

Draft Terms of Reference

Independent Evaluation of the Strategic Framework Fund (2019-2020)

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. The UNITAR Board of Trustees established the Strategic Framework Fund (SFF) in November 2018. The SFF is a flexible, pooled funding instrument to help UNITAR deliver on its mandate and achieve the objectives of the [2018-2021 strategic framework](#). The SFF's two largest donors are the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the State of Qatar. The SFF focusses on meeting the learning and other capacity development needs of beneficiaries from countries in special situations, including the least developed countries, the landlocked developing countries, the small island developing States and countries in and emerging from conflict, as well as groups made vulnerable, including women and children and persons with disabilities. The SFF is guided by a set of [Governing Principles](#). The Governing Principles call for an independent evaluation every two-years.
3. In 2019-2020 the SFF supported over 50 initiatives (31 initiatives in 2019 and 23 initiatives in 2020 reported on) with a total budget of 1,925,001 USD. The initiatives include programming and activities under the Peace, People, Planet and Prosperity pillars of the 2030 Agenda, in addition to crosscutting programme pillars on accelerating the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, multilateral diplomacy and optimizing the use of technologies for evidence-based decision-making.

Purpose of the evaluation

4. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of SFF-related programming; to identify any problems or challenges that the SFF has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on the SFF's design, implementation, and management. The evaluation's purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the initiative's improvement and broader organization learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the SFF and SFF-supported programming have performed, but also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results.

Scope of the evaluation

5. The evaluation will cover programme unit projects funded in 2019-2020. In addition to assessing the results achieved, the evaluation should also be forward-looking with a view to providing recommendations to inform the future of the fund. The evaluation's scope is different from the [midterm evaluation of the strategic framework 2018-2021](#), which covered all of UNITAR's programming to implement the strategic framework during its first two years of implementation (2018-2019). The evaluation will not cover support from the fund to the UNITAR strategic enablers or functional support units.

Evaluation criteria

6. The evaluation will assess SFF-funded project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
- **Relevance:** *Are projects reaching their intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
 - **Coherence:** *To what extent are the SFF-funded projects coherent with other UNITAR projects and adhering to international norms and standards?*
 - **Effectiveness:** *How effective have the SFF-funded projects delivered planned results and strengthened the capacities of beneficiaries, particularly those left behind, or other groups made vulnerable?*
 - **Efficiency:** *To what extent have the SFF-funded projects delivered results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?*
 - **Impact:** *What are the cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the SFF-funded projects, including contribution towards the intended impacts, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?*
 - **Sustainability:** *To what extent are the SFF-funded project results likely to be sustained in the long term?*

Principal evaluation questions

7. The following questions are *suggested* to guide the design of the evaluation, although the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with programme management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible.

Relevance

- *To what extent do the SFF's design and delivery mechanism meet the programmatic and financial needs of UNITAR to achieve the 2018-2021 strategic objectives/sub-objectives?*
- *How relevant has the SFF been to UNITAR's work in helping Member States achieve the Goals of the 2030 Agenda?*
- *How relevant are the objectives and design of the projects under the SFF to the priorities of donors and strategic partners?*
- *How relevant are the projects under the SFF to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries from vulnerable groups (e.g., women, children, youth, persons with disabilities, indigenous groups, etc.) and stakeholders from countries in special situations? (GEEW)*
- *How relevant are the funded projects to the SFF's selection criteria (have strong SDG alignment; give rise to high impact results that benefit countries in special situations, including individuals who are made vulnerable, such as women and children; promote the attainment of multiple goals or the holistic, integrated nature of the Agenda; delivered with partners to maximize resource efficiencies; involve cross UNITAR projects collaboration been complied with? (GEEW)*

Coherence

- *How well do the funded projects complement each other (internal coherence) and other UNITAR programming efforts with a view to achieving the objectives of the strategic framework, and to what extent is synergy across programming promoted and possible?*

- *To what extent has UNITAR leveraged partnerships with external actors, within and outside the UN system, to promote synergy in efforts to achieve SFF-funded project objectives?*
- *To what extent are the projects under the SFF aligned with a human rights-approach, and the 2030 Agenda's principles of leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first?*

Effectiveness

- *How effectively has UNITAR made use of the SFF to contribute to the achievement of the objectives and expected thematic results of the strategic framework for the period 2019-2020? Which factors have contributed to this?*
- *To what degree have the funded projects achieved the results expected (depending on the training or other needs), and to what degree have the funded projects enhanced programmatic innovation, and how?*
- *Has the SFF been effective in providing increased leverage and flexibility to UNITAR to achieve the objectives of the strategic framework, and to what extent has the SFF provided value-added opportunities?*
- *Has the effectiveness of the SFF in contributing to the achievement of the strategic objectives (SOs) changed due to COVID-19? How responsive have the funded projects been to the COVID-19 realities?*
- *To what extent have human rights-based approaches and inclusion strategies (gender, disability) been incorporated in the design, planning and implementation of each of the projects funded by the SFF? (GEEW) (e.g., Has a twin-track approach been adopted in the programming of the projects funded by the SFF)¹*
- *Has the initiative's structure of providing seed funding for smaller initiatives and partnerships with implementing or other partners been effective?*
- *Do the selection criteria ensure a balanced allocation of funds to all pillars/divisions in efforts to achieve the different strategic objectives, and integration of diverse goals and targets from the 2030 Agenda 2030, as well as support of diverse groups made vulnerable?*

Efficiency

- *To what extent have SFF project outputs been produced in a cost-efficient (e.g., in comparison with feasible alternatives in the context) and timely manner, and how?*
- *How timely has the SFF's decision and allocation process been?*
- *To what extent has UNITAR maximized resource efficiencies through partnerships, and to what extent are the SFF-funded projects implemented through co-financing or cost-sharing?*
- *To what extent have programme units mitigated delivery constraints during the COVID-19 context?*
- *From a natural resources perspective, how efficient have the SFF-funded projects been (e.g. by minimizing waste, unnecessary travel)?*
- *To what extent have projects created benefits of integrating gender equality (or not), and what were the related costs? (GEEW)*

Likelihood of impact/early indication of impact

¹ The twin-track approach combines mainstreaming of programmes and projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities with programmes and projects that are targeted towards persons with disabilities [UN Disability Inclusion Strategy](#), [UN Disability Inclusion Strategy: Technical notes](#)

- *What real differences has the SFF made towards contributing to the achievement of the strategic objectives and helping Member States to implement the 2030 Agenda, in comparison to other funding channels (e.g., traditional earmarked SPG)?*
- *What observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended, or unintended) have occurred from the SFF-funded projects?*
- *To what extent has SFF funding provided opportunities for scalable initiatives, and to what extent have any such initiatives achieved scalable results?*

Likelihood of sustainability/early indication of sustainability

- *To what extent have the projects (short vs. long-term) affected the likelihood of the perception of benefits beyond the implementation of the activities?*
- *Are the strategies and mechanisms of the SFF to capture financial resources sustainable and how can it be improved? What is to be expected for the 2021 period?*
- *What can we learn from the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic to inform the future design and implementation of the SFF?*
- *To what extent are the SFF-funded projects' results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term?*
- *To what extent has seed funding led to other initiatives and funding?*

Gender equality and women empowerment (GEEW)

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with “**GEEW**” in the above.

Evaluation Approach and Methods

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](#), 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).

8. In order to maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of SFF stakeholders in the process, including the project partners, participants, donors, implementing partners 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 project log frames and theories of change (including reconstruction if needed); key informant interviews; and focus groups. These data collection tools are discussed below.
9. In assessing results, the evaluation should look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
 - **Individual dimension**, as it relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skills levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours, and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training, and the development of competencies.
 - **Organizational dimension**, as it 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**, as it 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

Individual	Skills levels (technical and managerial skills) Competencies	Knowledge Attitudes, behaviours, and values
Organizational	Mandates Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms Motivation and incentive systems Strategic leadership Inter/intra institutional linkages Programme management Multi-stakeholder processes	Organizational priorities Processes, systems, and procedures Human and financial resources Knowledge and information sharing Infrastructure
Enabling environment	Policy and legal framework Political commitment and accountability framework Governance	Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power Legal, policy and political environment

10. 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.

Data collection methods:

Comprehensive desk review

The evaluator will compile, review, and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the SFF-funded projects, including results frameworks. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C.

