Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Independent Midterm Evaluation of the "United Nations Satellite Centre (UNOSAT) Mapping Service - Evidence-based information support to humanitarian assistance, peace and security using satellite imagery and geospatial technologies" 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 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. The United Nations Satellite Centre (UNOSAT) Mapping Service - Evidence-based information support to humanitarian assistance, peace and security using satellite imagery and geospatial technologies (in short "UNOSAT Mapping Service") project provides satellite image analysis during humanitarian emergencies related to disasters, complex emergencies and conflict situations. The service has been created to meet the demand of United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and other humanitarian agencies and NGOs part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on humanitarian coordination hosted by the UN (IASC) for mapping and satellite derived analysis in wake of disasters and complex emergencies. With a 24h/7days a week year-round availability to process requests, UNOSAT delivers satellite imagery derived maps, reports and data ready for direct inclusion in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) according to needs.

4. Typical situations for which the **UNOSAT Mapping Service** is activated include floods, earthquakes, storms, landslides, volcanoes, oil spills, chemical waste, refugee and Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camp mapping, conflict damage assessment and situation analysis. Requests for mapping in complex emergencies are increasing, and often include monitoring situations over time and thus requires additional support from UNOSAT as compared to a typical sudden onset natural disaster. The evolution of IDP situations and assessments during conflict situations are examples of this. However, natural disasters still represent significant activities at UNOSAT, in particular floods, which often include the need for monitoring over time. The capacity of providing frequent imagery analysis updates as situations unfold has become one of the key features of UNOSAT's Mapping Service and shows that the service is fully operational and predictable. UNOSAT benefits from a variety of sources for its satellite imagery: Free and open source, commercial vendors, International Charter Space and Major Disasters (natural and technological disasters only), in-kind donations.

5. The expected impact of the project is to improve humanitarian assistance and protection of peace, justice, security and human rights. Four outcomes are expected to contribute to the project's goal: i) enhanced evidence-based decision making in humanitarian assistance and protection of peace, justice, security, and human rights in the context of disasters and conflict; ii) reinforced synergy and coordination during emergency situations through information

products dissemination to both humanitarian and human rights communities, and use of web-based platforms and tools to support coordination, planning and decision making; iii) increased exploration and adoption of innovative approaches and methodologies in the use of satellite imagery and geospatial information, including artificial intelligence and deep learning implications; and iv) enhanced awareness of the value of satellite imagery analysis to support evidence-based decision making in humanitarian assistance and protection of peace, justice, security and human rights.

6. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Evaluation Policy. The evaluation plan calls for a mid-term evaluation of the project. The evaluation shall also build on the [independent evaluation](#) undertaken of the earlier phase of the project). Lessons from the evaluation shall inform possible future phases of the project.

Purpose of the evaluation

7. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the progress being made towards the achievement of planned targets; 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.

8. The evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria (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.

Scope of the evaluation

9. The midline evaluation will cover the project's first year starting from August 2022 to July 2023. Although the scope of the evaluation does not include the previous phases of the project (since 2003, 2016-2017, 2017-2019 and 2019-2021), funded by the same and another donor, the evaluator should take into account the findings and the implementation of the recommendations of the past independent evaluation and look back at previous phases for assessing the impact criterion. The evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases or the development of similar projects.

Evaluation criteria

1. 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 on track in reaching 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 results so far and in making progress towards 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?*
- **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

2. 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 is the UNOSAT Mapping Service and its different (and new) products, as designed and implemented, relevant to the institutional **needs and priorities** of the respective partner institutions working in the area of humanitarian assistance and protection of peace, justice, security and human rights?*

c. *Are the activities and outputs of the UNOSAT Mapping Service consistent with the requesting parties' **goals and objectives**?*

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)***

e. *How well does the project align to environmental frameworks, e.g., Blue Marble principles? **(ENVSUSE)***

Coherence

f. *To what extent does the UNOSAT Mapping Service complement other humanitarian assistance related projects and services provided by UNITAR Divisions and UNOSAT and by other organizations? How well is the project building on lessons learned and experience from the previous three phases and its 20 years of existence?*

g. *How well does the UNOSAT Mapping Service align with the Norwegian Humanitarian Strategy and the Strategic Partnership Model?*

h. *To what extent is coordination with the UN Operations and Crisis Centre (UNOCC) and hence at the Executive Office of the Secretary General, as well as with other UN agencies (OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WHO, ICRC, IFRC, UNESCO, OHCHR amongst others), the ICC and the REACH Initiative and the Satellite Mapping Coordination System (SMCS) set up in the framework of the Global Disaster Alerts and Coordination System (GDACS), the Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX) and creation of the UNOSAT Satellite Image bank leading to synergies and reducing potential duplication?*

i. *How well does the project complement and foster synergies with other existing actors carrying out analysis, such as academia, the private sector and governments? What is the project's specific niche and added value in a world of constantly changing actors and services offered by other providers?*

