CHAPTER III
MANAGING AN INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION

This Chapter addresses UNODC Project Managers who manage Independent Project Evaluations under IEU guidance and quality assurance.

Managing an evaluation process implies early preparation to lay the groundwork for a timely, relevant and useful evaluation. In light of the high levels of engagement of evaluation stakeholders in this process, the role of the Project Manager in scheduling the evaluation is crucial for success.

Depending on the complexity and size of the evaluation, the preparation period may vary.

The Independent Evaluation Unit strongly recommends reserving a minimum of **three months** for an Independent Project Evaluation.

Preparing for a large scale evaluation such as **In-Depth Evaluations** may take up to **six months**, as it includes stakeholders' engagement, collection of background information, finalization of ToR and ensuring a common understanding of the purpose and scope, selection and recruitment of the evaluation team, preparation of the logistics, before the evaluation team is able to undertake the evaluation.

A. Schedule an Evaluation

Bearing in mind that an evaluation ought to provide information in a timely manner, so that it becomes available when the programme or project needs it most, Project Managers should determine a schedule for when to carry out a mid-term or final Independent Project Evaluation in order to plan well in advance

1. Planning for an Independent Project Evaluation

Project Managers take into account:

- The time needed for the Project Manager to **draft and finalize the evaluation ToR**;

- The time needed for IEU to **clear the finalized ToR**;

- The time needed to identify, interview and contract external international and national evaluators.

Time needed for the evaluation team to conduct the desk review and to work out the sampling strategy and overall evaluation methodology

- **Travel** days and national holidays;

- The time needed for **data analysis** and preparation of the **draft report**;

- The time needed for stakeholders (including IEU) to **comment on the draft report**;

- The time needed for evaluators to **accommodate those comments**;

- The time needed for IEU to **clear the final report**.

2. Considering the Independent Project Evaluation Process

In other words, when scheduling an evaluation, Project Managers consider the time needed to complete each steps of the evaluation process.

Steps in an evaluation

- I. Background data collection
- II. Evaluation ToR
- III. Logistics
- IV. Recruitment of the evaluation team
- V. Desk review
- VI. Evaluation team briefing and possible interviews at UNODC HQ
- VII. Inception report
- VIII. In-country evaluation mission(s) (visits to the field, briefings, interviews etc.)
- IX. Data analysis
- X. Draft evaluation report
- XI. Quality assurance of the draft evaluation report: factual verification and collection of comments
- XII. Inclusion of comments received
- XIII. Final evaluation report
- XIV. Final presentation of findings, e.g. at UNODC Headquarters and/or in the field

Indicative duration of an Independent Project Evaluation Process:

Evaluation Steps	Responsible Person	Tentative working Days
Background data collection	PM	10 days
Evaluation ToR	PM	10 days
Logistics	PM/IEU	5 days
Recruitment of the evaluation team	PM/IEU	10 days
Desk review	Evaluation team	5 days
Evaluation team briefing and possible interviews at UNODC HQ	PM/ Evaluation team	2 days
Inception report	Evaluation team IEU	2 days
Field mission, including briefings from Ministries and interviews	Evaluation team	7 days
Data analysis	Evaluation team	7 days
Presentation of evaluation findings with key stakeholders	Evaluation team	0,5 day
Draft evaluation report	Evaluation team/ IEU	15 days
Factual verification and collection of comments	PM	7 days
Inclusion of comments received	Evaluation team	3 days
Final evaluation report	Evaluation team/ IEU	7 days
Final presentation of findings at HQ	Evaluation team	1 days
TOTAL		**91,5 days**

Timing for In-Depth Evaluations takes significantly longer.

3. Developing a Timetable for an Independent Project Evaluation

A detailed timetable with breakdown of days worked by consultants against their tasks and deliverables should be included by Project Managers in the ToR of the evaluation.

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contract is a legally binding document in which the consultant agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. **There is no template or formula to calculate the number of days needed. It is however the responsibility of the requesting office to carefully consider and determine the estimated number of days that the consultant would need, to be able to produce quality work and fully complete all the expected deliverables on time. It is particularly essential that sufficient time is planned for the drafting and finalizing of the report, including the process of consultation and incorporation of comments and changes.**

A minimum of 30 days may be recommended, but it is understood that the number of days may vary depending on the complexity and scope of the project. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three installments are typically planned for: upon delivery of the Inception Report, of the Draft Evaluation Report and of the Final Evaluation Report, including the final presentation.

International Consultant Tasks

Duties		Location	Results
Desk review		Home based	List of evaluation questions developed Evaluation tools developed Draft inception report
Briefing and interviews with staff at UNODC HQ.		UNODC HQ	Inception report
Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews etc.		Cities/Countries	Notes
Presentation of findings at UNODC HQ		UNODC HQ	Notes
Drafting of the evaluation report based on UNODC template; submission to stakeholders for comments; and finalization of report		Home base	Draft report Final Report

National Consultant Tasks

Duties		Location	Results
Desk review and collection of additional information as required		Home base	List of evaluation questions Evaluation tools developed Draft inception report
Establishment of the mission's programme; Interview guidelines in collaboration with the international consultant			
Evaluation mission: briefing and interviews		Cities/Countries	Notes
Drafting of chapters of the evaluation report in collaboration with the international consultant		Home base	Draft chapters of the report

B. Background documentation collection

The provision of the background documents is the **responsibility of the Project Manager**.

An initial list of background documentation, which can be refined during the evaluation process, is to be jointly prepared by the Project Manager and the Core Learning Partnership (<mark>Please see Chapter I, Section E. for further information on the CLP</mark>).

While preparing this list and collecting the documents, Project Managers make an assessment as regards to the documentation that the Evaluator(s) have to review. The purpose of such a review is to have a clear understanding and a good overview of the project/programme achievements.

Please note that this process takes time depending on the availability of the sources from which the background documentation can be obtained. It is therefore recommended that the Project Manager **initiates** the collection **well in advance of the evaluation.**

Once the evaluation has started, the evaluator can request additional and complementary information based on the initial review of the background documentation. The collection of documentation is a **continuous task** during the evaluation process. It is the Project Manager's responsibility to provide the additional information requested by the evaluator during the evaluation.

The **type of background documents** to be collected are: mandates, national strategies, project/programme documents, monitoring and reporting documents (e.g. baseline data, progress reports, mission reports and minutes of meetings), policies of UNODC and other stakeholders, information on projects and programmes undertaken by others in a relevant area, and previous evaluation reports or reports on evaluations undertaken by other partners.

Additional documents, such as *policies of UNODC and other stakeholders*, and *information on projects and programmes undertaken by others in a relevant area*, must also be part of the background documentation required for the desk review. This will help the evaluators gain a historical and contextual understanding of the situation in which the UNODC project or programme is being implemented. *Earlier evaluation reports or reports on evaluations undertaken by other partners* should be made available as well.

Each UNODC project or programme is required to produce regular *monitoring and reporting documents* (most of the documents are available on ProFi). Each project or programme should also ideally have collected *baseline data* on the situation at the beginning of the project or programme. The evaluation uses the baseline data to compare with the data collected about the progress made towards the achievement of project objectives. Project objectives and expected results are shown in the logical framework, which is part of the *programme or project document*.

In an Independent Project Evaluation Project Managers assemble the background documents as early as possible, (usually a shared folder is created), and **send them to the evaluation team in advance** so that the team can start with the desk review as soon as possible (please <mark>see Chapter IV, Section A.</mark>).

This list of background documentation is part of the evaluation Terms of Reference (please <mark>see Chapter III, Section C</mark>).

C. Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

Terms of Reference (ToR) are a written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the indicative methods to be used, the issues to be addressed, and the resources, schedule and reporting requirements.

1. Roles and Responsibilities

The ToR of the evaluation are developed and finalized by the Project Manager.

IEU clears the ToR. The Project Manager then informs the CLP about the evaluation, their role and asks them to comment on the evaluation questions.

Once the ToR are cleared, the Project Manager proceeds with the identification, selection and recruitment of the evaluation team, following the guidelines.

2. Structure

Most of the previous Sections (Please see Chapter II, Sections C, D, E and Chapter III, Section A and B) of the present evaluation handbook (on purpose, scope, timing, budgeting etc.) actually come together in the various parts of the ToR, as described below.

The ToR of the evaluation reflect the Project Manager's understanding of the overall framework of the evaluation.

The ToR form an integral part of the agreement between UNODC and the independent evaluators. Well-considered and well-written ToR, with sufficient clarity and details, are therefore the foundation of a good evaluation and must contain the below content. Please see the Guidelines for Evaluation ToR in the Chapter III tools.

ToR Table of Contents

I. Background and context

II. Disbursement history

III. Purpose of the evaluation

IV. Scope of the evaluation

V. Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions

VI. Evaluation methodology;

VII. Timeframe and deliverables

VIII. Evaluation team composition

3. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methodology is the approach used to collect and analyze data on the programme or project being evaluated.

The Project Manager suggests an evaluation methodology; the evaluation team further develops the evaluation methodology, including the methodological tools, in the Inception Report. (Please see Chapter IV, Section C for further information on Inception Reports)

The evaluation methodology provides the basis for the credibility of the evaluation results.

The present paragraph provides the Project Manager with basic knowledge about evaluation methodology. This information should enable him/her to (i) draft the evaluation methodology paragraph in the ToR and (ii) judge the quality of the Inception Report provided by the evaluation team at a later stage of the evaluation. For further details on the evaluation methodology, please consult Chapter IV, Section C. about Inception Reports.

Project Managers should ask the evaluator to develop an evaluation methodology that:
- Allows to answer the evaluation questions specified in the ToR (scope paragraph), and
- Selects adequate tools to gather the data required to answer these questions

The methodology paragraph in the ToR could therefore include:
- Possible identification of the methods for data collection (optional)
- Identification of the sources for data collection (mandatory)
- Triangulation of the methods and sources (mandatory)

a) Data Collection Methods

The Project Manager suggests the **data collection methods** to be used by the evaluation team to answer the evaluation questions. The data collection methods in the ToR should be indicative only, as the external evaluators will have to develop the concrete sampling strategy and data collection tools.

> **Methods** include, but are not limited to, the following:
> - desk review
> - questionnaires
> - surveys
> - interviews
> - focus group
> - workshops
> - field visits
> - observations
> - case study

> **Focus group:** qualitative evaluation methodology in which small groups of people are brought together to discuss specific topics under the guidance of a moderator.

The data collection methods should ensure validity, reliability and credibility of the evidence gathered.

> **Validity:** The extent to which the data collection strategies and instruments measure what they purport to measure.

> **Reliability:** Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgements, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data.

> **Credibility:** The extent to which the evaluation evidence and the results are perceived to be valid, reliable and impartial by the stakeholders, particularly the users of the evaluation results.

To improve reliability and validity of the data collected:
- Improve the quality of sampling by ensuring that the sample is representative of the population (e.g. clarify the characteristics of the sample, how it is selected, the rationale for the selection, and the limitations of the sample for interpreting the evaluation results).
- Improve the quality of data gathering by (i) training data collectors to consistent data gathering, (ii) defining key words used in questionnaires or interviews, (iii) considering the characteristics of interviewers.
- Use mixed methods of collecting data and building in strategies (triangulation) to verify or cross-check data using several pieces of evidence rather than relying only on one.

b) Data Sources

> **Data sources** include, but are not limited to, the following:
> - documents
> - monitoring reports
> - evaluation reports
> - research papers or publications
> - national records
> - UNODC staff
> - Project/programme beneficiaries
> - Key stakeholders
> - Ministries

Data must be collected from various sources and through various methods to enhance reliability and validity of the evaluation findings. This means that the Project Manager should ensure that at least 3 different methods and 3 different sources are used in the collection of the data.

Triangulation is the use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. By combining multiple data sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies. The purpose of triangulation is to enhance reliability of evaluation findings.

Triangulation of methods: the evaluator should have identified preferably three different methods for the purpose of revealing different aspects of the same reality and therefore for more reliability and credibility.

Triangulation of sources: the evaluator should analyse when and why there are differences in the results from three different sources.

4.   Planning for Impact Evaluation in the ToR

The present paragraph is addressed to Project Managers willing to measure the impact produced by their projects/programmes.

Should Project Managers want to evaluate impact of their projects/programmes, they should stress in the ToR that impact evaluation is a requirement.

Therefore the evaluation team should reflect on evaluation methods to measure impact depending on the data that is already available, e.g.:
- (i)   large scale sample surveys, in which the treatment and control groups are compared before and after, and possibly at several points during the project implementation, or
- (ii)   small-scale rapid assessments and participatory appraisals, where estimates of impact are obtained from combining group interviews, key informants, case studies and available secondary data.

For further information on how to assess impact, please consult Chapter IV, Section C.

5.   Declaration of Interest

Before undertaking an evaluation with UNODC, Project Managers should ensure that each evaluator completes a declaration of interest form (please see Chapter III Tools).

The declaration of interest form should be attached to the Terms of Reference of the evaluation.

Please see Chapter III, Section D. for more information on conflict of interest.

6.   The case of Joint Evaluation

a)   Drafting the ToR

It is generally practical for one party to take the lead in drafting the ToR. After a draft is produced, it should be discussed and agreed upon by the CLP, as well as the partner organisation. It is important to satisfy the interests of all parties concerned in the ToR to the extent possible. Consideration should be given to creating a common agenda reflecting priorities that balance ownership with what is feasible.

b)   Determining whose procedures will be used

Since different organizations take different approaches to evaluation, it is important to allow flexibility to adapt and additional time to accommodate delays due to such differences. There are two common approaches to managing this issue: to agree that the evaluation will be managed based on the system and procedures of one of the partner organizations, or to split the evaluation into components and agree whose systems will be used to manage which components.[1] The ToR should reflect any decision as regards the procedures to be used.

---

[1] UNDP Evaluation Handbook

D. Evaluation team

1.   Selection of evaluators

In order to promote transparency and ensure the maximum objectivity of evaluations, UNODC relies on external evaluators selected on the basis of their competence, independence and integrity.

Evaluators are selected by means of a transparent process by the Project Manager.

Upon request, IEU may also provide recommendations and curricula vitae from its own database of experts; other stakeholders may also have valuable suggestions which might help to identify potential evaluators. The relevant technical units should also be consulted for advice on prospective evaluators.

Please refer to the Chapter III tool: Guidelines for the selection of evaluators.

In the case of In-Depth Evaluations, evaluators are identified by IEU in consultation with the CLP, often through a bidding process.

The Project Manager and the Core Learning Partners (including UNODC, the beneficiary Government and donors) can also be invited to propose evaluators, participate in the selection of the evaluation team members, and nominate observers to be assigned to the evaluation team.

The cost of the participation of observers is borne by the organization they represent.

In all cases, IEU reviews the curricula vitae of the proposed candidates against the criteria set down in the Terms of Reference and may:
  (a) Have no objection to the recommended candidates;
  (b) Suggest candidates other than those recommended; or
  (c) Request new candidates.

TIP

Process
  • Project Manager is responsible for selection & recruitment processes

Important Considerations
  • Candidates are external and independent from the project
  • Candidates MUST have experience in evaluation
  • IEU recommends recruitment of an Evaluation Team to provide complementary skills (e.g. evaluation expert and subject matter expert)
  • Gender balance in the evaluation team should be considered

2.   Competencies

Competencies are identified in the ToR by the Project Manager.

To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluations ought to be conducted by evaluators who have had no prior involvement in the design or implementation of the project or programme to be evaluated. These are usually **independent** consultants, external to UNODC.

Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct **impartially** their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.

3.   Conflict of interest

When selecting the evaluation team, the Project Manager must ensure that there is no conflict of interest. A Declaration of interest (see Chapter III tools) should be signed by the Evaluator(s).

> A **conflict of interest** in consultant recruitment could be defined as a situation in which, because of a person's work history or possibilities for future contracts, the consultant may find himself/herself in a position to provide a subjective analysis in order to obtain undue benefits for himself/herself or affiliates, with a potential or actual bias against the interests of the employer.[2]

The following potential sources of conflicts of interest could be identified:

a)   Conflict of interest due to past engagement

Consultants should not be assigned to the evaluation of projects or programmes in which they have had prior involvement in the design, implementation, decision-making or financing stages. Typical examples of prior involvement include the inception, formulation, appraisal, supervision, support mission, or any other design or support activity for projects, programmes, corporate processes or policies to be examined by the evaluation.

b)   Conflict of interest due to potential future involvement

There is a ceiling to the percentage of work that a consultant can perform for UNODC. In general, consultants with an UNODC work history that exceeds 25 per cent of their total work history will not be recruited. In addition, when consultants are recruited through a firm (reimbursable loan), a ceiling of 35 per cent of the overall total work history will be applied to the firm or institution in question. Further restrictions apply according to the task to be performed and are explained below.

Work history refers to professional experience, including consultancies, employment by UNODC as a staff member, as temporary staff or the equivalent.

c)   Conflict of interest due to involvement in multiple assignments

Some restrictions are also placed on concurrent and future employment of consultants: they are to have no parallel assignments within UNODC during the contract period, and they should agree not to work with the division or department concerned by the evaluation for a period of six months after the expiration of the contract.

Other potential sources of conflict of interest that are not covered by the above provisions should be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the evaluation officers concerned in consultation with their supervisor.[3]

---

[2] IFAD Evaluation Manual
[3] IFAD Evaluation Manual

If a conflict of interest is uncovered or arises during the evaluation, the organization should determine whether the evaluator should be dismissed or the evaluation terminated.

4. Composition

The composition of the evaluation team is identified in the ToR by the Project Manager.

The composition of the evaluation team should be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned.[4]

Getting the **gender balance** right in an evaluation team is important as female evaluators may have easier access to women and can encourage them to participate in discussions and express their views. However, even more important than the sex of the evaluators is their knowledge and commitment to gender issues. It is better to have on the team a gender-sensitive man who has received training on gender issues than a gender-insensitive woman.

An evaluation team consists of a **team leader**, and depending on the size and complexity of the project evaluated, of **inter-disciplinary national and international team members with evaluation expertise**. When needed, a translator could be part of the evaluation team.

For small-scale projects, one evaluator supported by the Project Manager might be able to undertake the whole evaluation on his or her own.

IEU generally recommends at least two evaluators per evaluation, one international and one national where they have complementary skills and abilities. However, this cannot always be accommodated. Given the scope of most **Independent Project Evaluations**, the evaluation can only be conducted by one evaluator with both technical and evaluation expertise. In this case, although technical expertise as regards the subject evaluated is important, priority should be given to a consultant **with evaluation expertise**. In addition, there should be distinction on whether the evaluator is a national or international recruit.

There are many benefits to hiring a **national versus an international** and vice versa. The rationale for hiring a national evaluator is that s/he allows for competencies that perhaps an international evaluator may not have (e.g. knowledge of local culture, fluency in local dialects, understanding of social norms, etc). Furthermore, involving national evaluators helps to strengthen the national evaluation capacity. Conversely, the rationale for hiring an international evaluator is that s/he may have more experience in specific evaluation tools and methods which would be of great benefit to any evaluation allowing for perhaps increased reliability of the findings and better learning, etc.

In addition to external evaluators, evaluations managed by IEU (**In-Depth Evaluations**) should always include in the evaluation team an evaluator from IEU, appointed by the Chief of IEU (in some cases, acting as the team leader). This staff member could also fulfil the function of IEU Evaluation Manager.

5. Roles and responsibilities

The **evaluation team leader** acts as the primary liaison with the Project Manager in the respective Units and Sections at Headquarters and Field Offices. The evaluation team leader bears the primary responsibility for the evaluation, coordinates the input provided by the various team members and ensures the timely

---

[4] UNEG Norms and Standards, 2005

undertaking of the evaluation and a smooth evaluation process. This requires technical expertise, evaluation skills and experience, as well as good interpersonal, management, facilitation, writing and presentation skills. The specific tasks of the team leader ought to be reflected in the Terms of Reference.

Example The following text provides an example of how a **description of the team leader's tasks** might read:

- Works closely with the evaluation manager and manages the team throughout the process to ensure that all aspects of the Terms of Reference are fulfilled;
- Undertakes a desk study and on this basis oversees the finalization of the evaluation methodology, in compliance with the evaluation norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG);
- Produces an Inception Report based on UNODC Evaluation guidelines;
- Undertakes relevant field missions and receives appropriate briefings;
- Presents and discusses preliminary findings in the field and at Headquarters, and considers received feedback and comments;
- Facilitates discussion among the team members on the findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- Drafts the evaluation report, with the inputs received from the different team members, to be circulated for comments and factual validation to evaluation stakeholders;
- Duly considers comments received from evaluation stakeholders and IEU, in particular comments as regards factual verification;
- Produces the final report;
- Presents the final evaluation report at a stakeholders workshop (if required).

Each **team member** is responsible for a certain part of the evaluation exercise, including the report writing. Usually the following tasks are shared: conducting some of the data collection and drafting parts of the evaluation report, including findings, conclusions and recommendations. The ToR ought to provide a detailed description of the qualifications required for each team member and the deliverables expected.

6. Qualifications and skills

The qualifications and skills of the evaluation team are identified in the ToR by the Project Manager.

Independent evaluation consultants are selected for their evaluation and technical skills and experience and their local or country knowledge, depending on the specificity of each project. They must also have an understanding and experience of evaluation concepts, techniques and ethics, and be able to work as part of an international team. Whenever possible, local consultants should also be included since they are familiar with the local context and speak the local language. The involvement of local consultants also contributes towards building local evaluation capacity.

When a team of several consultants is needed, the team leader plays a key role in getting the team to work together in a smooth and efficient way. Besides having relevant evaluation and technical skills the team leader should therefore have effective management, interpersonal, facilitation, writing and presentation skills, as the team leader's working style may also affect the acceptance of evaluation results.

7. Joint Evaluation

There are several ways to approach the selection of evaluators for a Joint Evaluation.

- One option is to task one of the partners with recruiting the evaluation team, in consultation with the other partners.
- Another option is for each of the partners to contribute their own evaluators.

In some cases, the approach taken to the selection of evaluators may need to correspond to the funding modality.

- For example, if parallel financing is used, each partner might need to bring its own evaluator to the team.
- In cases where the contribution of another funding agency exceeds that of UNODC, the evaluation team leader may be nominated by that agency.
- In cases where each party brings its own evaluators to the team, evaluators may have difficulty in reporting to one actor while serving as a member of a joint team. To resolve this issue, all of the institutions involved should agree on the identity of the team leader at the onset, or delegate a particular agency to recruit the team leader and make clear to evaluators that the independence of the team will be respected and expected.[5]

███

---

[5] UNDP Evaluation Handbook

E. Recruitment

Sufficient time needs to be allowed for the recruitment of the evaluators, especially since the availability of experienced evaluators is limited and well-qualified evaluators must often be contracted months in advance.

In addition, the recruitment process itself may take a significant amount of time. The Project Manager can help by indicating to consultants as early as possible what they need to do to fulfil **UNODC requirements for contract signature**. In other words the Project Manager may provide guidance on providing an updated curricula vitae in United Nations format (Personal History Form), completing the declaration of interest form, passing the basic or advanced security training as needed, obtaining security clearance as necessary and supplying an up-to-date medical certificate. Please consult with the Human Resources Management Service in this regard.

Fee rates are not negotiated; they are calculated on the basis of the experience of the consultant and can be obtained from the Human Resources Management Service while up-to-date daily subsistence allowances rates are available in ProFi.

Please note that for In-Depth Evaluations the bidding process may take up to 3 months.

F. Logistics

Once the members of the evaluation team have been recruited, **logistical arrangements** need to be made for the visits of the team members. This may include arranging **visits** to Headquarters, Field Offices and specific operational sites, arranging **meetings** with key stakeholders, booking **transportation** and **hotels** and providing **translation and interpretation services** when needed.

Local holidays and **any obstacles to movement (for example, security reasons)** should be taken into account so as to avoid delays during the field visits.

Background documentation (such as baseline data, project progress reports and other regular reporting data) should also start being gathered at an early stage, as some of the material might not be easily accessible. Too often, evaluators spend valuable and scarce time searching for relevant documents that could have been collected by Project Managers before the start of the evaluation.

Guidelines for Evaluation
Terms of Reference

These guidelines assist Project Managers in the preparation of Terms of Reference (ToR), i.e. the "contract" between UNODC and the Evaluator(s), in the aim of improving quality of evaluation in UNODC. The guidelines below should be read together with the Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Handbook and must be tailored to the needs of each project or programme..

For Independent Project Evaluations, Project Managers are in charge of drafting the ToR, in cooperation with relevant Units and Sections at Headquarters and in Field Office. The ToR must be shared with all key stakeholders, i.e. "Core Learning Partners/Partnership" (CLP). The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools, the Evaluation Handbook as well as information on the roles and responsibilities on the IEU web site: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html

The following sections need to be addressed in the ToR:

2. Background and context
3. Disbursement history
4. Purpose of the evaluation
5. Scope of the evaluation
6. Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions
7. Evaluation methodology
8. Timeframe and deliverables
9. Evaluation team composition
10. Management of evaluation process
11. Payment modalities
12. Annexes:

   1. Job descriptions of evaluators
   2. List of background documents for the desk review
   3. List of CLP members
   4. UNODC standard format and guidelines for evaluation reports

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This section includes:

(a)   The below tables which provide an overview of the project and its evaluation.

Project number:	
Project title:	
Duration:	
Location:	
Linkages to Country Programme	
Linkages to Regional Programme	
Linkages to Thematic Programme	
Executing Agency:	
Partner Organizations:	
Total Approved Budget:	
Donors:	
Project Manager/Coordinator:	

Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	
Time period covered by the evaluation:	
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	
Core Learning Partners[6] (entities)	

---

[6] The **Core Learning Partnership (CLP)** encourages a participatory evaluation approach by allowing its members to participate in and provide feedback on key steps of the evaluation process. CLP members are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (project, programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. The CLP works closely with the Evaluation Manager to guide the evaluation process. The list of CLP members is to be found in Annex.

(b)   Project overview and historical context in which the project is implemented;

(c)   Justification of the project and main experiences / challenges during implementation, if any;

(d)   Project documents and revisions of the original project document;

(e)   UNODC strategy context, including project's main objectives and outcomes and project's contribution to UNODC country, regional or thematic programme;

(f)   Project's main objectives and outcomes and project's contribution to UNODC country, regional or thematic programme;

(g)   Reference should be made to the background information list (Annex 1), which encompasses materials to be used by the evaluator for the desk review. Of particular importance, is to include information on previous audits, evaluations and donors' assessments.

Please limit the text of this section to no more than 3 pages.

2. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

This section includes the following table:

Overall Budget (time period)	Total Approved Budget (time period)	Expenditure (time period)	Expenditure in % (time period)

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This section identifies the purpose of the evaluation by answering the below questions.

(a)   Who commissioned the evaluation?

TIP The evaluation might have been foreseen in the project document, decided on by UNODC senior management, requested by donors or identified for strategic reasons by IEU.

(b)   Why is the evaluation being undertaken at this point?

TIP To present at the CND or at an annual donor meeting.

(c)   What does the evaluation seek to accomplish?

TIP To learn lessons for a possible extension of project; to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized; to identify areas of improvement in a project; to highlight and resolve disagreements; to clarify and tackle problems; to get feedback, appraisal and recognition; to attract resources toward a project.

(d)   What decisions may the evaluation guide you to?

TIP To set different priorities and goals; to suggest new strategic directions; to decide whether to extend the duration of a project; to decide whether the project feeds into a regional programme.

(e)   Who are the main evaluation users and how will they be involved?

TIP CND Member States; the beneficiary Government, the Project Manager; the donors etc.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In clarifying the scope of the evaluation, the following points should first be determined:

(a)   The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

TIP A project, a cluster of related projects, a programme, a subcomponent, or a process within a project.

(b)   The time period to be covered by the evaluation

TIP The period 2010-2013.

(c)   The geographical coverage of the evaluation. Please state the rationale of your selection

TIP Global, regional. sub regional or national.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This section identifies the key evaluation questions to be answered by the evaluation, along with their related evaluation criteria. The questions need to address the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) and the criteria of partnerships and cooperation. Additional criteria may also be used to customize evaluations and adapt to the specific needs of the project, e.g. design and innovation.

Please note that standard questions need to be tailored to the particular project and to the specific context; they should not simply be copied and pasted.

TIP Standard evaluation questions:

Relevance
- How relevant is the project to target groups', including Governments', needs and priorities?

Efficiency
- Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?

Partnerships and cooperation

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This section includes:

(a)   The methods used to collect and analyse data on which the quality of the evaluation is dependent on.

TIP Desk review, questionnaires, surveys, structured interviews, discussions, workshops, field office visits, observations, retrospective baseline construction etc. If applicable, gender sensitive methods should also be considered.

(b)   The sources of data

TIP Primary or secondary sources.

(c)   Possible reference to an evaluation methodology summarized in an evaluation matrix by the evaluator.

7. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

This section includes:

(a)   When the evaluation takes place

(b)   When the field missions of the evaluation are planned for

(c)   What the expected deliverables and respective timeframes are

TIP

Expected Deliverables

The Lead Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

This section includes:

(d)   The number of evaluators needed;

(e)   The role of IEU;

(f)   A standard sentence addressing conflict of interest;

(g)   Reference to the specific job descriptions detailing qualifications and responsibilities.

It should be kept in mind that:

(h)   It is recommended that evaluations be conducted by an evaluation team with a lead evaluator with expertise in evaluation and a supporting consultant with expertise in the subject area of the project to be evaluated. The evaluation team should be gender balanced and take into consideration local customs and religious beliefs; Preference should be given to evaluation teams that are gender balanced.

(i)   Large evaluation teams should be multicultural with appropriate gender balance and geographical representation.

(j)   The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

TIP Members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the project under evaluation.

The consultants are contracted by UNODC. The qualifications and responsibilities for each team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1).

9. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

This section includes:

(a)   Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders, including responsibilities of the field offices and units and sections at headquarters (where appropriate);

(b)   Logistical support responsibilities, such as arrangements for transportation, translation, office space etc.

(c)   Reference to any agreements with other relevant stakeholders where relevant (for example, in the case of a joint evaluation).

Please see "Roles and responsibilities" matrix.

TIP

Management Arrangements

The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC's evaluation policy and UNEG Norms and Standards.

TIP

Project Manager

Management is responsible for drafting and finalizing the ToR, selecting Core Learning Partners and informing them of their role, recruiting evaluators, providing desk review materials to the evaluation team, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations.

Management will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team. For the field missions, the evaluation team liaises with the UNODC Regional/Field Offices and mentors as appropriate.

TIP

The Independent Evaluation Unit

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html

---

TIP

Core Learning Partners

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project managers. Members of the CLP are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor Member States. The CLPs are asked to comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contract is a legally binding document in which the consultant agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. There is no template or formula to calculate the number of days needed. It is however the responsibility of the requesting office to carefully consider and determine the estimated number of days that the consultant would need, to be able to produce quality work and fully complete all the expected deliverables on time. It is particularly essential that sufficient time is planned for the drafting and finalizing of the report, including the process of consultation and incorporation of comments and changes. A minimum of 30 days may be recommended, but it is understood that the number of days may vary depending on the complexity and scope of the project. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three installments are typically planned for: upon delivery of the Inception Report, of the Draft Evaluation Report and of the Final Evaluation Report, including the final presentation.

75 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance, before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

The consultant is paid in accordance with United Nations rules and procedures. Payment correlates to deliverables – three installments are foreseen (25%, 25% and 50% of total fees).
• The first payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Inception Report;

• The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Draft Evaluation Report;

• The third and final payment (50 percent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report and clearance by UNODC.

11. ANNEXES

Annex 1. Job descriptions of evaluators
Annex 2. List of background documents for the desk review
Annex 3. List of CLP Members (names and titles)
Annex 4. UNODC standard format and guidelines for evaluation reports

Annex 1: Job descriptions

Independent Project Evaluation of the UNODC project:

Job description for the International Evaluation Consultant

Post title   International Evaluation Consultant and Team Leader
Estimated duration   over a period of X months
Starting date required   XXX
Duty station   Home base; missions to Countries/Cities

Duties of the International Evaluation Consultant:
The International Evaluation Consultant will collaborate with the National

Evaluation Consultant on the Independent Project Evaluation of the UNODC

project XXX. On the basis of the Terms of Reference s/he will carry out the

following duties:

Duties	Location	Results
Desk study	Home base	List of evaluation questions Evaluation tools Draft inception report
Interviews with staff at UNODC HQ	UNODC HQ	Inception report
Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews and presentation of preliminary findings	Countries/Cities	Notes
Presentation of preliminary findings at UNODC HQ	UNODC HQ	Notes
Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to stakeholders for comments; incorporation of comments and finalization of report	Home base	Draft report Final Report

Required qualifications:
The consultant should demonstrate:
- extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- a strong record in designing and leading evaluations;
- technical competence in the area of evaluation (advanced university degree or practical experience);
- excellent communication and drafting skills; proven by previous evaluation reports

Languages:
The consultant must have excellent English writing skills. Knowledge of another language relevant to the evaluation might be an advantage.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:
According to UNODC rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Ethics
The evaluators shall respect the UNEG Ethical Guidelines

Independent evaluation of the UNODC project:

Job description for the National Evaluation Consultant 1

Post title   National Evaluation Consultant
Estimated duration   over a period of X months
Starting date required   XX
Duty station   Home base; Countries/Cities

Duties of the National Evaluation Consultant:
The National Evaluation Consultant will collaborate with the International Evaluation

Consultant on the independent evaluation of the UNODC project XXX. On the basis of

the Terms of Reference s/he will carry out the following duties:

Duties	Location	Results
Desk study of project documents, reports, etc and collection of additional information as required	Home base	List of evaluation questions and tools developed Draft inception report
Establishment of the mission's programme; Interview guidelines in collaboration with the international consultant		
Evaluation mission: briefing and interviews	Countries/Cities	Notes
Drafting of chapters of the evaluation report in collaboration with the international consultant	Home base	Draft report

Qualifications:
The consultant should demonstrate:
- knowledge of, and experience in applying, evaluation methods;
- technical competence in the area of evaluation;
- knowledge of the UN environment and possibly of UNODC;
- proven experience in gender analysis and gender evaluation methodologies (at least one team member);
- Language skills: English proficiency and knowledge of another language relevant to the evaluation might be an asset;
- Field experience

Languages:
The consultant must be fluent in XXX

Absence of Conflict of Interest:
According to UNODC rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Ethics
The evaluators shall respect the UNEG Ethical Guidelines.

Evaluation Consultants Declaration of Interest Form

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant)**:** _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____