The evaluator should also consider the most appropriate tools/methods to collect data and answer the key questions. This may include participatory approaches such as [Outcome mapping](#) / [Outcome harvesting](#).

Stakeholder analysis

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

- Partner institutions, including the SFF donors and implementing partners;
- Beneficiaries/participants;
- Trainers/facilitators;
- Etc.

Survey(s)

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of SFF-funded 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.

Focus groups

Focus groups should be organized with selected SFF project stakeholders to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

Field visit

Due to COVID-19 the data collection does not include a field visit that requires international travel. Local travel for interviews and focus groups is to be considered depending on the residence of the evaluator.

The evaluator should be able to undertake data collection entirely remotely should travel restrictions be imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Gender and human rights

11. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender, and equity perspectives ([UNEG Guidance](#)) 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, disability and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report.
12. 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

13. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from February 2021 (initial desk review and data collection) to July 2021 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
14. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the 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.

15. 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.
16. 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 20-30 pages, excluding annexes.
17. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to UNITAR Programme Management (Directors and Managers of Programmes with SFF funded projects) to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex G by 23 July 2021. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 30 July 2021. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to UNITAR Programme Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe: February 2021 – July 2021

Activity	February	March	April	May	June	July
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 Programme Management						
Programme Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations						

Evaluation report finalized and management response by Programme Management						
Presentation of the evaluation findings and lessons learned						

Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline*
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	9 April 2021
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	16 April 2021
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	25 June 2021
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	2 July 2021
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	9 July 2021
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	23 July 2021
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	30 July 2021
Presentation of the evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	30 July 2021

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

Communication/dissemination of results

18. 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.

Evaluation management arrangements

19. 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').

20. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR.² According to UNITAR's Monitoring and 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.

21. 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

² While PPME liaises with donors to the SFF and compiles and synthesizes annual narrative reports, the unit is not involved in any activity that would compromise its independence for the present evaluation.

surveys, and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel should that be required (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants. Given COVID-19, no travel for the evaluation is presently foreseen.

Evaluator Ethics

22. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the design or implementation of any of the SFF-funded project or have any other conflict of interest with the evaluation. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct and pledge of ethical conduct under Annexes F and G prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

Professional requirements

23. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:
- MA degree or equivalent in development or a related discipline. Knowledge and experience in evaluating training, including in areas related to broader development cooperation undertakings.
 - At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of training/capacity building and preferably experience undertaking cluster type evaluations.
 - Knowledge of the OECD DAC Criteria, the [United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#) and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.
 - Knowledge of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and awareness of other outcomes of 2015 international conferences.
 - Field work experience in developing countries.
 - Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick/Phillips or similar method for evaluating training is an advantage.
 - Excellent writing skills.
 - Strong communication and presentation skills.
 - Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
 - 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. Audit trail
 - F. Evaluator code of conduct
 - G. Evaluator pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation

Annex A: List of contact points

- UNITAR directors and managers
- EDO office
- SFF donors
- Beneficiaries
- Other stakeholders

B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.1.2019-31.12.2020 on events funded by the SFF

Export date: 2021-01-15																				
Admin entity	start date (Y-m-d)	end date (Y-m-d)	Event title	Learning	Registration type	Number of participants	Custom number	Participated	dates of participations	dates of completion	% Overall	% 4-5	Job relevant	% 4-5	% New info	% 4-5	% Intent of us	% 4-5	Overall useful	% 4-5
NYO / New Y	2019-02-04	2019-02-04	Financing for L		By application	124	0	124	124	0	23	81	23	90	23	66	23	86	23	90
NYO / New Y	2019-04-10	2019-04-10	Elections in t L		By application	79	0	79	79	0	29	80	29	96	29	52	29	91	29	91
NYO / New Y	2019-03-03	2019-03-03	Columbia Lav L		By application	66	0	66	0	0	45	79	45	97	45	47	45	93	45	90
NYO / New Y	2019-05-13	2019-05-13	Columbia Lav L		By application	49	0	49	0	0	18	78	18	78	18	67	18	89	18	89
NYO / New Y	2019-03-12	2019-03-12	Columbia Lav L		By application	70	0	70	0	0	43	90	43	97	43	77	43	97	43	97
NYO / New Y	2019-03-26	2019-03-26	Diversifying N L		By application	32	0	32	0	0	38	83	38	75	38	92	38	83	38	92
NYO / New Y	2019-04-21	2019-04-21	How Agrofore L		By application	25	0	25	0	0	64	77	64	75	64	69	64	88	64	88
NYO / New Y	2019-04-18	2019-04-18	The Role of C L		By application	21	0	21	0	0	81	73	81	71	81	65	81	82	81	82
NYO / New Y	2019-04-29	2019-04-29	Workshop on L		By application	30	0	30	0	0	93	84	100	77	90	81	90	93	100	93
NYO / New Y	2019-05-08	2019-05-08	Workshop on L		By application	25	0	25	0	0	36	78	36	100	36	56	36	78	36	78
PMCP / Peac	2019-07-22	2019-07-26	Training Prog L		Private – by ii	29	0	29	0	29	100	97	100	93	100	97	100	100	100	100
PMCP / Peac	2019-06-25	2019-07-04	Fellowship P L		Private – by ii	38	0	38	0	38	100	97	100	97	100	95	100	100	100	100
NYO / New Y	2019-01-23	2019-01-23	The Work of t L		By application	79	0	79	0	0	38	82	38	97	38	63	38	87	38	83
NYO / New Y	2019-04-30	2019-05-02	Introduction to the work of t		Private – by ii	15	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NYO / New Y	2019-05-19	2019-05-20	Developing Leadership and		Private – by ii	25	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NYO / New Y	2019-05-22	2019-05-23	Training for the Developer		Private – by ii	37	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PFTP / Public	2020-01-15	2020-04-15	Frontier Tech L		By application	32	0	32	0	28	88	86	88	75	88	82	88	100	88	100
PTP / Peacel	2019-11-05	2019-12-31	(PTP.2019.22 L		Public – by re	68	0	68	43	0	60	57	60	54	60	51	60	66	60	63
PTP / Peacel	2019-12-02	2019-12-31	(PTP.2019.24 L		Public – by re	9	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NYO / New Y	2019-10-20	2019-10-28	Practical Pre L		Private – by ii	9	0	9	0	0	100	82	100	89	100	78	100	78	100	100
NYO / New Y	2019-10-14	2019-11-04	Training for N L		Private – by ii	6	0	6	0	0	100	94	100	100	100	83	100	100	100	100
NYO / New Y	2019-10-20	2019-10-28	Practical Pre L		Private – by ii	17	0	17	0	0	100	98	100	100	100	94	100	100	100	100
PMCP / Peac	2019-11-26	2019-12-05	Regional Trail L		Private – by ii	35	0	35	0	35	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
UNOSAT / Op	2019-12-16	2019-12-20	Introduction t L		Private – by ii	20	0	20	0	0	75	89	75	93	75	73	75	100	75	100
NYO / New Y	2020-02-10	2020-02-10	Demographic NL		By application	33	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2019-12-09	2019-12-13	Youth-Led Cc L		Private – by ii	30	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDP / Multile	2020-05-04	2020-05-25	Rule of Law & L		By application	65	0	65	65	0	34	92	34	100	34	77	34	100	31	100
NYO / New Y	2020-11-04	2020-11-04	Columbia Lav L		By application	223	0	223	100	0	93	13	90	13	96	13	92	14	85	16
NYO / New Y	2020-11-18	2020-11-18	Columbia Lav L		By application	171	0	171	0	0	18	89	18	93	18	90	18	83	18	100
PTP / Peacel	2020-01-20	2020-01-30	Towards Sha L		Private – by ii	30	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDP / Multile	2020-11-09	2020-11-10	Overcoming c NL		By application	19	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NYO / New Y	2020-10-15	2020-10-15	Achieving Sui L		By application	70	0	70	20	0	95	93	100	97	96	87	89	95	97	96
MDP / Multile	2020-11-16	2020-11-17	Overcoming c NL		By application	20	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDP / Multile	2020-11-23	2020-11-24	Overcoming c NL		By application	16	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2020-03-11	2020-05-06	Introduction t L		Private – by ii	30	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2019-12-31	2020-03-09	Conflict Reso L		Private – by ii	42	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2020-09-08	2020-09-11	Design thinki L		Private – by ii	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2020-05-13	2020-07-08	Gender Matte L		Private – by ii	27	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2020-03-10	2020-06-01	Human Secui L		Private – by ii	31	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PTP / Peacel	2020-05-13	2020-07-06	Conflict Analy L		Private – by ii	49	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDP / Multile	2020-10-26	2020-10-29	e-Workshop t L		Private – by ii	12	0	12	12	0	58	86	58	100	58	57	58	100	58	100
UNOSAT / Op	2020-10-26	2020-10-30	Introduction t L		Private – by ii	20	0	20	0	20	95	95	95	100	95	85	95	100	95	100
UNOSAT / Op	2020-12-07	2020-12-10	Application of L		Private – by ii	26	0	26	26	0	92	100	92	100	92	100	92	100	92	92
UNOSAT / Op	2020-12-14	2020-12-18	Introduction t L		Private – by ii	13	0	13	0	13	100	77	100	92	100	38	100	100	100	100
MDP / Multile	2020-10-26	2020-12-06	Multilateral D L		Private – by ii	19	0	19	0	15	61	92	58	100	63	75	63	100	63	100
MDP / Multile	2020-12-14	2020-12-15	Asylum, extri L		Private – by ii	28	0	28	0	24	64	79	64	94	64	50	64	94	64	83
MDP / Multile	2020-10-15	2020-10-27	Online Works L		Private – by ii	10	0	10	10	0	60	94	60	100	60	83	60	100	60	100
MDP / Multile	2020-11-02	2020-11-05	Online Works L		Private – by ii	45	0	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDP / Multile	2020-11-20	2020-11-25	Online Works L		Private – by ii	22	0	22	22	0	41	89	41	89	41	78	41	100	41	0
PMCP / Peac	2020-11-09	2020-11-20	Fellowship P L		Private – by ii	41	0	41	0	41	98	98	98	100	98	95	98	100	98	98
								2039	577	243										

Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Annual narrative and financial reports
- SFF reporting to donors
- SFF Guiding principles
- SFF Allocation requests
- Mid-term evaluation of the strategic framework
- Board of trustees annotations
- SFF Flow chart
- Event Management System event and participant data
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

Annex D: Structure of evaluation report (UNITAR provides a template)

- 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
 - g. Code of conduct
 - h. Pledge of ethical conduct form

Annex E: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by Programme 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 “Strategic Framework Fund” initiative

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 F: 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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex G: Evaluator pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation



ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

PLEDGE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT IN EVALUATION



By signing this pledge, I hereby commit to discussing and applying the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and to adopting the associated ethical behaviours.



INTEGRITY

I will actively adhere to the moral values and professional standards of evaluation practice as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and following the values of the United Nations. Specifically, I will be:

- **Honest and truthful** in my communication and actions.
- **Professional**, engaging in credible and trustworthy behaviour, alongside competence, commitment and ongoing reflective practice.
- **Independent, impartial and incorruptible**.



ACCOUNTABILITY

I will be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken and responsible for honouring commitments, without qualification or exception; I will report potential or actual harms observed. Specifically, I will be:

- **Transparent** regarding evaluation purpose and actions taken, establishing trust and increasing accountability for performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by the evaluation.
- **Responsive** as questions or events arise, adapting plans as required and referring to appropriate channels where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified.
- **Responsible** for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken and for ensuring redress and recognition as needed.



RESPECT

I will engage with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, well-being, personal agency and characteristics. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Access** to the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders – whether powerless or powerful – with due attention to factors that could impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.
- **Meaningful participation and equitable treatment** of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes, from design to dissemination. This includes engaging various stakeholders, particularly affected people, so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.
- **Fair representation** of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products (reports, webinars, etc.).



BENEFICENCE

I will strive to do good for people and planet while minimizing harm arising from evaluation as an intervention. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Explicit and ongoing consideration of risks and benefits** from evaluation processes.
- **Maximum benefits** at systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels.
- **No harm**. I will not proceed where harm cannot be mitigated.
- **Evaluation makes an overall positive contribution** to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

I commit to playing my part in ensuring that evaluations are conducted according to the Charter of the United Nations and the ethical requirements laid down above and contained within the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. When this is not possible, I will report the situation to my supervisor, designated focal points or channels and will actively seek an appropriate response.

(Signature and Date)