Effectiveness

j. *To what extent is the project on track in achieving planned outputs and outcomes?[1] What are the factors positively or negatively affecting the project's performance?*
k. *To what extent is the UNOSAT Mapping Service on track in achieving the planned objectives and results to provide better information for informed decision-making in situations of natural disasters and conflict?*
l. *To what extent is environmental sustainability taken into account when operating the UNOSAT Mapping Service?* **(ENVSUSE)**
m. *To what extent have relevant recommendations from the previous independent evaluation been taken into account/implemented in the project design and implementation?*
n. *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?* **(GEEW)**
o. To what extent is the project making effective use of innovation and new technologies including Artificial Intelligence (AI), machine learning and algorithms to achieve its outcomes? Is the project effective in adjusting its products offered?
p. *To what extent have the project's structure and partnerships been effective?*
q. *To what extent is the project's monitoring and self-evaluation effective in assessing user-based real-time impact (see recommendation from previous independent evaluation) and updating indicators and targets for outcome and impact?*

Efficiency

r. *To what extent have outputs been produced in a cost-efficient manner (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)?*
s. *Were the objectives achieved on time so far and was the UNOSAT Mapping Service delivered in a timely manner emergency situations?*
t. *To what extent were partnership modalities, including the hosting at CERN, conductive to the delivery of the mapping? Were the project's resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?*
u. *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been?* **(ENVSUSE)**

Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact

v. *To what extent has the UNOSAT Mapping Service initiated a real difference to the partners' work and improved humanitarian assistance and protection of human rights and to the end beneficiaries?*
w. *What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred or are likely to occur?*
x. *What cumulative effects have the mapping initiatives made to the partners work in humanitarian assistance and to the end beneficiaries?*
y. *What has happened as a result of the mapping and other activities?*
z. *How have the end-users benefitted from the UNOSAT Mapping Service?*

Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability

aa. *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?*
bb. *To what extent have the mapping initiatives contributed to better humanitarian assistance in the long term?*
cc. *What are likely to be the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the mapping initiatives?*
dd. *How has environmental sustainability been considered during the project design and first part of implementation? (ENVSUSE)*

---

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

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

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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:

- Beneficiary and requesting organizations (UNOCHA, UNHCR, WHO, UNICEF, WFP, IOM, UNDP, UN EOSG, UNOCC, UN ESCAP, UN OHCHR, IFRC, ICRC, ICC, NRC) and governments.
- The donor (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs);
- UN Country Teams or local/national governments benefitting from the service;

- UNITAR project implementation team (M&E expert, project manager, GIS experts, etc).
- 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) to Mapping Service requestors 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 may be envisaged if useful for case study data collection.

Case Studies

The evaluation shall develop 3-4 case studies, focusing on specific emergencies/countries/regions and/or crosscutting themes. The evaluation shall use a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Case studies can be particularly useful for understanding how different elements fit together and how different elements (implementation, context and other factors) have produced the observed impacts. Different types[2] of case studies shall be explored:
- Illustrative: This is descriptive in character and intended to add realism and in-depth examples to other information about a program or policy. (These are often used to complement quantitative data by providing examples of the overall findings).
- Exploratory: This is also descriptive but is aimed at generating hypotheses for later investigation rather than simply providing illustration.
- Critical instance: This examines a single instance of unique interest, or serves as a critical test of an assertion about a program, problem or strategy.
- Program implementation. This investigates operations, often at several sites, and often with reference to a set of norms or standards about implementation processes.
- Program effects. This examines the causal links between the program and observed effects (outputs, outcomes or impacts, depending on the timing of the evaluation) and usually involves multisite, multimethod evaluations.

---

[2] Source: [Case Study | Better Evaluation](#)

- Cumulative. This brings together findings from many case studies to answer evaluative questions.

Gender and human rights

6. 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.

7. 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

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

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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 24 November 2023. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 14 December 2023. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe (Preference from Project Management to start before the midterm of the project in order to share results as part of 20 year anniversary of the service): June 2023 – December 2023

Activity	June 2023	July 2023	August 2023	September 2023	October 2023	November 2023	December 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	30 July 2023
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	4 August 2023
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	18 October 2023
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	25 October 2023
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	3 November2023
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	To be defined
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	24 November 2023
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	14 December 2023
Dissemination and publication of report	Evaluation manager		28 December 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 (Norway MFA) and several representatives from the requesting (Pakistan) or partner organizations (OCHA) 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

13. The evaluation report shall be written in English with the Executive Summary 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.

Evaluation management arrangements

14. 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').

15. 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.

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

16. 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

17. 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 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of humanitarian programming, protracted conflict, resilience and disaster risk reduction, or similar areas. Experience undertaking evaluations related to technology based programming (e.g. GIS), mapping or satellite imagery would be a strong asset. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- 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

- Donor : Norway MFA
- List of organizations requesting UNOSAT's Mapping Service.
- UNITAR UNOSAT project team personnel

B: Event data available on the Event Management System

To be added if applicable (e.g. awareness raising events)

Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- First annual narrative and finance reports
- Legal Agreement
- Logical framework and outcome areas
- Project theory of change
- Project description and project workplan
- UNOSAT website content and list of activations
- Midterm review of the Norwegian Humanitarian Strategy and Strategic Partnership Model
- Independent evaluation of the Rapid Mapping Service 2018.
- 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: Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change

To be received in word or excel format from Project Management

(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 "UNOSAT Mapping Service" project

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