**Annex 1**

**Terms of Reference**

**Independent Evaluation of the “Training and Advanced Training of West African Security Forces” project**

**Background**

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges.
2. UNITAR’s first Strategic Objective calls to “Promote peace and just and inclusive societies”. The sub-objective SO 1.1 “Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace” focuses on increasing institutions and individuals’ capacities to prevent and resolve violent conflicts, restore the rule of law, and build lasting peace. Special focus is placed on strengthening knowledge and skills of women as change agents in conflict analysis, negotiation and mediation; and strengthening engagement of men and boys as agents of change in efforts to work towards ending sexual and gender-based violence and reducing the stigmatization.
3. UNITAR has been supporting Ghana and other West African countries military and police forces and civilian personnel since 2012 in the framework of the pre-deployment training and advisory team (PDTA) programming. The “Training and Advanced Training of West African Security Forces” project, funded by the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, fits within this framework.
4. The project shall be implemented between 15 May and 31 December 2022. The project is designed to support the [Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre](https://www.kaiptc.org/) (KAIPTC) in Accra, Ghana, to strengthen and further develop security policy self-responsibility of West African partners engaged in the context of crisis prevention / crisis reaction to internal and external threats in the region. It does so through the reinforcement of the role of the KAIPTC as: i) the leading international centre for training, education and research on African peace and security; and ii) the provider of globally recognized capacity building programs. In addition, by recognizing the strategic location of the centre in West Africa, the project will also focus on the expansion of the range of programs offered by KAIPTC and the integration of a specific UN framework into the training of military, police, and civilian personnel. UNITAR has direct presence at the KAIPTC as of July 2021.
5. The project activities will be framed under the three following outputs: i) review of the centre’s internal operating framework in line with UNITAR Quality Assurance Standards – including overall environment; culture; strategy; structure; systems; people; inputs and resources; outputs and performance; and considering cultural and gender aspects ii) review and expansion of the course portfolio (specifically, integration of UN training programmes - standards, policies, and frameworks – into KAIPTC’s programming); and iii) delivery of training to gender balanced groups of military and police personnel engaged in both internal and external (UN, AU, ECOWAS) operations.
6. Under the third component, training will be tailored to police personnel by supporting the implementation of the [Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping](https://police.un.org/en/strategic-guidance-framework-international-policing) in addition to the continuous delivery of training targeting both military and police personnel following the traditional programming of the centre. UNITAR will have an advisory and mentoring role to strengthen even further the impact of the training on the performance of personnel (high-impact training)[[1]](#footnote-2) and particular attention will be put on the specific training needs / preferences of female personnel.
7. Thus, the long-term outcome of the project is “Expanded access to high-impact training for military and police personnel (men and women) from West Africa and beyond (aligned to UN standards and policy frameworks)”. Short-term expected outcomes are i) “Strengthened operating framework of KAIPTC – in line with UNITAR Quality Assurance Framework”, and ii) “Strengthened capabilities and motivation of military and police officers from West Africa engaged in both internal and external (UN, AU, ECOWAS) operations".
8. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Evaluation Policy.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

1. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; to identify good practices as well as any challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation’s purpose is thus to meet accountability requirements, and to provide findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project’s quality 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.
2. The evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria and 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, with emphasis on institutional assessment and support.

**Scope of the evaluation**

1. The evaluation will cover all the project implementation period (June to December 2022).[[2]](#footnote-3) The evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases or the development of similar projects under the PTD (Bonn) programming, with particular focus on institutional assessment and support.

**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 (objective and design) relevant to the individual beneficiaries and beneficiary organisation’s needs, policies, and priorities, and designed with quality? Are the project capacity building activities reaching its intended individual beneficiaries (military and police officers)?*
* ***Coherence:*** *To what extent is the project coherent with relevant UN/international frameworks and the KAIPTC’s institutional objectives, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?*
* ***Effectiveness:*** *How effective has the project been in delivering results, specifically in reinforcing the role of the KAIPTC as the leading international centre* for training, education, and research in African peace and security, its delivery of high-impact training; *and in strengthening security self-responsibility of West African partners?*
* ***Efficiency:*** *To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?[[3]](#footnote-4)*
* ***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**

1. 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**

1. *To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute’s efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the UNITAR strategic framework 2022-2025, and particularly SO 1.1, and SDG 16?*
2. *To what extent is the project aligned with UN, AU, ECOWAS, and other international frameworks and reports in the peace and security area, including the* [*Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing*](https://police.un.org/en/strategic-guidance-framework-international-policing)*,* [*Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Agenda*](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/720/18/PDF/N0072018.pdf?OpenElement)*, the* [*UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/uniformed-gender-parity-2018-2028.pdf)*,* [*Integrated Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/un_dmspc.pdf)*,?[[4]](#footnote-5) To what extent is it aligned to international environmental frameworks, e.g., Blue Marble principles?* ***(ENVSUSE)***
3. *How relevant, including contextual relevance, are the objectives and design of the project (all its components) to the needs, policies, and priorities of KAIPTC; and to the capacity needs, priorities, and performance improvements of the beneficiaries of the training centre, i.e., military and police personnel? Is the project strategy, including trainings,designed to lead to a behavioural change/performance growth?*
4. *To what extent were institutional needs (human and financial capacities, targets, etc) reviewed and included into project design?*
5. *Is the project reaching its intended immediate and final beneficiaries, i.e., staff of KAIPTC and military and police personnel engaged in peace operations?*
6. *How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the peace and security field?* ***(GEEW)***

**Coherence**

1. *How well does the project complement other UNITAR programming in the area of pre-deployment training, funded by the same or other donors, including those aiming at strengthening the deployment-related training offerings of training centers in the African continent, e.g., Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces in East Africa or the Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMP) in West Africa (Mali)?*
2. *How well does the project complement and foster synergies with other initiatives implemented by other partners/donors of the training centre, i.e., core and non-core funders and other institutional partners?*
3. *How well does the project fit in the wider political and operational contexts of Ghana and West Africa?*

**Effectiveness**

1. *Have the planned outputs and outcomes been achieved? What are the factors, positively or negatively, affecting the project’s, organisation’s, and the individual’s performance?*
2. *Has the project’s structure, with its three components, and partnerships been effective in delivering results, including the performance of the implementing partner in delivering high-impact training?*
3. *How effective has the adoption of the UNITAR quality assurance framework been in strengthening KAIPTC’s operating framework to deliver high-impact training?*
4. *To what extent and how is the project contributing to changed behaviour (motivations) and improved performance (capabilities) of the trained personnel?**What has worked well and what is missing, if anything?*
5. *To what extent are a Do-No-Harm approach, human rights-based approach, disability considerations, a gender mainstreaming, and environmental sustainability strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project? How well are gender aspects included in the new operating framework of the centre, counting the training delivered?* ***(GEEW)(ENVSUSE)***
6. *How effective has the gender sensitive deployment-related training been in reinforcing a gender-safe environment to both men and women participants?* ***(GEEW)***

**Efficiency**

1. *To what extent has the project produced outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through partnership arrangements (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)? Were the project’s resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?*
2. *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been* ***(ENVSUSE)****?*

**Early indication and likelihood of impact**

1. *To what extent will the project contribute to strengthen crisis prevention and response capacities of West African partners (in UN, AU and ECOWAS missions in West Africa)?*
2. *To what extent has the project strengthened (or is likely to) the KAIPTC’s role as the leading international centre for training, education and research on African peace and security?*
3. *To what extent has the project contributed to improved policing and military functions in peace operations in the region (West Africa)? How did the trainings impact the specific training needs of uniformed (men and women) personnel and the served communities?*
4. *What other observable end-results or organizational changes* (*positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred?*
5. *To what extent did lessons learned from project implementation impact institutional practices? Were good practices identified? Were gender approaches developed and consolidated? Were network of professionals consolidated?*

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

1. *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. *What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project and can be mitigated by project stakeholders?*
3. *To what extent are the current design and exit strategies likely to contribute to sustained capacity of the training centre? To what extent did UNITAR support the design of exit strategies, including funding strategies?*
4. *What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming, particularly in institutional assessment and support?*

**Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (GEEW)**

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women’s 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**

1. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy](https://unitaremail.sharepoint.com/unitarnet/Documents/UNITAR%20Evaluation%20Policy.pdf), [the operational guidelines for independent evaluations](https://unitaremail.sharepoint.com/unitarnet/Documents/Operational%20Guidelines_Indepdendent%20Evaluation.pdf) and the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914), and the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/3625). 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.
2. 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 implementation team, project partners, the beneficiaries, the donor and other relevant 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 and the theory of change; key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.
3. It is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
* **Individual dimension** relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
* **Organizational dimension** relates to public and private organizations, civil society organizations, and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
* **Enabling environment dimension** refers to the context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

Table 1: Capacity areas within the three dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual** | Skills levels (technical and managerial skills)Competencies | Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence, Professional identity, Norms, Values, Intentions, Emotions, Environmental barriers and enablers with specific focus on gender and disability inclusion (among others)  |
| **Organizations** | MandatesHorizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms Motivation and incentive systemsStrategic leadershipInter/intra institutional linkages Programme managementMulti-stakeholder processes | Organizational prioritiesGender and disability inclusionProcesses, systems and proceduresHuman and financial resourcesKnowledge and information sharingInfrastructure |
| **Enabling environment** | Policy and legal frameworkPolitical commitment and accountability framework Governance | Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power Legal, policy and political environment |

1. 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](http://www.betterevaluation.org/resources/outcome_mapping/ilac) / [Outcome harvesting](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Outome%20Harvesting%20Brief%20FINAL%202012-05-2-1.pdf) / [outcome evidencing](http://ifsa.boku.ac.at/cms/fileadmin/IFSA2016/IFSA2016_WS12_Douthwaite.pdf), [process tracing](https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Process-tracing.pdf), [contribution analysis](https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Contribution-analysis.pdf), [episode study](https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/episode_studies), or other theory-based approaches to evaluate outcomes, are suitable tools for answering the evaluation questions.

*Stakeholder analysis*

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

* Implementing partner KAIPTC (staff and leadership);
* The donor (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany);
* Project implementation team (Police adviser based at KAIPTC, administrative assistants, learning specialist);
* Beneficiaries/participants at all levels;
* Host (ECOWAS, Ghanaian Ministry of Defence);
* Other donors or partners supporting KAIPTC;
* Etc.

*Survey(s)*

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

*Key informant interviews*

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

*Focus groups*

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

*Observation: Field visit*

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

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

1. The evaluation shall look for synergies and benefit from the evaluation undertakings of the projects “Supporting the yearly training programmes of the Ecole de Maintien de la Paix” and “Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces”, taking place in parallel. PPME will be liaising with the evaluation teams and schedule joint meetings that allow for exchange.

**Gender, disability and human rights**

1. The evaluator should incorporate [human rights, gender](http://www.uneval.org/document/download/1294) and [disability](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/3050) perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, UN country status/classification, disability, and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on **gender equality and women’s empowerment**.
2. 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](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)).

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

1. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from November 2022 (initial desk review and data collection) to June 2023 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 28 April 2023. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 26 May 2023. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders

Indicative timeframe: November 2022 - June 2023

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

 **Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **From**  | **To** | **Deadline\*** |
| Evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 9 December 2022 |
| Comments on evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 16 December 2022 |
| Zero draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 31 March 2023 |
| Comments on zero draft | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 14 April 2023 |
| Draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 28 April 2023 |
| Comments on draft report | Programme Management | Evaluation manager | 12 May 2023 |
| Final report  | Evaluator  | Evaluation manager | 26 May 2023 |
| Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned | Evaluator/evaluation manager | Programme Management | 30 May 2023 |
| Dissemination and publication of report  | Evaluation manager  |  | June 2023  |

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

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

**Communication/dissemination of results**

1. 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**

1. 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’).
2. 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.
3. 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**

1. 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](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102).

**Professional requirements**

1. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:
* MA degree or equivalent in peace, security or conflict studies; governance and international relations, peace and development evaluation, or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, and in areas related to peacekeeping and police/military training is desired.
* At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building and peace and security thematic evaluations. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
* Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of peacekeeping related topics, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts to develop policing capacities in broader peacekeeping missions. Knowledge of or experience in institutional assessments/support.
* Field work experience in Africa, particularly West Africa.
* 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. Working level of French is an advantage.

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

**Annexes:**

1. **List of contact points**
2. **Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
3. **List of documents and data to be reviewed**
4. **Structure of evaluation report**
5. **Project logical framework**
6. **Audit trail**
7. **Evaluator code of conduct**

**Annex A: List of contact points**

**Project Management to complete**

**B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.04.2022-17.10.2022**

**To be confirmed.**

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

* Interim and final narrative and financial reports – Phase I (or explanation why this did not take place as planned)
* Interim narrative and financial reports – Phase II
* Legal Agreement
* Logical Framework and outcome areas
* Project Description
* UNITAR website content
* Event Management System Data
* International frameworks, including [*Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing*](https://police.un.org/en/strategic-guidance-framework-international-policing)*,* [*Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Agenda*](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/720/18/PDF/N0072018.pdf?OpenElement)*, the* [*UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/uniformed-gender-parity-2018-2028.pdf)*,* [*Cruz Report*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/improving_security_of_united_nations_peacekeepers_report.pdf)*,* [*Action for Peacekeeping (A4P)*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/action-for-peacekeeping-a4p)*,* [*Integrated Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/un_dmspc.pdf)*,* [*Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations*](https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development-enjeux_developpement/gender_equality-egalite_des_genres/elsie_initiative-initiative_elsie.aspx?lang=eng)*,* [*Africa Peace Support Trainers Association*](https://apstaafrica.org/)*’s values and objectives,* [*UNSC Resolution 2242 (2015) on Women and Peace*](https://www.un.org/press/en/2015/sc12076.doc.htm#:~:text=Through%20resolution%202242%20%282015%29%2C%20adopted%20unanimously%20ahead%20of,concerns%20across%20all%20country-specific%20situations%20on%20its%20agenda.)*, the* [*Policy on United Nations Police*](https://police.un.org/sites/default/files/sgf-policy-police-2014.pdf) *(2014), report on* [*Forced Police Unit Command Staff Training Needs Assessment*](https://resourcehub01.blob.core.windows.net/training-files/Training%20Materials/002%20Policies/002-036%20Formed%20Police%20Unit%20Command%20Staff%20Training%20Needs%20Assessment.pdf)*; and other relevant UN, AU or ECOWAS frameworks.*
* Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

**Annex D: Structure of evaluation report**

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

**Annex E: Provisional Project Logical Framework and outcome areas submitted for project proposal.**



 **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 “Training and Advanced Training of West African Security Forces” 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[[5]](#footnote-6)**

**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 eval

1. High-impact training is based in six principles: i) performance, ii) human-centeredness; iii) innovation; iv) transformation; v) inclusivity; vi) interactivity; and vii) sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A previous phase of the project was planned for June 2021, but it was not implemented. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The KAIPTC acts as both partner and beneficiary of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. A non-exhaustive list of relevant frameworks is included in Annex C. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)