology in the project countries and of different beneficiaries?*
c. *How relevant is the project in providing targeted support to beneficiary organizations for strengthened disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and natural resource management?*
d. *How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women's empowerment and meeting the needs of other groups made vulnerable, including countries in special situations? (GEEW)*

Coherence

e. *How compatible is the project with relevant national policies, strategies and commitments on disaster risk reduction, climate resilience and environmental management?*
f. *To what extent does the project complement or create synergies with other interventions in the project countries by development partners?*

Effectiveness

g. *To what extent has the project achieved planned outputs and outcomes, including strengthened knowledge and skills and enhanced decision-making?[1] What progress has been made in each country since the midline review? What are the factors that have positively or negatively affected the project's performance?*
h. *To what extent have relevant recommendations and lessons learned from the previous independent evaluation and the midline review been taken into account/implemented in the project implementation?*

---

[1] Logframe and project Theory of Change available in Annex E

i.   *To what extent has the project persisted with its efforts on addressing women's needs in GIS and achieved differential results across groups (e.g. through a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy)?* **(GEEW)**

Efficiency

j.   *To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through partnership arrangements (grants to implementing partners e.g. Commonwealth Secretariat) and with in-country experts in comparison with alternative approaches(define alternatives as part of evaluation design deliverable)?*

k.   *Were the project's human and financial resources fully utilized as planned? What caused deviations from the original plan? Did the project apply adaptive management to adjust to implementation challenges?*

l.   *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been?* **(ENVSUSE)**

Likelihood of impact

Comparing project countries with counterfactuals and transformative impact

m.   *What difference has the project made on project countries compared to the counterfactual countries[2] in the area of disaster risk reduction? Have gaps increased or decreased over the project timeframe (baseline vs endline)?*

n.   *To what extent has the project contributed to increased climate finance in Pacific Island project countries compared to their counterfactual over the project timeframe (baseline vs end-line)? To what extent has the project enhanced resilience to natural hazards in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, including through improved disaster management, improved quality of data and analysis, increased efficiency and contributing to sustainable use of land resources?*

o.   *How have organizational capacities on the application of geospatial information technology for disaster risk and natural resources management changed from the baseline to the end-line based on the areas identified in the capacity development scorecard? Do the differences between the baseline and endline scorecard measurements vary comparing project countries and counterfactual countries?*

p.   *To what extent have beneficiaries from training events reported changed behaviour or practices following the participation to technical training events and other project components?*

q.   *To what extent has the project contributed to systemic changes in policies, regulations, resource allocations, or decision-making processes to strengthen the application of geospatial information technologies for resilience building and how has application of geospatial information technologies informed policies, regulations, resource allocation or decision-making processes to improve resilience, disaster risk and natural resource management?*

r.   *To what extent has the project facilitated new partnerships, collaborations or engagement platforms between stakeholders (government, communities, academia) that can contribute to long-term changes?*

s.   *How has the project influenced shifts in norms (including gender), behaviours, relationships or mindsets through its capacity strengthening and awareness-raising work with beneficiaries around leveraging geospatial data and tools?* **(GEEW)** *Is the project leading to other changes, including "scalable" or "replicable" results? Have any unintended changes (positive or negative) happened at a systemic level driven by the project's activities and outputs?*

Likelihood of sustainability

t.   *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?*

---

[2] Project countries: Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Bhutan, Lao PDR, Nigeria, Uganda, Bangladesh. Counterfactual countries. Potential countries identified in the baseline evaluation with current or potential UNOSAT presence include Tonga and Samoa for Pacific countries, and Rwanda for Uganda.

u. *What lessons have been learned, challenges faced, and good practices identified by project beneficiaries through their engagement with various project activities?*
v. *To what extent has the project promoted country ownership and stakeholder participation, and how has this contributed to the likelihood of sustaining project results and activities in the mid- to long-term?*
w. *To what extent has the project contributed to sustainability through creating an enabling environment through Training of Trainers (ToT), the knowledge platform and community of practice in order to maintain capacities and expanded knowledge- after project completion?*

<u>Gender equality and women empowerment (GEEW)</u>

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.*

<u>Environmental Sustainability in Evaluation (ENVSUSE)</u>

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

Evaluation Approach and Methods

16. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy, the operational guidelines for independent evaluations,](#) 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.

17. 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 beneficiary organizations, 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.

18. 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.

19. Based on the baseline evaluation, the evaluator shall gather baseline data on counterfactual countries such as Tonga, Somalia and Rwanda and scorecard data should be collected across pertinent countries. This information will serve to contextualize project results and measure possible impacts.

Suggested data collection methods:

Comprehensive desk review

20. 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.

Stakeholder analysis

21. The evaluator will revise the stakeholder mapping and analysis undertaken at the baseline and midline stages as needed. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

- Project Management
- National Stakeholders, such as beneficiary organizations
- Counterfactual countries such as Tonga, Somalia and Rwanda
- Regional Bodies
- Climate change funds bodies
- Implementing partner: Commonwealth Secretariat

Survey(s)

22. To maximize feedback from the widest possible range of the project the different stakeholders 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

23. 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, at the national or local level.

Focus groups

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

Field Visit

25. Field visits at the national level for project countries shall be organized for data collection. The number of field visits is still to be defined with project management. The evaluator could potentially attend high-level decision-making workshops with approximately 40-50 participants per session in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu (1 mission) and Bhutan (1 mission) for stakeholder data collection.

Quasi- and non-experimental impact evaluation methods

26. Subject to data collection opportunities, a comparison of 'treatment' and 'control' groups shall be involved against a selection of outcome and impact level logframe indicators to determine the extent of changes that are attributable to the project, being the difference between the two groups.

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

Case studies

28. The evaluation shall develop two illustrative case studies, highlighting beneficiaries' experiences across different regions. The evaluation shall use a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. The case studies can be particularly useful for understanding the beneficiaries' changes of behaviour.

29. The case studies will be descriptive in nature and examine how various elements - including project implementation, contextual factors, etc. - have contributed to observed impacts for beneficiaries. They will look at the causal linkages between the project and noted effects at output, outcome and/or impact levels.

    These case studies will add realism and provide in-depth examples to complement other evaluation findings.

Gender and human rights

30. 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.

31. 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

32. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from March 2024 (initial desk review and evaluation design) to July 2024 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

33. 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, as well as a list of documents reviewed highlighting insights from every reviewed document. 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. Moreover, alternative approaches should be defined in the evaluation design/question matrix in order to define what data needs to be collected.

34. During data collection and analysis, the consultant shall share emerging findings, recommendation and lessons learned prior to writing the zero draft report and with the intention to inform a possible next phase of the project.

35. 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.

36. 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.

37. 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 29 July 2024. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 31 July 2024. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative: March 2024 – July 2024

Activity	March 2024	April 2024	May 2024	June 2024	July 2024	
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 to Fiji, Solomon Islands and Bhutan for attending high-level decision-making event (half a day workshop with 40-50 participants per event)	■	■	■	■		
Sharing emerging findings	■	■	■	■		
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR					■	
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management					■	
Presentation of 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	3 April 2024
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	5 April 2024
Sharing emerging findings	Evaluator	Programme Management	April 2024 (date tbc)
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	1 July 2024
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	8 July 2024
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	15 July 2024
Presentation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	22 July 2024
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	29 July 2024
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	31 July 2024
Dissemination and publication of report	Evaluation manager		August 2024

*To be adjusted depending on the contract signature and to be agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager. The Draft report deadline is immovable

Communication/dissemination of results

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

39. Communication products such as an infographic or a concise video may be developed to disseminate key evaluation findings and recommendations to wider audiences, subject to budget availability. The video may be focusing on transformational change in selected countries only (e.g. those countries were a closing event is being organised, e.g. Bhutan, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu).

Evaluation management arrangements

40. 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').

41. 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.

42. 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.

Risks and mitigation measures

Risk	Likelihood of occurrence	Mitigation measure
Unavailable final financial report	High	Access expenditures from FBU.
Unavailable final narrative report	High	Request updated log frame by 30 May 2024 from project management
Slow response to documentation request	Moderate	Send reminders with Division Director in cc.
Delayed production of zero draft	Moderate	Exchange with programme management and donor on delay and request programme management to amend agreement to implementation period.

Evaluator Ethics

43. 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

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

- MA degree or equivalent in evaluation, social, environmental or development studies, or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in technology-based programming is desired.
- At least seven years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building, sustainable learning, GIS, disaster risk reduction and climate resilience and environmental preservation and food security
- Technical knowledge of the focal area (optional).
- Field work experience in developing countries.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches.
- Excellent writing skills.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.

- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in oral and written English.

- **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

To be provided by project management

B: Event data available on the Event Management System

To be downloaded from EMS (e.g. technical training and awareness raising events)

Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Baseline Evaluation
- Midline Review
- Project Agreement
- Logical framework and outcome areas
- Project theory of change
- Project description and project workplan
- Commonwealth Secretariat Implementing partner agreement and reporting
- Country (Bangladesh via UNDP, Bhutan, Lao PDR) Implementing partner agreement and reporting
- Updates to MoUs with partner countries
- Monitoring event and backstopping request table
- Interim narrative reports
- Interim financial reports
- Content from the Knowledge Platform including webinar series and community of practice
- Impact stories
- 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. Case Studies
   b. Terms of reference
   c. Survey/questionnaires deployed
   d. List of persons interviewed
   e. List of documents reviewed
   f. Evaluation question matrix
   g. Evaluation consultant agreement form

Annex E: Updated Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change

To be received in word or excel format from Project Management

Annex F: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)

To the comments received on (*date*) from the evaluation of the project "Strengthening Capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa"

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

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[3]

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.

---

[3]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct