

Terms of Reference

Independent Evaluation of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series

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. Learning outcomes are associated with about two-thirds of the Institute's 450-some events organized annually, with a cumulative outreach to over 40,000 individuals (including 25,000 learners). Approximately three-quarters of beneficiaries from learning-related programming are from developing countries. UNITAR training covers various thematic areas, including activities to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; multilateral diplomacy; public finance and trade; environment, including climate change, environmental law and governance, and chemicals and waste management; peacekeeping, peacebuilding and conflict prevention; decentralized cooperation; and resilience and disaster risk reduction.
2. The Hiroshima Office is one of UNITAR's out-posted offices. As part of its programming, the Hiroshima Office has been delivering a *World Heritage Training Series* since 2003. The series seeks to contribute to capacity building for World Heritage by focusing on the elements required for nominating national sites for inscription on the World Heritage List. Over time, the series has evolved from a focus on World Heritage management, conservation and best practice, to an examination of the skills and knowledge required for developing more effective World Heritage nomination dossiers.
3. Since 2014, the series has been implemented under programme objective 2.4 of the UNITAR 2014-2017 Strategic Framework (Strengthening capacities to increase employability, to optimize the potential of creative economies and to protect cultural and natural heritage). Planned outputs under the 2014-2015 and 2016-2017 biennia programme budgets for the World Heritage results area include around 100 trained stakeholders, with 90 per cent confirming to have met or mostly met the learning objectives. Following the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015, the World Heritage Nomination Training Series results area of the UNITAR Programme Budget was aligned with target 11.4 of the Sustainable Development Goals (Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage).
4. The training series is funded under a multi-year Special Purpose Grant arrangement between UNITAR and the Hiroshima Prefecture and through participant fees, and is delivered in partnership with the UNESCO World Heritage Center and advisory bodies. Uniquely well-placed in Hiroshima which possesses two world heritage sites, the series consists of an annual five-day workshop which provides a detailed examination of the World Heritage nomination process and requirements, utilizing expert insight and experience, as well as exchanging know-how on best practices and case studies.

From 2004-2016, thirteen annual workshops have been held in Hiroshima, with one in-country workshop having taken place in India, with a total of over 400 Alumni from 60 countries.

The foci of the series have been:

- 2016 | World Heritage Nominations: Justification for Inscription
 - 2015 | World Heritage Nominations: Protection and Management Requirements
 - 2014 | World Heritage Nominations: Justification for the Inscription of Cultural Landscapes
 - 2013 | World Heritage Serial Nominations: The Vital Role of Comparative Analysis
 - 2012 | World Heritage Nominations: Justification of Outstanding Universal Value
 - 2011 | World Heritage Nominations: UNESCO's Preparing World Heritage Nominations Manual and Comparative Analysis in the Nominations Process
 - 2010 | Conservation Monitoring and Monitoring Indicators
 - 2009 | World Heritage Impact Assessment
 - 2008 | Conservation for Peace
 - 2007 | Maintaining Values and Significance
 - 2006 | Managing the Tangible and Intangible
 - 2005 | A Values-based Approach
 - 2004 | The Management and Conservation of World Heritage Site
5. The series offers a set of innovative approaches to heritage conservation, including: a values-based management approach examining the significance of the sites to be conserved, the fusion of cultural and natural heritage management, the recognition of both the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage sites, and a targeted examination of distinct areas of the world heritage nominations process.
6. What is critical to the successful inscription of any site is the development of a comprehensive and effective nomination dossier and it is crucial to have a deeper understanding of the World Heritage Convention and the UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, which, together with the Preparing World Heritage Nominations resource manual, are used as key references for the training. The UNITAR World Heritage Nomination Training Series achieves this understanding through interactive presentations and practical exercises examining a number of core topics, such as:
- Principles and Objectives of the World Heritage Convention;
 - The Operational Guidelines;
 - The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value;
 - Comparative Analysis;
 - Justification for Inscription;
 - World Heritage Nomination and Evaluation Processes;
 - Tips on Writing and Preparing the Nomination Dossier; and
 - World Heritage Nominations: Format.

Purpose of the evaluation

7. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the World Heritage Training Series, as well as to identify any problems or challenges that the series encountered and to issue recommendations, if needed. The purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to improvement and organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess the performance of the World Heritage Nomination Series project, but also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful implementation and achievement of results.

Scope of the evaluation

8. The evaluation will cover the period from 2012 to 2017. It will cover the training series' output and outcome areas, in addition to progress towards the intended impact and contribution to helping Member States implement the relevant Sustainable Development Goals.

Evaluation criteria

9. The evaluation will assess training series performance using the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
 - *Relevance: Is the series reaching its intended users and relevant to the targeted beneficiaries specific needs and priorities?*
 - *Effectiveness: To what extent has the series produced planned outputs and has made progress towards attainment of outcomes?*
 - *Efficiency: To what extent were the outputs being produced in a cost-effective manner?*
 - *Impact: What cumulative and/or long-term effects are expected from the UNITAR World Heritage Nomination Training Series, including contribution towards the intended impact, as well as positive or negative effects, or intended or unintended changes?*
 - *Sustainability: To what extent are the planned results likely to be sustained in the long term?*

Principal evaluation questions

10. The following questions are suggested to guide the evaluation:

Relevance

- a. *To what extent was the World Heritage Nomination Training Series, as designed and implemented, suited to the needs and priorities of selected beneficiaries working in the area of heritage conservation?*
- b. *To what extent are the World Heritage Nomination Training Series' relevant to stakeholder needs?*
- c. *Who were the World Heritage Nomination Training Series' users?*
- d. *To what extent were the objectives of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series relevant to helping Member States implement SDG 11.4?*
- e. *Were the activities and the outputs of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series consistent with their respective goals and objectives?*
- f. *Were the activities and outputs of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series consistent with the intended impacts and effects?*

- g. *To what extent is the World Heritage Nomination Training Series in line with UNITAR's mandate and strategic objectives?*
- h. *What other training activities have been undertaken in this area, and what similarities/differences exist in the training scope?*

Effectiveness

- i. *To what extent have the World Heritage Nomination Training Series achieved the planned objectives and results to contribute to capacity building for World Heritage?*
- j. *What factors may have influenced the achievement (or non-achievement) of the objectives?*
- k. *To what extent have the World Heritage Nomination Training Series been successful in contributing to capacity building for World Heritage and implementation of SDG 11.4 and the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy?*
- l. *To what extent has learning from World Heritage Nomination Training Series workshops resulted in follow-up work at the country level?*

Efficiency

- m. *To what extent have the outputs been produced in a cost-efficient manner (e.g. in comparison with alternative approaches)?*
- n. *Were the World Heritage Nomination Training Series outputs and objectives been achieved on time?*
- o. *To what extent have collaborations with partners been conducive to the delivery of the outputs?*
- p. *To what extent was the entire approach efficient?*

Impact

- q. *What real difference have the World Heritage Nomination Training Series made building capacity for World Heritage and to the end beneficiaries?*
- r. *What cumulative effects have the World Heritage Nomination Training Series made to the partners' work in contributing to capacity building for World Heritage and to the end beneficiaries?*
- s. *What has happened as a result of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series?*

Sustainability

- t. *To what extent have the World Heritage Nomination Training Series contributed to better capacity building for World Heritage in the long term?*
- u. *What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series?*
- v. *How likely is it that contributing to capacity building for World Heritage continues beyond the scope of the workshops?*
- w. *What gaps and/or opportunities exist for capacity building-focused training in World Heritage?*
- x. *What is the likelihood that the benefits of the World Heritage Nomination Training Series will continue after donor funding ceases?*

Evaluation Approach and Methods

11. The evaluation will be undertaken by a consultant under the overall responsibility of the UNITAR evaluation manager. The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework and the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

12. The evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process. 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; key informant interviews; focus groups; and possibly field visits (to a selected country or countries for case studies). These data collection tools are discussed below.
13. 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 analyze background documents and secondary data/information related to the World Heritage Nomination Training Series. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex A.

Stakeholder analysis

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in *the World Heritage Nomination Training Series*. Key stakeholders at the global level include, but are not limited, to:

- UNITAR Hiroshima Office (project management);
- Beneficiaries/participants;
- The Hiroshima Prefectural Government;
- The City of Hiroshima;
- The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO);
- International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM);
- The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS); and
- The World Conservation Union (IUCN).

Survey(s)

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultants shall 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 global focal points is available in Annex B. 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 or at the national level.

Focus groups

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

Field visit

Field visits will be organized to enable the evaluator to engage in first-hand observation, focus group discussions and interview key informants. The venue(s) of the field visits will be determined following the desk review and inception report. It is recommended that the evaluator participate in the Lessons Learned Conference to be held in March 2018.

Gender and human rights

14. 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.
15. 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.

Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review

16. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from January (initial desk review and data collection) to April 2018 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
17. The consultant shall submit a brief inception report following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The inception report should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The inception report should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.
18. 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.
19. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex C. 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 20-30pages, excluding annexes.
20. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to the Hiroshima Office to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex D by 30 April 2018. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 14 May 2018.

Indicative timeframe: January – May 2018

Activity	January	February	March	April	May
Evaluator selected and recruited					
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis					
Inception report					

Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews, focus groups and field visits					
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR					
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Hiroshima Office					
Hiroshima Office reviews draft evaluation report and share comments and recommendations					
Evaluation report finalized and validated by Hiroshima Office					

Summary of evaluation deliverables and schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline
Inception report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager/ Hiroshima Office	5 February 2018
Comments on inception report	Evaluation manager/ Hiroshima Office	Evaluator	19 February 2018
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	19 March 2018
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	2 April 2018
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager/ Hiroshima Office	16 April 2018
Comments on draft report	Hiroshima Office	Evaluation manager/ evaluator	30 April 2018
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager/ Hiroshima Office	14 May 2018

Communication/dissemination of results

21. The final evaluation report will be shared with all *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

Professional requirements

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

- MA degree or equivalent in political science, development or a related discipline;

- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluations.
- Knowledge of the World Heritage Convention, the nomination processes and training related programming;
- 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; and
- Fluency in English.

Contractual arrangements

23. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Manager of the Planning, Performance and Results Section ('evaluation manager'). 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 with field visits (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

Evaluator Ethics

The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project related activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex E prior to initiating the assignment.

Annexes:

A: List of documents and data to be reviewed

B: List of *World Heritage Nomination Training Series*' Partners and Contact Points

C: Structure of evaluation report

D: Audit trail

E: Evaluator code of conduct

Annex A: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* Reports, including financial reports
- Content of *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* website <http://unitar.org/world-heritage>
- Database of *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* events
- Data from *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* platform
- Content from workshop events
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

Annex B: List of *World Heritage Nomination Training Series* Partners and Contact Points (to be updated)

Partners	
Organization	Focal Point

Annex C: 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. Summary of field visits
 - f. Evaluation question matrix
 - g. Evaluation consultant agreement form

Annex D: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by the Hiroshima Office 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 World Heritage Nomination Training Series 2014-2017

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

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 Form¹
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.
Signed at <i>place</i> on <i>date</i>
Signature: _____

*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.

¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct