

Independent Evaluation of project “Strengthening the capacity of the judicial system and promoting the rule of law in Mali Phase II”
TARPT082

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 Institute works towards supporting institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace. It incorporates activities aimed at strengthening capacities of institutions and individuals towards peaceful coexistence, conflict prevention and resolution, restoration of the rule of law, and the development of sound regulatory frameworks in promotion of public participation in decision making and access to information and justice.
3. UNITAR’s Division for Peace groups together programming in the fields of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Its aim is to provide comprehensive support to the promotion of peace, justice and strong institutions worldwide, thereby advancing the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16.¹
4. The project entitled “**Strengthening the capacity of the judicial system and promoting the rule of Law in Mali phase II**” which is implemented by UNITAR’s Division for Peace was funded by the German Federal Foreign Office and aims to support the national stakeholders for a comprehensive reform of the judicial system as part of Mali’s governmental transition. It aimed to accomplish this objective through, on the one hand, strengthening and modernising the Malian judicial system, particularly in its institutional desire to promote the rule of law, a just and equitable society, the effective fight against corruption and impunity and finally national development. On the other hand, the project aimed to digitalise the judicial system of Mali. The project has been implemented between July 2021 and July 2023 and UNITAR chose to work with the *Institut National de Formation Judiciaire du Mali* (INFJ) as an implementing partner. Over the course of the project implementation, the activities have been adapted to meet the needs of the target audience and to effectively respond to the settings and requirements on the ground.
5. The project was implemented subsequent to an earlier project phase entitled “Strengthening the capacity of the judicial system and promoting the rule of law in Mali” that was implemented between December 2020 and March 2021 with an amendment until May 2021. According to the project document, this phase focused on an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Malian judicial system including a needs assessment. An action plan was prepared and agreed upon with the Ministry of Justice.
6. UNITAR has been active in Mali and the Sahel since 2016 through projects aiming to strengthening regional peacekeeping training capacities, strengthening operational capacities of police contributing countries, supporting the yearly training programmes of the Mali-based *Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMP)* and strengthening crisis management capacities of Malian national Police, Gendarmerie and national Guard during elections. The project builds on these previous project interventions and on the assessment of the Malian judicial system and action plan developed as part of Phase I of the project to enhance the capacities of judicial system actors, while empowering judicial institutions to fulfil their mandates.

¹ SDG 16 seeks to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels”. This project is particularly relevant to the target 16.3, to “promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all”. See in this context <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16>.

7. The project objective was planned to be achieved through two outcomes:
 - A strengthened and modernized Malian judicial system, particularly in its institutional desire to promote the rule of law, a just and equitable society, the effective fight against corruption and impunity and finally national development.
 - Digitalization of the judicial system.
8. The project's outputs included various capacity building interventions in the form of tailored training provided to judicial police officers and lawyers, the members of the Magistrates Prosecutor's Office, judges and clerks, bailiffs and commissioners of justice, notaries, magistrates, the media and selected civil society groups. These aimed to contribute to the above outcomes, e.g. strengthening of the capacity of judicial bodies and judicial accessibility, combating impunity and corruption, and finally – an improved case management and filing system and computerising the judicial system.
9. To improve the knowledge, skills and behaviour of the above mentioned stakeholders the project foresaw to develop training packages and learning reinforcement tools and implement some 13 training sessions,² organise a study tour to Rwanda for the Magistrates to learn from country experience in developing its electronic filing system (Case Management), and a study tour to Senegal for the Members of the Higher Council of the Judiciary focused on the analysis of the composition and measures related to sanctions and General approach. The training component of the project is implemented in partnership with INFJ, following UNITAR training quality standards. A Training of Trainers (ToT) for trainers nominated by INFJ was conducted as preparation to the proposed training activities.
10. Furthermore, it was planned to include the creation of an integrated Electronic Management System (IECMS) that covers the Judiciary, Ministry of Justice, National Public Prosecution, Criminal Investigation Department and the Correctional Services to share information and archiving. It also includes the electronic filing system (Case Management). The above-mentioned study tour to Rwanda is to be implemented under this context.
11. Additional translation, publication and dissemination of legal texts were planned to be developed as part of the project. As per the last interim report, a number of handbooks, materials, booklets and legal documents were translated in various languages, produced, printed, published and disseminated.

Purpose of the evaluation

12. The purpose of the evaluation is to (a) assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; (b) to identify good practices as well as any challenges that the project has encountered; (c) to issue recommendations, and (d) to identify lessons to be learned on 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 future projects' quality improvement 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.

Scope of the evaluation

13. The evaluation will cover the entire project timeframe, from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2023. While Phase I is not formally part of the scope of the evaluation, the outcomes of the first phase are directly related to the second phase and shall hence be taken into consideration. The evaluation should maintain sufficient focus to deliver findings and conclusions with actionable recommendations to inform future phases of the project, similar projects in the country and other projects in other contexts beyond Mali. The evaluation will include an assessment of all six

² Annex A presents the list of proposed training to be delivered.

OECD/DAC criteria and gender, disability and human rights considerations, and environmental sustainability considerations. The scope, evaluation questions and data collection will be commensurate with the evaluation's resource requirements.

Evaluation criteria

14. The evaluation will assess project performance following the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability.

- **Relevance:** *Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
- **Coherence:** *To what extent is the project coherent with relevant internal policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international frameworks?*
- **Effectiveness:** *How effective has the project been in delivering results and increasing support of national stakeholders for a comprehensive reform of the Malian judicial system?*
- **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 incorporated in the project?*

Principal evaluation questions

15. The following questions are suggested to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible and with regard to the project's future orientation, as may be relevant.

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, and its principles, and the UNITAR strategic frameworks (2018-2021 and 2022-2025), and particularly SO 1 and SDG 16?*
- b. *How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women's empowerment? (GEEW)*
- c. *How relevant are the objectives and the design of the project to the identified Malian judicial systems' needs and challenges assessed during Phase I of the project and overall capacity needs and priorities, to strengthen and modernise the Malian judicial system, particularly in its institutional desire to promote the rule of law? More specifically, were all the project components relevant to all the stakeholders and have they remained relevant throughout project implementation despite changes of the political and national context or were adjusted using adaptive management?*

Coherence

- d. How well does the project complement other UNITAR programming implemented between 2020-2023 in Mali, e.g. in supporting the crisis management capacities during national elections?³
- e. How well does the project complement other projects or programming implemented in the field of justice and the rule of law by other organizations, e.g., UN Women, MINUSMA, etc.?
- f. To what extent are the results of the previous phase (2020-2021) informing the phase II (2021-2023)?
- g. To what extent does the project (and the training material) align with relevant national, regional and international frameworks and agreements such as national laws, regulations and procedures, regional instruments, the Women, Peace and Security Agenda (UN Security Council Resolution 1325 and the [UNSC Resolution 2242 \(2015\) on Women and Peace](#)), the Call to Action for Human Rights and other [relevant documents](#)? **(GEEW)**

Effectiveness

- h. How effective is the project's design and methodology in achieving the outcome area related to strengthening, modernising and digitalising the Malian judicial system?
- i. To what extent is the project contributing to increasing the support to national stakeholders for a comprehensive reform of the judicial system as part of the Mali governmental transition?
- j. How effective is the project's contribution to improving the knowledge, skills, its use and behavioural change of Malian judicial stakeholders at all levels? Are there any differential results across groups? What is missing, if anything?
- k. To what extent was the train the trainer element effective and has led to trained trainers to use knowledge and skills to implement trainings?
- l. To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disability considerations and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project and more specifically in the design and delivery of training events, especially in those focused on women in the judicial system, protection of vulnerable groups and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) and how is the participation of women being promoted? To what extent were civil society considered? **(GEEW)**
- m. To what extent was cross-national learning from Senegal and Rwanda effective?
- n. To what extent was the partnership strategy (working with an implementing partner) effective to enhance national ownership?
- o. To what extent is environmental sustainability taken into account, specifically when organising the study tours to Senegal and Rwanda? **(ENVSUSE)**

Efficiency

- p. To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner including the implementing partner's deliverables (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)?
- q. Were the project's resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilized?
- r. To what extent are the project's inputs/resources deployed in an efficient manner (e.g., cost-efficient) to realize the activities? **(ENVSUSE)**
- s. To what extent has the project been able to link to other initiatives and collaborated with UN Women and MINUSMA and other international organizations working in the field?

Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact

- t. To what extent has the project contributed to the reform of the Malian judicial system as part of Mali's governmental transition process, through strengthening, modernizing and digitalizing the Malian judicial system?
- u. What was the project's contribution, if any, with regards to gender equality and preventing and reducing GBV? **(GEEW)**
- v. What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred or are likely to occur?

Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability

- w. To what extent are the project's results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the

³ An overview of the portfolio is available on the UNITAR [website](#).

activities in the mid- to long-term and under which conditions, including the new case management system (funding and capacity), continued application of knowledge and skills from the training, use of the publications and resources?

- x. To what extent did the support and particularly the train-the-trainer approach provided by UNITAR contribute to the national ownership and hence the sustainability of the project?
- y. What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- z. To what extent can the project be replicated elsewhere?
- aa. What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming, in the area of judicial reform and modernization of judicial systems?

Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEEW)

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with “**GEEW**” in the above. Other considerations for disability-inclusion and human-rights may be included in the questions.

Environmental Sustainability in Evaluation (ENVSUSE)

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

Evaluation Approach and Methods

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy](#) and Independent Evaluation [Operational Guidelines](#), as well as the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#). The evaluation will be undertaken by an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME).

16. 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 (or results formulation in text form) and the theory of change (to be reconstructed); key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if the security situation and time allows, field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.
17. 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 (among others)
Organizations	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

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

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 D.

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:

- German Federal Foreign Office;
- Implementing partner: Institut National de Formation Judiciaire
- Beneficiaries/participants from the project; Judicial Police Officers, Lawyers, Magistrates, Judges and clerks, Bailiffs and Commissioners of Justice, Notaries, political parties, NGOs, Media, Civil Society, etc.
- Trainers/facilitators;
- UN Country Teams (UN Women and MINUSMA);
- Host (local and national) governments;
- UNITAR staff and consultants in Geneva, Bonn and Mali;
- Peace Advisory Board members
- 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. Two separate surveys may be developed (to trained trainers and to training participants).

Key informant interviews

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

Focus groups

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

Field visit

A field visit for interviews and focus groups with logistical support from Project Management shall be organised only if the security situation and time allows for it. Alternatively, the evaluator should be able to undertake data collection entirely remotely.

Gender and human rights

19. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender 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 and age grouping and be included in the draft and final evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality and empowerment of women.
20. 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

21. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from December 2023 (initial desk review and data collection) to March 2024 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
22. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods, as well as a list of documents reviewed highlighting insights from every reviewed document. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.
23. 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.

24. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex E. 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.
25. 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 18 March 2024. Within one week of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 25 March 2024. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders. The final report to be submitted to the donor will be available in April 2024.

Indicative timeframe: November 2023 – March 2024

Activity	November 2023	December 2023	January 2024	February 2024	March 2024
Evaluator selected and recruited					
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis					
Evaluation design/question matrix					
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit					
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	14 December 2023
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	21 December 2023
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	19 February 2024
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	26 February 2024
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	4 March 2024
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	To be defined based on stakeholder availability
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	18 March 2024
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	25 March 2024
Dissemination and publication of report	Evaluation manager		28 March 2024

Communication/dissemination of results

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

Evaluation management arrangements

27. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Division for Strategic Planning and Performance and Manager of PPME ('evaluation manager').

28. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. In accordance with 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.

29. 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

30. 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 H prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

Professional requirements

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

- MA degree or equivalent in law, governance, international relations, peace studies and conflict management and resolutions or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, including training of trainers approaches and in areas related to rule of law or the judicial system.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of rule of law related topics.
- Field work experience in West Africa. Previous experience in Mali is an advantage.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills in English.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel (if the security situation allows for it).
- Fluency in oral and written French and English.

- **Annexes:**

- A. List of training**

- B. Needs of Assessment and Training**

- C. List of contact points**

- D. Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**

- E. List of documents and data to be reviewed**

- F. Structure of evaluation report**

- G. Logframe**

- H. Audit trail**

- I. Evaluator code of conduct**

Annex A. List of trainings planned

For the investigative authorities (Judicial Police Officers and Lawyers)

- Training in Ethics and Deontology to a total of 200 participants for each group.
- Training in criminal procedures to a total of 200 participants for each group.

For the Magistrates Prosecutor's Office

- Training in Ethics and Deontology to a total of 100 participants
- Training in criminal procedures to a total of 100 participants

For the Office of Judges (Judges and Clerks)

- Training of judges in Ethics and Deontology to a total of 100 participants
- Training of judges in qualitative and quantitative writing of judgements in time to a total of 100 participants
- Training of clerks in qualitative and quantitative drafting of court decisions respecting deadlines and limitations to a total of 100 participants

Executive Authorities

- Training of Bailiffs and Commissioners of Justice in Ethics and Deontology for a total of 50 participants
- Training of Bailiffs and Commissioners of Justice in Surety and Enforcement Law for a total of

50 participants

- Training of Notaries in Ethics and Deontology and money laundering (Role of CENTIF and GIABA (Intergovernmental Action Group Against Money Laundering) for a total of 50 participants

- Training of Judicial Police Officers and Magistrates in protecting minors and vulnerable people for a total of 100 participants

- Training of Judicial Police Officers, Magistrates and the Media in fighting Gender Based Violence (GBV) for a total of 100 participants

Political and Civil Actors (Political Parties, NGOs, Media, Civil Society)

- Training in Electoral Law for 200 participants

Annex C: List of contact points Project Management to complete

C: Event data available on the Event Management System

Start date (Y-m-d)	End date (Y-m-d)	Event title
2021-10-04	2021-10-08	Formation des Formateurs pour le renforcement des capacités du système judiciaire et promotion de l'état de droit au Mali
2021-12-03	2021-12-03	Officiers de police judiciaire - procédure pénale
2021-11-08	2021-11-19	Magistrature debout - Ethique et déontologie
2021-12-13	2021-12-13	Rédaction de jugement
2021-12-06	2021-12-17	Magistrature debout - Procédure pénale
2021-10-26	2021-10-26	Colloque sur le contentieux électoral
2022-02-14	2022-02-25	Formation des Formateurs pour le renforcement des capacités du système judiciaire et promotion de l'état de droit au Mali
2022-05-08	2022-05-12	Formation sur la prise en charge des cas de violences basées sur le genre
2022-05-30	2022-06-03	Formation sur la prise en charge des cas de violences basées sur le genre Magistrats - Bamako, Mali [30 May - 03 June 2022]
2022-05-23	2022-06-03	Préparation des Actes de Procédure: Enregistrement des actes de recours et la délivrance des actes y afférents - Bamako, Mali [23 May - 03 June 2022]
2022-08-29	2022-09-02	Les Voies d'Exécution - Bamako, Mali [29 August - 02 September 2022]
2022-08-15	2022-08-26	Protection des Mineurs - Bamako, Mali [15 - 26 August 2022]
2022-09-05	2022-09-30	Ethique et Déontologie des OPJ - Bamako, Mali [05 - 30 September 2022]
2022-11-07	2022-11-11	Ethique et Déontologie des Huissiers et Commissaires de Justice - Bamako, Mali [7 - 11 November 2022]
2022-11-21	2023-01-02	Ethique et Déontologie des Avocats - Bamako, Mali [21 November - 02 December 2022]
2022-11-21	2022-12-16	Droit Electoral et Contentieux Electoraux - Bamako, Mali [21 November - 16 December 2022]
2023-06-11	2023-06-15	Ethique et la Déontologie - Bamako, Mali [12 June 2023 - 16 June 2023]
2023-06-11	2023-06-15	Le Blanchiment des Capitaux - Bamako, Mali [12 June 2023 - 16 June 2023]
2023-06-12	2023-06-16	Blanchiment de capitaux (Notaires) - Bamako, Mali [12 - 16 June 2023]
2023-06-12	2023-06-16	L'Ethique et la Déontologie de l'avocat - Bamako, Mali [12 - 16 June 2023]

2023-07-10	2023-07-14	La Procédure Pénale et les bonnes pratiques (Avocats) - Bamako, Mali [10 - 14 June 2023]
2023-07-10	2023-07-14	Le Contentieux électoral (Acteurs électoraux) - Bamako, Mali [10 - 14 July 2023]
2023-07-17	2023-07-21	La Procédure Pénale et les bonnes pratiques (Avocats) - Bamako, Mali [17 - 21 July 2023]
2023-07-17	2023-07-21	ETHIQUE ET DEONTOLOGIE DU NOTAIRE - Bamako, Mali [17 - 21 July 2023]
2023-07-17	2023-07-21	Le Contentieux électoral (Acteurs électoraux) - Bamako, Mali [17 - 21 July 2023]
2023-07-16	2023-07-26	Organisation d'une formation en Genre, paix et sécurité - Bamako, Mali [17/07 - 28/07/2023]
2023-07-02	2023-07-13	Organisation d'une formation Gestion des Risques et Catastrophes (GRC) - Bamako, Mali [03/07 - 14/07/2023]
2023-04-02	2023-04-13	Organisation d'une formation Gestion des Projets Sensibles aux Conflit (GPSC) - Bamako, Mali [03/04 - 14/04/2023]
2023-05-28	2023-09-08	Organisation d'une formation sur la protection de civils II- Bamako, Mali [29/05 - 09/06/2023]
2023-09-03	2023-09-14	Organisation d'une formation sur le droit international humanitaire I - Bamako, Mali [16/06 - 23/06/2023]
2023-09-11	2023-09-13	Séminaire de haut niveau I : Sécurité climatique et environnementale : quels impacts sur la paix et sécurité au sahel ? - Bamako, Mali [12/09 - 14/09/2023]

Annex D: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Narrative and financial reports (in the absence of the final reports, interim reports shall be provided, including annexes and self-evaluations, Logframe updates etc.)
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Monitoring and self-evaluation data
- Implementing partner documentation
- Stakeholder contacts
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data
- YouTube channel from INJF including videos such as the closing ceremony video: <https://youtu.be/GfZ9zzT-H8A?feature=shared>.
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

Annex E: Structure of evaluation report

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

Annex F: Project logical framework
To be added by Project Management

Annex H: 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 Form⁴

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.

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct