



Annexes

Annexes.....	1
Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms.....	2
Annex 2 - Examples of Evaluation Questions.....	6
Annex 3(a) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Centralized Evaluations	10
Annex 3(b) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Independent Programme/Project Evaluations	13
Annex 3(c) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Internal Evaluations	16
Annex 4 - Evaluation Report Quality Checklist	19
Annex 5 - UNEG Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation.....	21
Annex 6 – Comparisons of Tasks and Responsibilities by Type of Evaluation	22
Annex 7 – Templates	27
Annex 7(a) - Evaluation Selection Criteria Template	28
Annex 7(b) - Evaluation Proposal Template	30
Annex 7(c) – Terms of Reference Template	33
Annex 7(d) - Stakeholder Mapping Matrix Template.....	46
Annex 7(e) - Evaluation Matrix Template.....	48
Annex 7(f) – Inception Report Template	50
Annex 7(g) - Evaluation Report Template: Centralized Evaluations	54
Annex 7(h) - Evaluation Report Template: Independent Programme/Project Evaluations	61
Annex 7(i) - Evaluation Report Template: Internal Evaluations	68
Annex 7(j) – Management Response & Tracking Template	74
Annex 7(k) – Evaluation Brief Template	76

Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms

Accountability	Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms. Accountability in development may refer to the obligations of partners to act according to clearly defined responsibilities, roles, and performance expectations, often with respect to the prudent use of resources. For evaluators, it connotes the responsibility to provide accurate, fair, and credible monitoring reports and performance assessments. For public sector managers and policymakers, accountability is to taxpayers/citizens. (UNEG, 2014 ¹)
Assumption	A hypothesis about factors or risks that could affect the progress or success of a development intervention. (OECD-DAC)
Attribution	The ascription of a causal link between changes observed or expected to be observed and a specific intervention. (OECD-DAC)
Base-line study	An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made. (UNEG, 2014)
Behaviour Change	A broad concept that includes any effort to change behaviour and often involves giving people information with the aim to change their attitudes and decisions. Behaviour change initiatives (such as training and communication campaigns) are often not informed by the scientific findings and methods of behavioural science. Behavioural science can help improve and complement those efforts to promote behaviour change. (UNOCT BI Hub)
Behavioural Insights	Knowledge obtained from the application of behavioural science to gain an accurate and evidence-based understanding of how people behave and make decisions. (UNOCT BI Hub)
Behavioural Science	The evidence-based study of how people behave, make decisions, and respond to context, which could include programmes, policies, administrative processes, and incentives. (UNOCT BI Hub)
Contribution	A programme effect that is difficult to isolate from other co-occurring causal factors.
Disability Inclusion	The meaningful participation of persons with disabilities in all their diversity, the promotion and mainstreaming of their rights into the work of the Organization, the development of disability-specific programmes and the consideration of disability-related perspectives, in compliance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (UNEG, 2022)
Duty-bearers	Within international human rights law, duty bearers are States (represented by their different government agencies and institutions at national and local levels). However, within a programming context, duty bearers are considered to be any State or non-State actor with either duties or responsibilities towards right holders in the context of / related to UN programming. This can additionally be understood to comprise 'moral duty bearers' such as parents and family members as well as corporate entities and UN agencies. (UNEG, 2014)
Evaluation	An assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors, and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations, and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders. (UNEG 2017)
Evaluation Criteria	The standards by which the merit or worth of an intervention is determined. The OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet) has defined a core set of six criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.
Evaluation Manager	The person who has designated responsibility for overseeing the preparation and implementation of the evaluation exercise. Within UNOCT, the Programme/Project Managers may have this responsibility for Independent Programme/Project Evaluations (IPEs) but will

¹ UNEG, "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, 2014", includes an extensive 'Glossary of Technical Terms', the most relevant being included in this table.

	typically be fully responsible for Internal Evaluations (IEs). Centralized Evaluations (CEs) and selected IPEs will generally be managed by the Evaluation and Compliance Unit (ECU) in the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Counter-Terrorism.
Ex ante evaluation	An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention. (OECD-DAC). This is also known as a 'prospective evaluation'.
Ex post evaluation	An evaluation of a development intervention after it has been completed. (OECD-DAC). This is also known as a 'retrospective evaluation'.
Gender ²	Refers to the roles, behaviours, activities, and attributes that a given society at a given time considers appropriate for men and women. In addition to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, "gender" also refers to the relations between women and men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes. They are context- and/or time-specific and changeable. Gender determines what is expected, allowed, and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. In most societies, there are differences and inequalities between sexes in responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, and access to and control over resources and decision-making opportunities. Gender is part of the broader socio-cultural context, as are other important criteria for socio-cultural analysis, such as sex, class, race, poverty level, ethnic group, sexual orientation, and age.
Gender Analysis	A critical examination of how differences in gender roles, activities, needs, opportunities, rights, and entitlements affect men, women, girls and boys in certain situations or contexts. Gender analysis examines the relationships between females and males and their access to and control of resources and the constraints they face relative to each other. A gender analysis should be integrated into all sector assessments or situational analyses to ensure that gender-based injustices and inequalities are not exacerbated by interventions and that, where possible, greater equality and justice in gender relations are promoted.
Gender Equality	Refers to the equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same, but that their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. Gender equality is not a women's issue; it should concern and fully engage men as well as women. Equality between women and men is seen as both a human rights issue and a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable, people-centered development.
Gender Mainstreaming	The chosen approach of the United Nations system and the international community towards realizing progress on women's and girl's rights, as a subset of the human rights to which the United Nations is dedicated. It is not a goal or objective on its own; it is a strategy for implementing greater equality for women and girls in relation to men and boys. Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies, or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a way to make women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic, and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.
Human Rights	Human rights are commonly understood as being those rights which are inherent to the human being. The concept of human rights acknowledges that every single human being is entitled to enjoy his or her human rights without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. International human rights law lays down obligations of States to act in certain ways or to refrain from certain acts in order to respect, protect, and fulfil human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals or groups. These obligations are rooted in the United Nations Charter,

² The definitions related to gender are from the UNOCT Gender Mainstreaming Policy and are based on those contained in the Gender Equality Glossary of the Training Centre of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

	the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the nine core human rights treaties adopted under the aegis of the United Nations ³ , as well as customary international law.
Human Rights and Gender Responsive	An evaluation approach that integrates human rights and gender equality-related norms and standards, including issues of discrimination and equality.
Human Rights-Based Approach	A strategy aimed at incorporating human rights in United Nations programming. A conceptual framework that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. (UNEG, 2014) It is simultaneously 1) a goal (requiring that all activities further the realization of internationally recognized human rights); 2) a process (requiring that international human rights norms and standards guide all activities at all phases of the programming process); and 3) an outcome (requiring that programming contribute to the capacities of duty bearers to meet their responsibilities/ obligations and/ or that of rights holders to claim their rights).
Impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. (UNEG, 2014)
Impact evaluation	Specific methodologies for establishing statistically significant causal relationships between the intervention and observed effects. It is commonly understood as only those evaluations that use a counterfactual (usually a comparison group) to determine what the outcomes would have been in the absence of the intervention.
Independent evaluation	An evaluation carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention. (OECD-DAC)
Indicators	Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor. (UNEG, 2014)
Inputs	The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention. (UNEG, 2014)
Intersectionality	A way of thinking about identity and its relationship to power . . . [it] is the acknowledgement that everyone has their own unique experiences of discrimination and oppression, and we must consider everything and anything that can marginalize people – gender, race, class, sexual orientation, physical ability, etc. (UNWOMEN- 2021)
Intervention	A broad term used in this handbook to cover the subject of the evaluation (also referred to as evaluand) including a programme, project, thematic area, or strategy.
Leave No One Behind	A guiding principle that is grounded in international law and is a political commitment for States signing on to the SDG Agenda. It is complementary to a human rights-based approach and focuses on inequalities, including on ways in which such inequalities overlap. It is important to assess differential impacts by considering how different groups may be affected differently by any intervention. This requires early planning in design and evaluation to ensure that disaggregated data is available where feasible and may also involve looking at a range of parameters around exclusion/inclusion.
Logical framework	A management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution, and evaluation of a development intervention (OECD-DAC).
Meta-evaluation	Evaluations designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluations. This term can also be used to denote the evaluation of an evaluation to judge its quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators. (UNEG, 2014)
Monitoring	The routine and continuous process of collecting and recording information on project activities, outputs, and outcomes throughout the project lifecycle in order to track and measure progress towards the achievement of expected results to inform management decisions. (UNOCT SOP No. 13)
Outcome	The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. (UNEG, 2014)

³ <https://www.ohchr.org/en/core-international-human-rights-instruments-and-their-monitoring-bodies>

Output	The products, capital goods, and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes. (UNEG, 2014)
Participation and Inclusion	Every person should be empowered towards active, free, and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural, and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realized. A participatory approach should empower citizens, including those that are marginalized, to articulate their expectations towards the State and other duty-bearers and support them in claiming their rights.
Participatory evaluation	An evaluation approach that includes the active engagement of stakeholders, especially rights holders/beneficiaries, in conducting the evaluation and in making decisions.
Purposive Sampling	A non-random sampling procedure.
Random Sample	A sample drawn from a population where each unit has an equal probability of being selected.
Reliability	Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgments, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures, and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data. (OECD-DAC)
Results-based Management	A management strategy by which all actors, contributing directly or indirectly to achieving a set of results, ensure that the processes, products, and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (outputs, outcomes and higher-level goals or impact). The actors in turn use information and evidence on actual results to inform decision making on the design, resourcing and delivery of programmes and activities as well as for accountability and reporting. (UNDG, 2011)
Rights holders	Individuals or social groups that can make legitimate claims that States and other duty-bearers have the obligation/responsibility to fulfil. In programming contexts, 'rights holders' is becoming more commonly used than 'beneficiaries' as the latter term has a more passive connotation.
Sample	A subset of units (for example, individuals or households) drawn from a larger population of interest.
Sex	Sex refers to the biological characteristics which define humans as female or male. These sets of biological characteristics are not mutually exclusive as there are individuals who possess both, but these characteristics tend to differentiate humans as males and females. (UNEG, 2014)
Sex and age disaggregated data (SADD)	Is data that is cross classified by sex and age, presenting information separately for men and women, and for boys and girls. SADD reflects roles, real situations, general conditions of women and men, girls, and boys in every aspect of society. Without SADD it is more difficult to identify real and potential inequalities. SADD is necessary for effective gender analysis.
Stakeholders	Agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation. (UNEG, 2014)
Terms of Reference	Written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements. Two other expressions sometimes used with the same meaning are 'scope of work' and 'evaluation mandate'. (UNEG, 2014)
Theory of Change (programme theory)	A visual and narrative description of how the activities and outputs of a programme are expected to generate one or more outcomes. The blueprint of all the building blocks needed to achieve the longer-term goals of the intervention.
Triangulation	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. (UNEG, 2014)
United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)	An interagency professional network that brings together the evaluation units of the UN system.

Annex 2 - Examples of Evaluation Questions

The following are provided as examples of the types of questions that can be included under each evaluation criteria. With the exception of the two mandatory questions, most can be, and in many cases should be, adapted to the specific context and intervention being assessed. The criteria and questions should be restricted to those that are the most important to help ensure that evaluation processes are focused and provide sufficient analysis of the key issues, keeping in mind that the cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender, disability inclusion and leave no one behind are also mandatory. It is recommended that there be one to three priority questions for each criterion used. It is acceptable for some questions to be combined or divided into sub-questions as long as the line of enquiry is similar. For most Internal Evaluations, it is recommended to have no more than eight questions in total, including the mandatory questions.

Relevance

1. **[Mandatory question]** To what extent is the intervention relevant to the pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and the Strategic Goals of the UNOCT Strategic Plan?
2. To what extent was the intervention relevant to stakeholder's (e.g., governments, Member States, etc.) needs and priorities?
3. To what extent was the intervention designed in a results-oriented, inclusive, and participatory manner?
4. To what extent were the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the intervention relevant to achieving its objective?
5. To what extent was the intervention informed by a substantive contextual analysis, including a tailored human rights and gender analysis that identified underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to implementing human rights & gender related norms and standards?
6. To what extent did the intervention adopt a human rights-based and gender-responsive approach?
7. To what extent was the theory of change presented in the programme/project document a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the intervention?
8. Did the theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the intervention approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence?
9. Was the intervention relevant for addressing the drivers of violent extremism and factors for countering terrorism in the country/region?
10. To what extent is the intervention relevant to the achievement of the SDGs in the country?
11. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant interventions considered in the design?
12. To what extent were the perspectives of rights holders and dutybearers considered during the design process?
13. Does the programme/project promote gender equality and is it based on understanding of nuanced roles women can play without instrumentalizing them?
14. Did the project/programme consider specific impacts of terrorism and counter-terrorism on women and men, women's organizations, and broader civil society?
15. Does the programme/project build on available research related to gender in CT/PCVE?

Coherence

1. To what extent did the intervention complement work among different sections within the Office, and with other organizations, especially with other UN entities?
2. To what extent was there coherence between this programme/project and other member state specific interventions in the areas of the evaluation?
3. To what extent did the intervention deliver results in line with organizational, regional, and international priorities?
4. How were stakeholders involved in the project's design and implementation?
5. Was the intervention formulated in accordance with international norms and standards on human rights and gender equality as relates to CT/PCVE (e.g., ICCPR, CEDAW, CRPD, UDHR, WPS Agenda)? Did it align with the regional conventions, policies, strategies (if they exist)?
6. To what extent has the intervention been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country/region?

Effectiveness

1. **[Mandatory question]** What has been the contribution of the intervention to the pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and the Strategic Goals of the UNOCT Strategic Plan?
2. To what extent did the intervention achieve its intended outcomes and objective?
3. What progress has been made towards outcome achievements stated in the results framework?
4. What has been the UNOCT contribution to the observed change?
5. What factors have supported and what factors have hindered the achievement of planned results?
6. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the intervention's objectives?
7. Have there been any unexpected results?
8. To what extent has the UNOCT partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
9. To what extent has UNOCT improved the capacities of national implementing partners to xxxxx?
10. To what extent are project management and implementation processes participatory?
11. To what extent did the theory of change and results framework of the intervention integrate human rights and gender equality?
12. Was the design of the intervention informed by a human rights analysis?
13. To what extent was a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention?
14. Do the intervention results contribute to changing attitudes and behaviours related to xxxxx?
15. Do the intervention results contribute to reducing the underlying causes of radicalization and the prevention of terrorism?
16. Do the project's goals address the specific needs of women and men, and boys and girls, including any unique needs of women and girls? If so, is such an aim clearly indicated?
17. To what extent was a gender mainstreaming approach implemented?
18. To what extent was the programme/project managed to mitigate gendered harms?

Efficiency

1. To what extent were intervention outputs delivered in a timely and efficient manner?
2. To what extent has the implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
3. How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the intervention?
4. How effectively did the programme manage changes in programmes management including continuity and efficient handover protocols?
5. Were sufficient systems in place for monitoring and reporting processes?
6. To what extent did UNOCT engage or coordinate with different beneficiaries, implementing partners, other UN entities and national counterparts to achieve outcome-level results?
7. To what extent have UNOCT practices, policies, processes, and decision-making capabilities affected the achievement of the intervention objectives?
8. To what extent did monitoring systems provide data, disaggregated by sex and other relevant variables, that enabled management to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
9. To what extent were resources used to address inequalities, including those related to gender?
10. To what extent were resources used to contribute to the capacities of duty bearers to meet their responsibilities/obligations and/or that of rights holders to claim their rights?
11. How well did the project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and project beneficiaries on its progress?
12. Overall, did the intervention provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?
13. To what extent did the intervention ensure synergies within different programmes of UN agencies and other implementing organizations and donor with the same portfolio?
14. To what extent did the allocation and use of resources to targeted groups take into account the need to prioritize women and individuals/groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against such as members of racial, ethnic, religious or other minorities, or groups and persons in vulnerable situations, such as refugees and asylum-seekers or persons affected by armed conflict and other types of violence?
15. What were the lost opportunities by NOT providing resources for integrating gender considerations (e.g., what could have been the benefits if such resources were provided?)

Sustainability

1. To what extent are the benefits of the intervention likely to continue after it ends?

2. What are the initial indications that the intervention will be sustainable, if any?
3. To what extent was local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders achieved?
4. To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
5. To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, UN entities, and development partners to sustain the attained results?
6. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks, and other mechanisms and procedures, in place that will support the continuation of intended results, including for those related to human rights and gender equality?
7. To what extent are lessons learned documented by the programme team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the programme?
8. To what extent do the range of stakeholders support the intervention's long-term objectives?
9. Is there a well-designed/well-planned exit strategy in place? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
10. How strong is the commitment of the government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results and continuing initiatives?
11. To what extent has there been institutional change conducive to systematically addressing human rights, inclusiveness, and gender equality concerns?
12. Have adequate accountability and oversight systems been established?
13. Has there been adequate support for capacity development of targeted rights holders and duty bearers to respectively demand and fulfil rights?
14. To what extent were national and local organizations involved in different aspects of the intervention implementation so that sustainability is feasible?
15. Did the intervention activities aim to promote sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviours, and power relations between the different stakeholder groups?
16. To what extent has capacity for gender mainstreaming achieved through the project been institutionalized?
17. To what extent do the beneficiaries feel ownership of results related to gender?
18. To what extent has human rights-related capacity-building been incorporated into institutional structures or mechanisms?
19. What measures did the intervention include to build national / local ownership and commitment to upholding the human rights norms and standards promoted by the intervention?

Impact

1. What difference has the intervention made in comparison to the situation that gave rise to the current intervention?
2. To what extent did the intervention achieve societal changes? Was there real change related to gender: for example, women's decision-making power on CT/PCVE strategies/programmes/approaches?
3. Were there any unintended or higher-level effects? Did these include, for example, reinforcing discriminatory gender norms and stereotypes, instrumentalizing women? Does it include any negative impact on the promotion and protection of human rights that are pertinent to the intervention?
4. Was there any change in the approach of relevant stakeholders towards human rights norms and standards pertinent to the intervention (higher level of awareness of obligations/ responsibilities on part of duty-bearers; higher level of awareness on how to claim rights on part of right holders; a change in attitude towards the role of human rights on the part of authorities; commitment to pursuing positive institutional change, etc.)
5. Was there permanent and real attitudinal and behavioural change related to xxxx?

Other Questions for Human Rights, Gender Equality, Leave No One Behind, Disability Inclusion

1. To what extent has the intervention design, implementation and monitoring fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalized groups, including people with disabilities?
2. If these themes have not been fully addressed, what have been the institutional and other type of constraints to doing so?
3. Was a context-specific human rights and gender analysis conducted and integrated into the programme/project? (Or, when relevant) Was a context-specific analysis on the drivers of radicalization of women and men to terrorism conducted and integrated?

4. Are there human rights and gender-sensitive indicators built into the intervention? Do they adequately reflect and capture data on the range of vulnerable groups affected?
5. Have marginalized populations, including those with disabilities, benefitted from the work of UNOCT?
6. To what extent has the intervention promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women?
7. Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men, or vulnerable groups?
8. Were women, persons with disabilities, and/or organizations working on these issues consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
9. Which groups of stakeholders have participated in the intervention and have any important groups been left out?
10. Are there differences in participation among more powerful groups and groups marginalized and/or discriminated against among the stakeholders of the intervention?
11. Were stakeholders respected and treated fairly in the various activities promoted by the intervention, regardless of their sex, origin, age, disabilities, etc.?
12. To what extent were the processes and results of the intervention able to break traditional discriminatory patterns (or reinforced discrimination) among its stakeholders?
13. Did the intervention purposefully integrate measures to (a) support participation of women and individuals/groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against, and (b) reduce barriers faced by persons with disabilities? If so, how? [Sub-questions could look at: was there provision of translation/interpretation into languages spoken by ethnic minorities or migrant groups?; did consultation practices account for power dynamics between and within different ages and groups?; were accessible venues and formats used?; were awareness-raising activities sensitive and tailored to the context and target group (for example, for activities targeting younger people, were the learning materials child- and youth-friendly)?]

Annex 3(a) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Centralized Evaluations

<p>Centralized Evaluations (CEs) include global and regional programmes, sub-programmes, thematic, strategic, and corporate evaluations, including those conducted jointly, ad hoc evaluations requested by governing bodies and the Secretariat, and those commissioned by OIOS. They are external and indepth processes carried out by independent evaluators, and fully managed by the ECU. Reports will be made public. CEs require a Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan, and the final report will be made publicly available on the UNOCT website.</p>				
<p>Acronyms: CE = Centralized Evaluations ECU = Evaluation Compliance Unit ERG = Evaluation Reference Group ET = Evaluation Team FP = Focal Point PM = Programme/Project Manager PMU = Programme Management Unit PRB = Programme Review Board SPPSS = Strategic Planning & Programme Support Section USG = Under-Secretary-General</p>				
	Primary Responsibility	Support and Approval	Completed	Date
PLANNING PHASE				
Step 1 Evaluation Approach (during Programme/Project formulation stage)				
Determination and assessment of need for and type of evaluation based on Evaluation Selection Criteria	PM (programme evals), ECU			
Develop Evaluation Plan as per outline (including budget) for inclusion in PD	PM (programme evals), ECU	Input and approval from USG		
Step 2 Evaluation Proposal (6-12 months prior to start of evaluation)				
Schedule the evaluation; ensure budget is available, notify appropriate supervisor and ECU.	PM (programme evals), ECU			
Develop Evaluation Proposal as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant	PM (programme evals), ECU	Input and approval from USG		
Assign Evaluation Manager (typically this will be the Evaluation Officer for CEs and the PM/ Evaluation Officer for IPEs and PM for SEs)	PM (programme evals), ECU			
PREPARATION PHASE				
Step 3 - Terms of Reference				
Draft ToR as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant.	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, PM, others		
Review and approval of ToR	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU		
Step 4 Recruitment of Evaluation Team				
Identify potential evaluators (typically a lead evaluator and a subject matter expert)	Evaluation Manager			
Review and selection of evaluation team (ET)	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM. Approval from USG upon recommendation from ECU		
Clearance and contracting of evaluators	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU/PM		
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE				
Step 5 Inception Stage and Report				
Hold kick-off/briefing meeting(s) for ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and PMU		
Share desk review material with ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and PMU		

Develop and submit draft Inception Report	Evaluation Team	Supported by PM and Evaluation Manager		
Review and approval of Inception Report including agreement on any field missions	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, PM, and PMU. Approval by ECU.		
Arrange travel and interview schedule	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and ERG		
Step 6 Data Collection				
Provide logistical support for further travel, interviews, interpreters, coordination with respective offices, etc.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by PM		
Data collection activities and preliminary analysis	Evaluation Team			
Hold oral debriefing with ERG on preliminary observations (validation of preliminary findings)	Evaluation Manager	Participation from PMU and PM		
Step 7 Draft Report				
Further analysis and triangulation of data; preparation and submission of preliminary draft report	Evaluation Team			
Review preliminary draft report for factual errors and alignment with Inception Report and quality standards	Evaluation Manager	PM		
Revisions to draft report if needed	Evaluation Team			
Full review of draft report by internal stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM, HRGS and ECU		
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Revisions to draft report	Evaluation Team			
Review and clearance of 'provisional draft report'	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief and ECU		
Full review of draft report	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, other key stakeholders		
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Initiate development of Management Response	PM Focal Point (Programme)	Input from Evaluation Manager and Programme Team		
Step 8 Final Evaluation Report				
Evaluation report finalized based on comments and submitted	Evaluation Team			
Preparation of Evaluation Brief	Evaluation Team			
Review of Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager			
Report and Brief revised if needed	Evaluation Team			
Approval of Final Evaluation Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU -> C/OUSG -> USG		
FOLLOW-UP PHASE				

Step 9 Evaluation Follow-Up Planning				
Prepare/confirm Follow-Up Plan and Communication Plan for sharing evaluation results	Evaluation Manager			
Finalize Management Response (within two weeks of receipt of final evaluation report)	PM Focal Point (Programme) in consultation with PMU	Input from Evaluation Manager and Programme Team		
Approval of Management Response	Evaluation Manager supported by Section Chief	Cleared by ECU -> C/OUSG -> DUSG -> USG		
Step 10 Presentation & Dissemination of Results and Lessons				
Hold presentation of evaluation results to ERG and other stakeholders	Evaluation Team and Evaluation Manager			
Share final evaluation report and brief with key stakeholders.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team		
Publish final evaluation report and brief on website	ECU	Supported by Comms Unit		
Compile key lessons for organizational learning	ECU	Input from PMU		
Post key lessons in Lessons Learned Repository and submit key lessons and good practice to Connect&Learn platform	ECU	Input from PM		
POST-EVALUATION PHASE				
Implement agreed recommendations	PM Focal Point (Programme)			
Track and report on status of implementation of recommendations	Heads of Units	Overseen by PRB / ECU		

Annex 3(b) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Independent Programme/Project Evaluations

<p>Independent Programme/Project Evaluations (IPEs) are midterm or final evaluations used for standalone projects or projects under the framework of global and regional programmes with budgets exceeding USD 1.3 million or with donor requirements for evaluation. They can be fully managed by the Programme/Project Manager or the Evaluation Officer and conducted by independent external evaluators in consultation with an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). IPEs require a Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan, and the final report will be made publicly available on the UNOCT website. They are expected to take less time, having fewer evaluation questions and shorter reports, than Centralized Evaluations. In some situations, IPEs may be managed by the ECU; in which case, Primary Responsibility will be the same as for Centralized Evaluations.</p>				
<p>Acronyms: ECU = Evaluation Compliance Unit ERG = Evaluation Reference Group ET = Evaluation Team FP = Focal Point IPE = Independent Programme/Project Evaluation PM = Programme/Project Manager PMU = Programme Management Unit PRB = Programme Review Board SPPSS = Strategic Planning & Programme Support Section USG = Under-Secretary General</p>				
	Primary Responsibility	Support and Approval	Completed	Date
PLANNING PHASE				
Step 1 Evaluation Approach (during Programme/Project formulation stage)				
Determination and assessment of need for and type of evaluation based on Evaluation Selection Criteria	PM	Supported by ECU		
Develop Evaluation Plan as per outline (including budget) for inclusion in PD	PM	Cleared by ECU		
Step 2 Evaluation Proposal (6-12 months prior to start of evaluation)				
Schedule the evaluation; ensure budget is available, notify appropriate supervisor and ECU.	PM			
Develop Evaluation Proposal as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant	PM	Input and approval from ECU		
Assign Evaluation Manager (typically this will be the Evaluation Officer for CEs and the PM/Evaluation Officer for IPEs and PM for SEs)	PM			
PREPARATION PHASE				
Step 3 - Terms of Reference				
Draft ToR as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant.	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU		
Review and approval of ToR	ECU			
Step 4 Recruitment of Evaluation Team				
Identify potential evaluators (typically a lead evaluator and a subject matter expert)	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Review and selection of evaluation team (ET)	Evaluation Manager	Input and approval from ECU		
Clearance and contracting of evaluators	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU and PM		
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE				
Step 5 Inception Stage and Report				
Hold kick-off/briefing meeting(s) for ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from ECU		
Share desk review material with ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team		

Develop and submit draft Inception Report	Evaluation Team	Supported by Evaluation Manager		
Review and approval of Inception Report including agreement on any field missions	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU. Approval by ECU.		
Arrange travel and interview schedule	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU. Approval by ECU		
Step 6 Data Collection				
Provide logistical support for further travel, interviews, interpreters, coordination with respective offices, etc.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team		
Data collection activities and preliminary analysis	Evaluation Team			
Hold oral debriefing with ERG on preliminary observations (validation of preliminary findings)	Evaluation Manager and ECU	Programme Team to support		
Step 7 Draft Report				
Further analysis and triangulation of data; preparation and submission of preliminary draft report	Evaluation Team			
Review preliminary draft report for factual errors and alignment with Inception Report and quality standards	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU if needed		
Revisions to draft report if needed	Evaluation Team			
Full review of draft report by internal stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM, HRGS, ECU		
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Revisions to draft report	Evaluation Team			
Review and clearance of 'provisional draft report'	Evaluation Manager	Clearance by Section Chief and ECU		
Full review of draft report	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, other key stakeholders		
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Initiate development of Management Response	Prog Focal Point in consultation with PMU	Input from Programme Team		
Step 8 Final Evaluation Report				
Evaluation report finalized based on comments and submitted	Evaluation Team			
Preparation of Evaluation Brief	Evaluation Team			
Review of Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Report and Brief revised if needed	Evaluation Team			
Approval of Final Evaluation Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU -> C/OUSG -> USG		
FOLLOW-UP PHASE				
Step 9 Evaluation Follow-Up Planning				

Prepare/confirm Follow-Up Plan and Communication Plan for sharing evaluation results	Evaluation Manager			
Finalize Management Response (within two weeks of receipt of final evaluation report)	Prog Focal Point in consultation with PMU	Input from Programme Team		
Approval of Management Response	Section Chiefs- Programme Focal Point	Cleared by ECU -> C/USG -> DUSG -> USG		
Step 10 Presentation & Dissemination of Results and Lessons				
Hold presentation of evaluation results to ERG and other stakeholders	Evaluation Team and Evaluation Manager			
Share final evaluation report and brief with key stakeholders.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Publish final evaluation report and brief on website	ECU	Supported by Comms Unit		
Compile key lessons for organizational learning	ECU	Input from PMU		
Post key lessons in Lessons Learned Repository and submitting key lessons and good practice to Connect&Learn platform	ECU	Input from Programme Team		
POST-EVALUATION PHASE				
Implement agreed recommendations	PMU/Programme Focal Point			
Track and report on status of implementation of recommendations	Head of Units	Overseen by PRB/ECU		

Annex 3(c) - Evaluation Management Checklist for Internal Evaluations

<p>Internal Evaluations (IEs), previously known as Self-Evaluations, are concise evaluations used for smaller-scale projects and as mid-term reviews for larger-scale interventions that have a timeframe of 3+ years. They are managed by the Programme/Project Manager (and delegated to the M&E Officer where this position exists). Although typically conducted internally, external consultants can be engaged to undertake some tasks. IEs involve lighter-touch processes than regular evaluations, requiring fewer questions, less external data collection, and shorter reports than IPEs and CEs. The table below assumes that independent evaluator(s) are engaged. If they are not, the Evaluation Manager would be responsible for preparing all deliverables.</p>				
<p>Acronyms: CE = Centralized Evaluation ECU = Evaluation Compliance Unit ERG = Evaluation Reference Group ET = Evaluation Team FP = Focal Point IE = Internal Evaluation IPE = Independent Programme/Project Evaluation PM = Programme/Project Manager PMU = Programme Management Unit PRB = Programme Review Board SPPSS = Strategic Planning & Programme Support Section USG = Under-Secretary General</p>				
	Primary Responsibility	Support and Approval	Completed	Date
PLANNING PHASE				
Step 1 Evaluation Approach (during Programme/Project formulation stage)				
Determination and assessment of need for and type of evaluation based on Evaluation Selection Criteria	PM	Supported by ECU		
Develop Evaluation Plan as per outline (including budget) for inclusion in PD	PM	Input and approval from ECU		
Step 2 Evaluation Proposal (6-12 months prior to start of evaluation)				
Schedule the evaluation; ensure budget is available, notify appropriate supervisor and ECU.	PM	Supported by ECU		
Develop Evaluation Proposal as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant	PM	Input and approval from ECU		
Assign Evaluation Manager	PM			
PREPARATION PHASE				
Step 3 - Terms of Reference				
Draft ToR as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant.	Evaluation Manager	Input from ECU and HRGS		
Review and approval of ToR	ECU or PMU			
Step 4 Recruitment of Evaluation Team				
Identify potential evaluators (typically a lead evaluator and a subject matter expert)	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Review and selection of evaluation team (ET)	PM	Input and approval from ECU		
Clearance and contracting of evaluators	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU and PM		
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE				
Step 5 Inception Stage and Report				
Hold kick-off/briefing meeting(s) for ET	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team		
Share desk review material with ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from PMU and Programme Team		
Develop and submit draft Inception Report	Evaluator(s)	Supported by Evaluation Manager		
Review and approval of Inception Report including agreement on any field missions	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team. Approval by ECU.		

Arrange travel and interview schedule	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team. Approval by ECU		
Step 6 Data Collection				
Provide logistical support for further travel, interviews, interpreters, coordination with respective offices, etc.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team		
Data collection activities and preliminary analysis	Evaluator(s)			
Hold oral debriefing with Programme Team on preliminary observations (validation of preliminary findings)	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Step 7 Draft Report				
Further analysis and triangulation of data; preparation and submission of preliminary draft report	Evaluator(s)			
Review preliminary draft report for factual errors and alignment with Inception Report and quality standards	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU if needed		
Revisions to draft report if needed	Evaluator(s)			
Full review of draft report by internal stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team and ECU		
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Revisions to draft report	Evaluator(s)			
Review and clearance of 'provisional draft report'	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU		
Full review of draft report	Evaluation Manager			
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager			
Initiate development of Management Response	Programme/Project Manager	Input from ECU		
Step 8 Final Evaluation Report				
Evaluation report finalized based on comments and submitted	Evaluator(s)			
Preparation of Evaluation Brief	Evaluator(s)			
Review of Final Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU		
Report and Brief revised if needed	Evaluator(s)			
Approval of Final Evaluation Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU		
FOLLOW-UP PHASE				
Step 9 Evaluation Follow-Up Planning				
Prepare/confirm Follow-Up Plan and Communication Plan for sharing evaluation results	Evaluation Manager			
Finalize Management Response (within one month of receipt of final evaluation report)	Evaluation Manager			
Approval of Management Response	Programme/Project Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU		
Step 10 Presentation & Dissemination of Results and Lessons				
Hold presentation of evaluation results to Programme Team and other stakeholders	Evaluation Manager and Evaluator(s)			

Share final evaluation report with key stakeholders.	Evaluation Manager			
Compile key lessons for organizational learning	ECU	Input from PMU		
Post key lessons in Lessons Learned Repository and submitting key lessons and good practice to Connect&Learn platform	Evaluation Manager and Programme Team	Supported by ECU		
POST-EVALUATION PHASE				
Implement agreed recommendations	Programme Focal Point			
Track and report on status of implementation of recommendations	Programme Team			

Annex 4 - Evaluation Report Quality Checklist

	☑
Report Structure and Presentation: Is the report well structured, logical, clear, and complete?	
Easy to read and understand (concisely written; avoids complex language and unexplained acronyms; has only minimal grammar and spelling errors).	
Follows a logical structure with all required sections (executive summary, introduction, evaluation purpose and scope, methodology, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, recommendations and annexes); and is easy to navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, and sub-titles, well formatted).	
Frequent and effective use of visual aids (i.e., infographics, maps, tables, graphs photos) to illustrate key points. They are clearly presented, labeled (title and source), and referenced in the text.	
Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use of terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is apparent.	
Annexes include at a minimum the ToR, evaluation matrix, theory of change and/or results framework; list of documents reviewed, list of stakeholders consulted, and data collection tools.	
Main body of the report (excluding the annexes) is within maximum length (60 page for CEs, 40 pages for IPEs, 30 pages for IEs) unless otherwise specified in ToR.	
Executive Summary: Can it inform decision-making?	
Clearly presented; serves as standalone section that contains required elements (subject, purpose, and objectives of evaluation; intended audience; methodology; main results and conclusions; recommendations).	
Within the maximum length (5 pages for CEs and IPEs, 3 pages for IEs).	
Introduction: Is the intervention and its context well presented?	
Clearly specifies the subject of the evaluation, and for programmes or projects: the intervention logic or theory of change; programme budget; link to the Global Compact Pillar(s) and the most relevant SDG targets and indicators; staffing and other resources; time frame; modalities and status.	
Provides sufficient information to understand the context within which the subject of the evaluation operates (i.e., key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors).	
Includes narrative or graphic stakeholder map/table that presents the key stakeholders (duty bearers and rights holders), and their roles/relationships in the intervention.	
For programmes and projects, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if needed, is reformulated/improved by the evaluators. If major shortcomings are found, this should be addressed as a finding with an associated recommendation.	
Evaluation Purpose and Scope: Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope sufficiently clear to frame and guide the evaluation?	
Clearly specifies the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, as well as its scope (i.e., thematic, time span, geographical coverage), the criteria and key questions to be answered, and the intended audience. Any changes from the ToR are explained.	
Explains stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process, including make-up and role of Evaluation Reference Group (if applicable), including in the development of the evaluation design, conclusions, and recommendations.	
Methodology: Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and is the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	
Specifies and explains the chosen evaluation design, evaluation questions, criteria, performance standards or other criteria. The approach is adequately robust/appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and for answering the key evaluation questions, including adequate measures to ensure data quality/validity.	
Clearly describes the data sources (typically both qualitative and quantitative sources are required), data collection and analysis methods, and the sampling strategy for each method. The number of evaluation participants is shown for each method disaggregated by stakeholder group, gender, and other relevant category (i.e., age, location, disability).	

Discusses how the methodology was responsive to human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion.	
Addresses methodological challenges and/or limitations, and how these were overcome.	
Explains ethical standards that were considered during the evaluation (i.e., informed consent of participants, confidentiality, avoidance of harm, data security, evaluator's ethical obligations). Addresses adherence to UNEG Ethical Principles for Evaluators.	
Findings: Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence and sound analysis?	
Presented with clarity, logic, and coherence (i.e., avoid ambiguities).	
Clearly relate to, and systematically address, all the evaluation criteria and questions defined in the scope in terms of report structure and substance.	
Are objective and are supported by sufficient evidence reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; are based on performance standards and triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources; perspectives of different stakeholder groups are evident; are free from subjective judgements made by the evaluators.	
Discuss the cause-and-effect linkages for accomplishments/difficulties and opportunities to build on; analysis based on the intervention logic and/or ToC; unintended results are considered.	
Conclusions: Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	
Clearly presented and logically linked to the findings.	
Reflect reasonable judgments of the evaluator(s) in relation to the main evaluation questions and add value to the findings (i.e., focus on significant issues; answer the evaluation's big questions; address cross-cutting issues).	
Provides a comprehensive picture of both the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention.	
Lessons Learned: Are logical and informative lessons learned identified?	
Stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	
Clearly and concisely presented yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience and organizational learning.	
Recommendations: Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evaluation and clear?	
Align with the evaluation purpose and are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	
Are clear, realistic (i.e., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and manageable (i.e., avoid providing a laundry list or being overly prescriptive).	
Are actionable (i.e., specifies who should implement them, are prioritized) and formulated with their use in mind.	
Gender, human rights, disability, leave no one behind and youth: Are these cross-cutting perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?	
Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.	
Gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	
Findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	
Human rights considerations, leave no-one-behind, youth and disability inclusion are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.	

Annex 5 - UNEG Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation

Pledge can also be found at UNEG Ethical Principles



ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

PLEDGE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT IN EVALUATION



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



INTEGRITY

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

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



ACCOUNTABILITY

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

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



RESPECT

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

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



BENEFICENCE

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

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

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

_____ (Signature and Date)

Annex 6 – Comparisons of Tasks and Responsibilities by Type of Evaluation

Acronyms: ECU = Evaluation Compliance Unit ERG = Evaluation Reference Group ET = Evaluation Team FP = Focal Point PM = Programme/Project Manager
 PMU = Programme Management Unit PRB = Programme Review Board SPPSS = Strategic Planning & Programme Support Section USG = Under-Secretary General

Task	Centralized Evaluations (CEs)		Independent Programme/Project Evaluations (IPEs)		Internal Evaluations (IEs)	
	Primary Responsibility	Notes	Responsibility	Notes	Responsibility	Notes
	Includes global and regional programmes, sub-programmes, thematic, strategic, and corporate evaluations, including those conducted jointly, adhoc evaluations requested by governing bodies and the Secretariat, and those commissioned by OIOS. They are external and indepth processes carried out by independent evaluators, and fully managed by the Evaluation and Compliance Unit (ECU) in the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Counter-Terrorism. Reports will be made public. CEs require a Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan, and the final report will be made publicly available on the UNOCT website.		Midterm or final evaluations used for standalone projects or projects under the framework of global and regional programmes with budgets exceeding USD 1.3 million or with donor requirements for evaluation. They can be fully managed by the Programme/Project Manager or the Evaluation Officer and conducted by independent external evaluators in consultation with an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). IPEs require a Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan, and the final report will be made publicly available on the UNOCT website. They are expected to take less time, having fewer evaluation questions and shorter reports, than CEs.		Concise evaluations used for smaller-scale projects and as mid-term reviews for larger-scale interventions that have a timeframe of 3+ years. They are managed by the Programme/Project Manager (and delegated to M&E Officers where this position exists). Although typically conducted internally, external consultants can be engaged to undertake some tasks. IEs involve lighter-touch processes than regular evaluations, requiring fewer questions, less external data collection, and shorter reports than IPEs and CEs. The table below assumes that independent evaluator(s) are engaged. If they are not, the Evaluation Manager would be responsible for preparing all deliverables.	
PLANNING PHASE						
Step 1- Evaluation Approach (during Programme/Project formulation stage)						
Determination and assessment of need for and type of evaluation based on Evaluation Selection Criteria	PM (programme evals), ECU		PM	Supported by ECU	PM	Supported by ECU
Develop Evaluation Plan as per outline (including budget) for inclusion in PD	PM (programme evals), ECU	Input and approval from USG	PM	Cleared by ECU	PM	Input and approval from ECU
Step 2 - Evaluation Proposal (6-12 months prior to start of evaluation)						

Schedule the evaluation; ensure budget is available, notify appropriate supervisor and ECU.	PM (programme evals), ECU		PM		PM	Supported by ECU
Develop Evaluation Proposal as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant	PM (programme evals), ECU	Input and approval from USG	PM	Input and approval from ECU	PM	Input and approval from ECU
Assign Evaluation Manager (typically this will be the Evaluation Officer for CEs and the PM/Evaluation Officer for IPEs and PM for IEs)	PM (programme evals), ECU		PM		PM	
PREPARATION PHASE						
Step 3 - Terms of Reference						
Draft ToR as per template, informing and engaging other stakeholders as relevant.	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, PM, others	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU	Evaluation Manager	Input from ECU and HRGS
Review and approval of ToR	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU	ECU		ECU or PMU	
Step 4 - Recruitment of Evaluation Team						
Identify potential evaluators (typically a lead evaluator and a subject matter expert)	Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU
Review and selection of evaluation team (ET)	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM. Approval from USG upon recommendation from ECU	Evaluation Manager	Input and approval from ECU	PM	Input and approval from ECU
Clearance and contracting of evaluators	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU/PM	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU and PM	SPPSS	Consultation with ECU and PM
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE						
Step 5 - Inception Stage and Report						
Hold kick-off/briefing meeting(s) for ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and PMU	Evaluation Manager	Input from ECU	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team
Share desk review material with ET	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and PMU	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team	Evaluation Manager	Input from PMU and Programme Team
Develop and submit draft Inception Report	Evaluation Team	Supported by PM and Evaluation Manager	Evaluation Team	Supported by Evaluation Manager	Evaluator(s)	Supported by Evaluation Manager

Review and approval of Inception Report including agreement on any field missions	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, PM, and PMU. Approval by ECU.	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU. Approval by ECU.	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team. Approval by ECU.
Arrange travel and interview schedule	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM and ERG	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG and ECU.	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team. Approval by ECU.
Step 6 - Data Collection						
Provide logistical support for further travel, interviews, interpreters, coordination with respective offices, etc.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by PM	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team
Data collection activities and preliminary analysis	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Hold oral debriefing with ERG/Programme team depending on the type of evaluation on preliminary observations (validation of preliminary findings)	Evaluation Manager	Participation from PMU and PM	Evaluation Manager and ECU	Programme Team to support	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU
Step 7 - Draft Report						
Further analysis and triangulation of data; preparation and submission of preliminary draft report	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Review preliminary draft report for factual errors and alignment with Inception Report and quality standards	Evaluation Manager	PM	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU if needed	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU if needed
Revisions to draft report if needed	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Full review of draft report by internal stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM, HRGS, and ECU	Evaluation Manager	Input from PM, HRGS, and ECU	Evaluation Manager	Input from Programme Team and ECU
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager	
Revisions to draft report	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Review and clearance of 'provisional draft report'	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief and ECU	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU
Full review of draft report	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, other key stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	Input from ERG, other key stakeholders	Evaluation Manager	
Collate comments on draft and send to ET	Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager	

Initiate development of Management Response	PM-Focal Point (Programme)	Input from Evaluation Manager and Programme Team	Programme Focal Point in consultation with PMU	Input from Programme Team	Programme/Project Manager	Input from ECU
Step 8 Final Evaluation Report						
Evaluation report finalized based on comments and submitted	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Preparation of Evaluation Brief	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Review of Final Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU
Report and Brief revised if needed	Evaluation Team		Evaluation Team		Evaluator(s)	
Approval of Final Evaluation Report and Brief	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU -> C/OUSG -> USG	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by Section Chief -> ECU -> C/OUSG -> USG	Evaluation Manager	Cleared by ECU in consultation with PMU
FOLLOW-UP PHASE						
Step 9 - Evaluation Follow-Up Planning						
Prepare/confirm Follow-Up Plan and Communication Plan for sharing evaluation results	Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager	
Finalize Management Response (within two weeks of receipt of final evaluation report)	PMU-Focal Point (Programme)	Input from Evaluation Manager and Programme Team	PMU-Programme Focal Point	Input from Programme Team	Evaluation Manager	
Approval of Management Response	Evaluation Manager supported by Section Chief	Cleared by ECU -> C/OUSG -> DUSG -> USG	Section Chiefs Programme Focal Point	Cleared by ECU -> C/OUSG -> DUSG -> USG	Programme/Project Manager	Section Chiefs ->ECU
Step 10 Presentation & Dissemination of Results and Lessons						
Hold presentation of evaluation results to ERG/ Programme team depending on the type of evaluation and other stakeholders	Evaluation Team and Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Team and Evaluation Manager		Evaluation Manager and Evaluator(s)	
Share final evaluation report and brief with key stakeholders.	Evaluation Manager	Supported by Programme Team	Evaluation Manager	Supported by ECU	Evaluation Manager	
Publish final evaluation report and brief on website	ECU	Supported by Comms Unit	ECU	Supported by Comms Unit	N/A	
Compile key lessons for organizational learning	ECU	Input from PMU	ECU	Input from PMU	ECU	Input from PMU

Post key lessons in Lessons Learned Repository and submit key lessons and good practice to Connect&Learn platform	ECU	Input from PM	ECU	Input from Programme Team	Evaluation Manager and Programme team	Supported by ECU
POST-EVALUATION PHASE						
Implement agreed recommendations	Programme Focal Point		Programme Focal Point		Programme Focal Point	
Track and report on status of implementation of recommendations	Heads of Units	Overseen by PRB / ECU	Head of Units	Overseen by PRB/ECU	Programme Team	

Annex 7 – Templates

- a. Evaluation Selection Criteria
- b. Evaluation Proposals
- c. Terms of Reference
- d. Stakeholder Mapping Matrix
- e. Evaluation Matrix
- f. Inception Report
- g. Evaluation Report – Centralized Evaluations
- h. Evaluation Report – Independent Programme/Project Evaluations
- i. Evaluation Report – Internal Evaluations
- j. Management Response
- k. Evaluation Brief

Annex 7(a) - Evaluation Selection Criteria Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

Criteria	Applicable Yes / No / Somewhat / Not Clear	Explanation
Primary Criteria – An evaluation is required if ‘Yes’ is selected for any of the following four criteria.		
Significant investment: Programmes/projects with a total budget of \$1.3 million and above.		
Duration: Interventions spanning a period of 36 months and beyond will be subject to a mid-term review (as an internal evaluation) and a final evaluation to assess the results of the intervention (output, outcomes, and impact). This criterion will also apply to interventions that originally had a duration of less than 36 months but were prolonged to 36 months or beyond with subsequent extension(s).		
Formal commitments to stakeholders: If evaluation is required based on terms and conditions of relevant donors and stakeholders.		
Request from Under-Secretary-General (USG) and Senior Management: The USG, Programme Review Board (PRB) or Senior Management Team (SMT) can require an evaluation based upon emerging priorities, requests or concerns.		
Secondary Criteria – If none of the above are applicable, Interventions are required to have at least one of the following characteristics to trigger an evaluation. The decision is to be made in consultation with the ECU.		
Risk associated with the subject: Programmes/projects whose environment (political, economic, conflict or organizational factors) poses potential risks and/or where there are risks of serious violations of international human rights laws, international humanitarian laws, and refugee law being committed by security sector actors that are likely to impact the achievement of results, will be evaluated ⁴ .		
Utility and strategic contribution to the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy: This criterion will be used to select interventions for evaluation based on their strategic importance, following guidance from senior management.		
Complexity and uncertainty factors of the project: This criterion will look at the technical and management complexity of an intervention and uncertainty factors. The technical factors relate to the use and familiarity of technologies (known/unknown) while management factors relate to the number of implementing partners involved in the intervention, change-related issues, and political issues. Uncertainty factors relate to interventions that may evolve in unpredictable ways due to their nature. Significant learning can come from evaluations of complex projects.		
Knowledge gap and organizational learning: This criterion will seek to look beyond the obvious results of the intervention to focus on intrinsic values related to organizational learning in terms of expanding the knowledge base of UNOCT and providing new insights of information for future planning.		
Innovation and sustainability: A programme/project may be selected for evaluation to capitalize on the evaluation results for future programming on the subject matter. This criterion will		

⁴ An assessment of risks based on the Project Risk Management Approach outlined in the UNOCT Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) will determine the suitability of the programme/project to undergo an evaluation.

help to ensure that innovative aspects and/or the sustainability of the results achieved by the intervention and support the incubation of other project ideas.		
---	--	--

Annex 7(b) - Evaluation Proposal Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

The Evaluation Proposal is an updated and expanded version of the Evaluation Plan which was developed as part of the approved Programme/Project Document (PD).

Timeline: Proposals for evaluations planned for implementation in Q2 must be submitted to the Evaluation Compliance Unit (ECU) by the end of March each year.

1. **Programme/Project title** –
2. **Programme/Project timeframe** –
3. **Programme/Project Manager and contact information** -
4. **Category(s) of evaluation anticipated** - Centralized Evaluation (CE), Independent Programme/Project Evaluation (IPE), Internal Evaluation (IE), other (specify)
5. **Type of evaluation(s)** - Formative, Mid-term, Final, Ex-post
6. **Purpose of evaluation(s)** - Explain the reasons for the evaluation and how results will be used.
7. **General timing of evaluation(s)** – Provide proposed timeframe for undertaking this and any future evaluation(s) for this intervention; whether rescheduling of evaluation is needed due to project extension.
8. **Relationship to relevant past and planned evaluations** - and to relevant evaluations at other levels (global programme, sub-programme, regional, national, project, thematic, other).
9. **Evaluation management** – Explain roles and responsibilities for managing and supporting the evaluation process, including logistical support, as well as the assistance needed from the ECU.
10. **Stakeholder involvement** – Discuss expected involvement of other UNOCT units, partners, or other groups in the conduct of each evaluation, such as being part of an Evaluation Reference Group or having an advisory role.
11. **Evaluation consultants** – Identify expected number of consultants and type of expertise required (if applicable).
12. **Methodological approach** – Identify the expected approach such as mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design, etc. This can be determined in consultation with the ECU. General information on different approaches can be found in Chapter 8 – Guide to Good Evaluation Practice of the Evaluation Handbook.
13. **Evaluation budget** – Attach a detailed budget for the evaluation, using the table below as guidance. More information can be found in Chapter 4 – Planning for Evaluations of the Evaluation Handbook.
14. **Total estimated budget for this evaluation (USD):**
15. **Amount of programme/project budget reserved for all evaluation activities:**
16. **Additional funds needed for this evaluation** (if applicable):
17. **Estimate of additional funds needed for other evaluation activities** (if applicable):

	Potential budget items
<p>Evaluator Fees UNOCT requires a minimum of two evaluators (one evaluation expert and one subject matter expert), except for Internal Evaluations. The engagement of national evaluators and junior evaluators as team members is encouraged. More complex evaluations may need to include additional consultant fees for external quality assurance⁵.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of consultants and grade level • Daily rates⁶ • Number of working days • Local data collectors (if applicable)
<p>Travel Consider the need for in-person versus remote data collection processes. Consider minimizing international travel by increased use of local consultants for in-country data collection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International and in-country flights and visas • Other local travel • Number of working days when daily subsistence allowance (per diem) is needed • Participation of UNOCT staff in field missions • Security costs (if applicable)
<p>Data collection and analysis Consider the costs of supporting effective data collection and analysis. Data collection could include stakeholder participation, such as interviews and workshops, which can require logistical costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facility rental fees and food/refreshments • Per diem for participating stakeholders • Interpreters • Translation of materials and tools into other languages (e.g., information forms, surveys) • Equipment and supplies • Software subscriptions (e.g., survey platforms) • Recording and transcription of qualitative data collection (e.g., interviews, focus groups) for analysis
<p>Evaluation Report If the final report needs to be professionally presented, consider whether this would be done internally or externally. Also consider whether there may be costs involved in sharing the report and lessons learned with stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of revisions to draft report envisioned. • Graphic design, editing and printing • Translation of reporting into other languages • Workshop or webinar to share results • Production of knowledge products in addition to main Evaluation Report
<p>Contingency Since there will usually be a time lapse between initial planning and the start of the evaluation, it is suggested that approximately 5% be budgeted for unknown expenses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contingency

18. **Evaluation schedule** – Use the table below to provide the anticipated dates for each stage of the evaluation process. Estimated timeframes are provided for each category of evaluation. Delete the column that is not applicable. Further guidance on completing this table can be found in Chapter 4 of the Evaluation Handbook.

Task	Centralized and Independent Programme/Project Evaluations	Internal Evaluations
Development of ToR	3-6 weeks (+ 2 weeks for review by ERG)	1-2 weeks (+2 weeks for clearance by ECU)

⁵ Further information can be found in Chapter 7 Quality Assurance and Assessment.

⁶ See Secretary-General's bulletin ST/AI/2013/4, Annex 3. The ECU can also provide advice in determining daily rates.

Recruitment of evaluation consultants (if used)	8-12 weeks if hiring individual team members. 10-16 weeks if issuing tender for evaluation firm.	8-12 weeks for hiring individual team members.
Onboarding evaluation team (orientation and inception meeting, sharing key documents)	1 week	1 week
Development and approval of Inception Report	3-6 weeks (once contract is signed)	3-6 weeks (once contract is signed, if using external evaluators)
Data collection, including field missions	6-16 weeks (depending on size and scope of intervention)	4-8 weeks
Analysis and drafting (data analysis, validation, development of draft reports, feedback)	6-10 weeks (depending on number of drafts and extent/timing of feedback from ERG and other stakeholders)	4-8 weeks
Final report and presentation	2-3 weeks	1-2 weeks
Follow-up activities (management response, dissemination)	1-4 weeks	1-3 weeks

19. Annexes:

- a. Evaluation Budget
- b. Evaluation Selection Criteria (template provided in Annex 7(a) of Evaluation Handbook)



Annex 7(c) – Terms of Reference Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

Template for Terms of Reference for Evaluations

This is a general template that can be adapted and used for all categories of UNOCT evaluations. The template includes instructions for each section of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for Evaluations, as well as required and suggested text where relevant. The annexes include templates that provide more specific ToR for evaluation specialists and for subject matter specialists. These are to be attached to the main ToR when engaging evaluators on individual contracts but are not required when engaging an evaluation firm through a competitive bidding process.

All instructions are in blue font. Please delete instructions before the document is finalized. Additional guidance in developing the ToR is available from the Evaluation Compliance Unit.

[Cover page components]

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Category of evaluation (specify Centralized Evaluation, Independent Programme/Project Evaluation, Internal Evaluation)

Type of evaluation (specify Formative, Mid-term, Final, Ex-post, other)

Full title of intervention

Programme/project number (if relevant)

Date of issue of ToR [month / year]

EVALUATION PROFILE

Programme/Project/Intervention Timeframe	[month/year to month/year]
Geographic Focus:	[specify if global, regional, country, multi-country, and identify which one(s)]
Linkages to UNOCT Strategic Plan and Results Framework, UNGCTS Pillars, Global Programmes, Thematic Programmes	[identify most relevant]
Linkage to SDG targets	[specify most relevant goals and targets to which the intervention contributes]

Primary Implementor	[specify UNOCT office/section/unit]
Implementing Partner(s)	[specify other internal and external entities involved in implementation]
Funding Partner(s)	
Primary Rightsholders (beneficiaries)	
Total Approved Budget (USD)	
Total Overall Budget (USD)	
Total Expenditure to Date (USD)	
Evaluation Manager	[specify name, title, office/section/unit]
Timeframe for Evaluation	[month/year to month/year]
Evaluation Budget	[specify total budget including evaluator fees]
Number of Independent Evaluators planned	
Type and Year of Past Evaluations (if any)	

BACKGROUND

Include brief descriptions of the following, keeping details at a summary level and including hyperlinks to other documents to provide more information if needed. This section should typically be no longer than 1 – 2 pages.

Context: Overview of social, political, economic, geographic, historical, and other factors that convey the context of the intervention when it was designed and at the time of the evaluation. This should include information on human rights and gender equality, and disability inclusion.

Evaluation Subject: Description of the intervention to be evaluated, including its main objectives, outcomes, theory of change, programme components, and main achievements.

Key Stakeholders: Overview of programme/project stakeholders, both rights holders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (government partners, other implementing partners, local partners, local communities, etc.). Clarify which stakeholder groups the evaluation is expected to engage.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Evaluation Purpose: Brief description of why the evaluation is needed and the planned utilization of the evaluation results, e.g., to assess the success and areas for improvement, inform the future development of the programme, for accountability and organizational learning purposes.

Evaluation Objectives: Provide approximately 3-6 specific objectives of the assignment, one of which is to be:

- To assess the extent to which the intervention addressed human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion.

Main Users of Evaluation Results: Identify the main intended audience/users (e.g., programme managers, other units, other implementors, government or funding partners, rights holders/beneficiaries).

Evaluation Scope: Identify what the evaluation is to include in respect to timeframe, themes, and geographic areas to be covered. Also identify stakeholder involvement in the conduct of the evaluation including make-up and role of Evaluation Reference Group or other advisory body (if used).

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

Identify the most important criteria and questions to be covered in order to keep the evaluation process focused but also respond to its objectives. While the evaluation must include the criterion of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and no one left behind, as well as any funder-required criteria, utilization of all other criteria is dependent on the information needs. The table below contains two mandatory questions and examples of other evaluation questions for each criterion. The questions are mostly phrased in the past tense for use in final evaluations and should be adapted for mid-term evaluations. More examples of questions for each criterion can be found in [Annex 2](#) of the Evaluation Handbook.

It is recommended that there be one to three priority questions for each criterion used, and it is acceptable for some questions to be combined or divided into sub-questions as long as the line of enquiry is similar. For most Internal Evaluations, it is recommended to have no more than eight questions in total, including the mandatory questions.

Standard text for the introduction of this section: The evaluation will be conducted based on the below selected relevant DAC criteria⁷. All evaluations must include a stand-alone section on the cross-cutting

⁷ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

themes of gender, human rights, disability inclusion and no one left behind. Ideally these issues are mainstreamed within the evaluation questions. Moreover, the evaluation needs to identify lessons learned⁸. The evaluation questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team in the drafting of the Inception Report.

<p>Relevance⁹: Did the intervention do the right thing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Mandatory question] To what extent was the intervention relevant to the pillars of the GCTS and the Strategic Goals of the SP? • To what extent was the intervention relevant to stakeholder's (e.g., governments, Member States, etc.) needs and priorities? • To what extent was the intervention designed in a results-oriented, inclusive, and participatory manner? • To what extent were the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the intervention relevant to achieving its objective? • To what extent was the intervention informed by a substantive contextual analysis, including a tailored human rights and gender analysis that identified underlying causes of human rights violations and barriers to HR & GE?
<p>Coherence¹⁰: How well did the intervention fit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the intervention complement work among different sections within the Office, and with other organizations, especially with other UN entities? • To what extent was there coherence between this programme and other member state specific interventions in the areas of the evaluation? • To what extent did the intervention deliver results in line with organizational, regional, and international priorities?
<p>Effectiveness: Did the intervention achieve its objectives?¹¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Mandatory question] What has been the contribution of the intervention to the pillars of the GCTS and the Strategic Goals of the SP? • To what extent did the intervention achieve its intended outcomes and objective? • What were the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of results? • Were there unexpected results? • How effectively did the programme manage changes in areas of the programme's management including continuity and efficient handover protocols?
<p>Efficiency¹²: How well were resources used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the intervention delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner? • How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the intervention? • Were sufficient systems in place for monitoring and reporting processes?
<p>Impact¹³: What difference has the intervention made?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the intervention achieve societal changes? • What difference has the intervention made? Were there any unintended or higher-level effects?
<p>Sustainability¹⁴: Will the benefits last?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the benefits of the intervention likely to continue after it ends? [For midterm evaluations – What are the initial indications that the intervention will be sustainable, if any?]

⁸ Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the intervention.

⁹ Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient, and donor.

¹⁰ The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector, or institution.

¹¹ The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

¹² The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

¹³ The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

¹⁴ The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue after the conclusion of the programme/project/intervention.

- To what extent was local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders achieved?

Human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind¹⁵:

- To what extent has the intervention design, implementation and monitoring fully considered human rights, gender equality, youth as well as marginalized groups, including people with disabilities?
- Were women, persons with disabilities, and/or organizations working on these issues consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
- If these themes have not been fully addressed, what have been the institutional and other type of constraints to doing so?

METHODOLOGY

Standard text for the introduction of this section, which can be adapted if needed:

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a **mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods** is mandatory due to its appropriateness for ensuring that evaluation conclusions, findings, recommendations, and lessons learned are substantiated by evidence and based on sound data analysis and triangulation. It is also mandatory to use a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful, and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues. Special attention will be paid to: (i) ensuring that voices and opinions of both men, women, and other marginalised groups, such as people with disabilities are heard (including gender related and disaggregated data, e.g., by age, sex, countries, ethnicity, disability, or other relevant factor); (ii) ensuring an **unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories**.

The methodology must describe the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection, and present these in an evaluation matrix. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys and/or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools including online tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, the UNEG Ethical Principles for Evaluators as well as the UNOCT Evaluation Policy, guidance, tools, and templates. All evaluations of the United Nations system are guided by human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind. Note that evaluation team members are required to sign and submit to the Evaluation Manager the UNEG Pledge of Ethical Conduct.

All tools, guidance, and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the [UNOCT website](#).

DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

Below is standard text for this section, which is to be adapted as needed. Note that guidance on the time needed for each activity is provided in Chapter 4 of the Evaluation Handbook.

Inception Report: Evaluator(s) will prepare an Inception Report to further refine the evaluation questions and detail the methodological approach, including data collection instruments, in consultation with the

¹⁵ The extent to which the intervention has mainstreamed human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e., vulnerable groups, including those with disabilities.

Evaluation Manager. Note that evaluators must use the inception report template provided in the Evaluation Handbook and that the Inception Report must be approved by the ECU-OUSG prior to commencement of data collection in the field.

Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to Evaluation Manager and other relevant stakeholders. Validation meetings should be held at the conclusion of each country mission, and at the end of data collection.

Final evaluation report: Evaluator(s) will prepare an evaluation report based on the UNOCT evaluation report template relevant for the category of evaluation undertaken. The first draft of the evaluation report will be shared with the Evaluation Manager and programme team who will review for alignment with evaluation quality standards and for factual errors respectively. Subsequent versions will be shared with the Evaluation Reference Group (if used) and other relevant stakeholders for their comments. The Final Report must be approved by ECU-OUSG.

Evaluation Brief and Presentation: Evaluator(s) will prepare a two-page brief that highlights key elements of the evaluation process and its main results. A PowerPoint presentation is also to be prepared and presented to internal and external stakeholders.

Schedule:

Activities and Deliverables*	Anticipated Timing	Number of Days
Inception Report*		
Data Collection (including field missions)		
Validation Exercise		
Data Analysis and Draft Report*		
Comment period for Draft Report		
Final Report*		
Evaluation Brief* and Presentation Slides*		
Presentation of Results*		

* Indicates deliverables

EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

Describe the management structure for the evaluation, including roles and responsibilities of all parties involved, and lines of authority. Guidance for each category of evaluation is provided in the Evaluation Flowcharts in Annex 6 of the Evaluation Handbook.

EVALUATION TEAM

Use the chart below to identify the:

- Structure and number of evaluators needed. The recommendation for any UNOCT evaluation is at least two independent evaluators: one Evaluation Expert (who is normally the Team Lead) and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project to be evaluated.
- Specific skills, knowledge, expertise, and competencies required/preferred. At least one member should have expertise in human rights and gender equality. Ideally, the team should also be gender balanced and culturally diverse with national/regional evaluation expertise.

Role	Number of consultants	Specific expertise required
Evaluation Expert	1 (international/national consultant)	Evaluation methodology

(Team Lead)		
Substantive Expert	# (international/national consultant)	Expertise in XXX

Standard additional text for this section:

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any internal or external party and must remain independent and impartial. They 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.

Furthermore, the evaluation team shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluation team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Evaluation Manager who is responsible for ensuring that appropriate clearance and approval is obtained for all evaluation deliverables and products.

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNOCT rules and regulations.

Payment processes are guided by the procedures set out in the UN Procurement Manual. Payments will be made by deliverable and only once cleared by UNOCT. Deliverables which do not meet UNOCT and UNEG evaluation norms and standards will not be cleared. The Evaluation Compliance Unit (ECU) in the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Counter-Terrorism is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluations. Project/Programme Management must fulfil any such request for payments within 5 working days to ensure the independence of this evaluation process. Likewise, Programme/Project Management must not interfere in any way that might compromise the independence of this evaluation process. Non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by the ECU.

SUBMISSION AND SELECTION PROCESS

This section is to be included when the evaluators are to be selected through a competitive bidding process. In which case, the following should be described:

- Structure and procedure for application, including supporting documents.
- Contact person and deadline for requests for clarification.
- Submission deadline.
- Criteria for review of application.

EVALUATOR TERMS OF REFERENCE

[To be used when engaging evaluation consultants on an individual basis]

Title / Role	Evaluation Consultant (Evaluation Expert and Team Lead)
Commissioning Unit	
Title and Number of Intervention	
Evaluation Manager (name and title)	
Duty Station or Home-based	Home-based with travel to (all places for travel should be specified. If there is no travel, only indicate Home-based)
Proposed period	Day/Mon/Year to Day/Mon/Year
Number of workdays	
Fee Range	Typically, C ¹⁶

[Note: All instructions are to be deleted before ToR is finalized.]

Background of Assignment: Provide a 1-2 paragraph description of the intervention to be evaluated, drawing from what is described in the main body of the ToR.

Purpose and Scope of Assignment: Provide a 1-2 paragraph description of the reason for the evaluation and what it is to cover, drawing from what is described in the main body of the ToR. The first sentence should be:

The purpose of this assignment is to lead and conduct an independent evaluation of [name of intervention] fully complying with the UNOCT evaluation requirements, as well as the UN Evaluation Group norms and standards.

Key Responsibilities: The following text is suggested for this section but may be adapted if necessary.

Under the guidance and supervision of the Evaluation Manager, the key responsibilities of the Evaluation Expert include:

- Leading and guiding the independent evaluation team, ensuring high-quality deliverables that fully meet UNOCT and UNEG evaluation norms and standards.
- Participating in the kick-off meeting.
- Developing the evaluation design with detailed method, tools and techniques that are human rights-based, gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive, generating information from and about men, women, and other marginalized groups, as well as key gender, disability inclusion and human rights issues.
- Conducting a robust data collection phase based on the approach, tools and methods stated in the approved Inception Report.
- Conducting robust data analysis, including by using relevant tools and software (e.g., NVivo), and ensure that the Evaluation Manager has access to all raw data at any given point in time.
- Ensuring adherence to UNOCT evaluation guidelines and templates and the full evaluation terms of Reference (ToR).

¹⁶ Please refer to ST/AI/2013/4 Annex III for further information on the fee range.

- Ensuring all deliverables identified in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner, and in line with the quality criteria checklist.
- Effectively coordinating and interacting, throughout the entire evaluation process, with the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team. Request drafted inputs (and revisions of such) from the Substantive Expert(s)/evaluation team for all deliverables.

Key Deliverables: The following text is suggested for this section but may be adapted if necessary.

The Evaluation Expert is responsible for the quality and timely submission of their specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English.

- An Inception Report which is to include a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, data analysis process, evaluation matrix and limitations to the evaluation.
- Implementation of the data collection phase based on the instruments from the cleared Inception Report, ensuring that ethical considerations for evaluations in the UN are fully met.
- Implementation of data analysis, ensuring that all evaluation results are based on triangulated evidence.
- Sharing initial observations and findings at a Briefing Meeting with project team/internal key stakeholders and at a Validation Meeting with the Evaluation Reference Group and other stakeholders (if applicable).
- A draft Evaluation Report in line with UNOCT evaluation norms, standards, guidelines, and templates. This may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance with comments received. A briefing on the draft report with project/programme management may also be organized.
- Revised draft Evaluation Report based upon comments received from the various consultative processes (ECU, Programme Management and Evaluation Reference Group), including full proof reading.
- Final Evaluation Report that is fully proofread and edited. This may also entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance with comments received.
- A 2-page evaluation brief and PowerPoint slides on final evaluation results.
- Final presentation of evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders.

Performance Assessment Indicators for Evaluation Expert: The following text is to be used.

Timely, satisfactory, and high-quality delivery of the abovementioned outputs as assessed by UNOCT (in line with UNOCT standards, guidelines, and templates as well as UNEG Norms and Standards).

Schedule for Deliverables and Payments: Use and adapt the following table and text. The table suggests a range in the number of working days for each deliverable for guidance purposes. The number selected should be based on the scope and complexity of each assignment.

	Deliverable	Working Days	To be accomplished by (dd/mm/yr)
1.	Inception Report (including desk review)	8 - 15	
2.	Data collection, analysis, and Draft Evaluation Report	20 - 35	
3.	Final Evaluation Report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides (including full proof reading) and presentation of final evaluation results	4 - 8	

Payments will be made upon satisfactory completion and submission of outputs/deliverables as assessed by the Evaluation Manager. Programme/Project Management is requested to release all payments within 5 working days after ECU clearance.

Please note that last payment must coincide with the end of the contract and must be identical to payment phases in the engagement of consultant/IC request. Please note that Programme/Project Management is responsible for all administrative processes around the recruitment of international/national consultants, including to release the payment after ECU clearance as appropriate.

Qualifications/expertise sought (required educational background, years of relevant work experience, other special skills or knowledge)

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in political or social sciences, evaluation, project management or related field is required. A first level university degree (Bachelor's degree or equivalent) in a similar field in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.
- A minimum of 10 (ten) years professional technical experience in the field of evaluation or related field, including a track record of conducting various types of evaluation at the international level, preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations.
- Subject matter expertise and/or experience in evaluating interventions related to the counter-terrorism and the prevention of violent extremism is desirable.
- Experience in leading a team is required.
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System and in particular of UNOCT is desirable.
- Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative methods is required.
- Experience in human rights-based approaches, gender sensitive evaluation methodologies and analysis, and an understanding of human rights, disability inclusion and ethical issues in relation to evaluation is desirable.
- Experience in presenting and communicating complex evaluation or research results in a structured manner (in reports, briefs, presentations, etc.) is required.
- Experience in producing well-designed reports that meet UNEG evaluation standards.
- English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this post, fluency in oral and written English is required. Knowledge of another official United Nations language is an advantage.

According to UNOCT rules and UNEG Norms and Standards, the Evaluation Expert shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation, or supervision of any of the projects, programmes or policies that he/she is evaluating and/or have benefited from the intervention under evaluation.

EVALUATOR TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title / Role	Evaluation Consultant (Substantive Expert)
Commissioning Unit	
Title and Number of Intervention	
Evaluation Manager (name and title)	
Duty Station or Home-based	Home-based with travel to (all places for travel should be specified. If there is no travel, only indicate Home-based)
Proposed period	Day/Mon/Year to Day/Mon/Year
Number of workdays	
Fee Range	Typically, C ¹⁷

[Note: All instructions are to be deleted before ToR is finalized.]

Background of Assignment: Provide a 1-2 paragraph description of the intervention to be evaluated, drawing from what is described in the main body of the ToR.

Purpose and Scope of Assignment: Provide a 1-2 paragraph description of the reason for the evaluation and what it is to cover, drawing from what is described in the main body of the ToR. The first sentence should be:

The purpose of this assignment is to contribute substantive expertise to, and fully participate in, an independent evaluation of [name of intervention] fully complying with the UNOCT evaluation requirements, as well as the UN Evaluation Group norms and standards.

Key Responsibilities: The following text is suggested for this section but may be adapted if necessary.

Under the guidance and supervision of the Evaluation Manager, the Substantive Expert, in close coordination and cooperation, will collaborate with the Evaluation Expert and the evaluation team throughout the entire evaluation process, and contribute as follows:

- Providing substantive inputs in relation to the area of expertise to the whole evaluation process and to all deliverables.
- Participating in the kick-off meeting, and other briefing, validation, and results-sharing meetings (as relevant).
- Contributing to robust data collection phase, based on the approved Inception Report, by implementing all approved data collection tools and methods.
- Contributing to robust data analysis, including using related tools and software (e.g., NVivo), and ensure that the Evaluation Manager has access to all raw data at any given point in time.

¹⁷ Please refer to ST/AI/2013/4 Annex III for further information on the fee range.

- Drafting inputs to the inception report (with the evaluation design and the detailed methods, tools, and techniques), the draft and final evaluation report, as well as the Evaluation Brief and the final presentation.
- Revising inputs in relation to the area of expertise to all deliverables based upon comments received from the various consultative processes, including also full proofreading and editing.
- Ensure that all deliverables mentioned in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner, and in line with the quality criteria checklist.

Key Deliverables: The following text is suggested for this section but may be adapted if necessary.

The Substantive Expert is responsible for the quality and timely submission of their specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English.

- Draft inputs in relation to the area of expertise into the Inception Report, which is to include a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, analysis process, evaluation matrix and limitations to the evaluation.
- Contribute to the data collection phase based on the instruments from the cleared Inception Report, ensuring that ethical considerations for evaluations in the UN are fully met.
- Contribute to data analysis, ensuring that all evaluation results are based on triangulated evidence.
- Contribute to the sharing of initial observations and findings at a Briefing Meeting with project team/internal key stakeholders and at a Validation Meeting with the Evaluation Reference Group and other stakeholders (if applicable).
- Draft inputs in relation to the area of expertise for the draft Evaluation Report in line with UNOCT evaluation norms, standards, guidelines, and templates. This may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance with comments received.
- Contribute to the draft Evaluation Report based upon comments received from the various consultative processes (ECU, Programme Management and Evaluation Reference Group), including full proof reading.
- Contribute to the finalization of the Final Evaluation Report which is to be fully proofread and edited. This may also entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance with comments received.
- Draft inputs for the 2-page evaluation brief and PowerPoint slides on final evaluation results.
- Participate in the final presentation of evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders.

Performance Assessment Indicators for Substantive Expert: The following text is to be used.

Timely, satisfactory, and high-quality delivery of the abovementioned outputs as assessed by UNOCT (in line with UNOCT standards, guidelines, and templates as well as UNEG Norms and Standards).

Schedule for Deliverables and Payments: Use and adapt the following table and text. The table suggests a range in the number of working days for each deliverable for guidance purposes. The number selected should be based on the scope and complexity of each assignment.

	Deliverable	Working Days	To be accomplished by (dd/mm/yr)
1.	Inception Report (including desk review)	6 - 12	
2.	Data collection, data analysis, and Draft Evaluation Report	15 - 30	

3.	Final Evaluation Report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides (including full proof reading) and presentation of final evaluation results	3 - 5	

Payments will be made upon satisfactory completion and submission of outputs/deliverables as assessed by the Evaluation Manager. Programme/Project Management is requested to release all payments within 5 working days after ECU clearance.

Please note that last payment must coincide with the end of the contract and must be identical to payment phases in the engagement of consultant/IC request. Also note that Programme/Project Management is responsible for all administrative processes around the recruitment of international/national consultants, including to release the payment after ECU clearance.

Qualifications/expertise sought (required educational background, years of relevant work experience, other special skills or knowledge)

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in political or social sciences, law, economics, or related field is required. A first level university degree (Bachelor's degree or equivalent) in a similar field in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.
- A minimum of 7 (seven) years professional technical experience in [insert relevant substantive topic under evaluation] is required.
- Professional technical experience in the field of evaluation or related field, including a track record of conducting various types of evaluation at the international level, preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations is desirable.
- Experience working in a team is required.
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System and in particular of UNOCT is desirable.
- Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative methods is desirable.
- Experience in adopting a human rights-based approach, gender sensitive evaluation methodologies and analysis, and an understanding of human rights, disability inclusion and ethical issues in relation to evaluation is desirable.
- Experience in presenting and communicating complex evaluation or research results in a structured manner (in reports, briefs, presentations, etc.) is required.
- English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this post, fluency in oral and written English is required. Knowledge of another official United Nations language is an advantage.

According to UNOCT rules and UNEG Norms and Standards, the Substantive Expert shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation, or supervision of any of the projects, programmes, or policies that he/she is evaluating and/or have benefited from the intervention under evaluation.

Annex 7(d) - Stakeholder Mapping Matrix Template

All UNOCT evaluations are to include a stakeholder mapping and analysis process to help determine the sampling framework for the evaluation and the roles that stakeholders should have in the evaluation process. The following is an illustrative example of a stakeholder map template.

Who (stakeholders - disaggregated as appropriate)	What (their role in the intervention)	Why (gains from involvement in the evaluation)	Priority (how important to be part of evaluation process) (H/L/M)	When (stage of the evaluation to engage them)	How (ways and capacities in which stakeholders will participate)
Duty-bearers with the authority to make decisions related to the intervention: - government organizations - government officials and government leaders - funding agency					
Duty-bearers who have direct responsibility for the intervention: - funding agency - programme managers - partners (individual and organizations) - staff members					
Secondary duty-bearers: - private sector / employers - other authorities within the context of the intervention					
Rights-holders who, one way or another, benefit from the intervention: women, men, girls, boys; other groups; these should be disaggregated					
Rights-holders who are in a position disadvantaged by the intervention: women, men, girls, boys; other groups; disaggregated					
Other interest groups who are not directly participating in the intervention: - other development agencies working in area - civil society organizations - other organizations					

Source: UNEG, "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance", 2011.

How to populate and use the stakeholder mapping matrix	
<p>“What” (roles in the intervention)</p>	<p>Examples of roles that should be included in the matrix (not exhaustive, others should be added depending on the context and intervention):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funder – more than 50% Funder – less than 50% Partner Advisor Supporter Programme management Programme staff member Primary beneficiary Secondary beneficiary Non-participants possibly affected by the intervention
<p>“Why” (gains from involvement in the evaluation)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inform: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation’s progress and findings. 2) Consult: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation’s progress and findings, listen to them, and provide feedback on how the stakeholder’s input influenced the evaluation. 3) Involve: Work with the stakeholder to ensure that their concerns are considered when reviewing various evaluation options; make sure that they have the opportunity to review and comment on options and provide feedback on how their input was used in the evaluation. 4) Collaborate: Incorporate the stakeholder’s advice and concerns to the greatest degree possible and provide opportunities for meaningful involvement in the evaluation process. 5) Empower: Transfer power for the evaluation over to the stakeholder: it is their evaluation. The evaluation team will offer options and advice to inform their decisions. Decision-making power ultimately rests with this stakeholder, whose decisions will be supported, informed, and facilitated by the evaluation team.
<p>“Priority” (how important to be part of the evaluation process)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Low level of relevance to the evaluation 2) Medium level of relevance to the evaluation 3) High level of relevance to the evaluation
<p>“When” (stage of the evaluation to engage them)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preparation (e.g., preparation of ToR including setting of scope, selection of evaluation team). 2) Inception and primary research (e.g., development of evaluation design, framing evaluation questions and criteria). 3) Data collection and analysis. 4) Report preparation. 5) Management response. 6) Dissemination.
<p>“How” (ways and capacities in which stakeholders will participate)</p>	<p>Possible ways and capacity to participate in an evaluation (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an informant. As a member of a steering committee. As an evaluator. As part of the audience to be informed of the evaluation.

Annex 7(e) - Evaluation Matrix Template

All UNOCT evaluation processes are to be guided by an evaluation matrix which is to be developed during the inception phase. This template is provided as a sample structure and evaluators may adapt the format as long as the following elements are maintained: evaluation criteria, evaluation questions and sub-questions (where needed), indicators or other metrics by which progress will be assessed, sources of information, data collection methods, and data collection tools. The evaluation matrix is to be included in the Inception Report and in the Evaluation Report. Although not required, it is good practice to include brief summaries of key findings for each question in the version of the matrix that is included in the final Evaluation Report. An example is provided on how the matrix could be filled out for a question on Coherence – note that the content is at a general level and is for illustrative purposes only.

Criterion: (for example, Coherence)				
Evaluation Question: How well does the project align with the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy's collaborative approach?				
Sub-question (a): To what extent is the intervention bringing together other UN entities in engaging youth in the prevention of violent extremism and helping to extend this work?				
Assumptions to be assessed	Indicator/Success Standards	Baseline (if applicable)	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection
UNOCT activities facilitate inter-agency cooperation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forum established for regular communication amongst Compact entities involved in this work. Stakeholders report increased level of cooperation. Joint projects developed and implemented. 	Minimal inter-agency interactions on youth- focused PCVE efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Managers and Section Chiefs at UNOCT and collaborating agencies. Government counterparts and Resident Coordinators in the 5 countries visited. Documents including the UNSDCFs, joint project reports, other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remote and in-person Interviews On-line survey Document review
Key Findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly meetings held between project managers of UNOCT and four other agencies. Five webinars conducted by UNOCT with 2 other agencies were attended by representatives from 10 UN entities, 12 Member States and 25 NGOs. Three of five government counterparts and four of five Resident Coordinators interviewed report that there is a unified approach at country level that was not evident before the start of the project. 				

- 78% of survey respondents (38 out of 49) report high levels of satisfaction with UNOCT's facilitation. Respondents in 2 countries were not aware of project.
- Two joint research studies launched since start of project. Two joint proposals submitted to funding partners for extending the project to five more countries.

Sub-question (b):

Assumptions to be assessed	Indicator/Success Standards	Baseline (if applicable)	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection

Key Findings:



Inception Report Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Unlike the Final Evaluation Report, the Inception Report is not required to include the UNOCT logo or follow specific formatting and design specifications. However, it is expected to include all of the sections within this template and to follow the instructions provided.

Guidelines and other relevant templates are available on the [UNOCT website](#). Please contact the Evaluation Compliance Unit directly if more guidance is needed [OCT-ECU@un.org].

TITLE PAGE COMPONENTS

- Type of Evaluation: Centralized Evaluation, Independent Programme/Project Evaluation, Internal Evaluation
- Specify that this is an Inception Report
- Full title of evaluation, including name of programme/project
- Programme/project number
- Type of evaluation [i.e., midterm, final]
- Version of report [i.e., draft, revised draft, and revision number, final]
- Submitted by:
- Submission date:

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This section should concisely demonstrate the evaluators' understanding of the intervention being evaluated.

ANALYSIS OF LOGIC FRAMEWORK AND TOC

This section should provide a brief discussion and analysis of the logic frameworks and the theory of change (ToC). These should be reviewed to ensure they are adequate for the purpose of the evaluation (i.e., the intended results can be measured, the causal pathways between the intervention activities and chain of results appear valid). If shortcomings are found, the evaluators should propose reformulations or develop one (in the case of the ToC) to use in the evaluation process. The need to formalize any changes/additions should be reflected in the evaluation recommendations. [Note that all UNOCT programmes and project have results frameworks but not all have a ToC. Results frameworks will have already been approved by the Programme Review Board and financial partners; therefore, any changes

will require a change of programme/project request and will need to be addressed as part of a recommendation emerging from the evaluation.]

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE, SCOPE

This section should explain why the evaluation is being carried out, what it covers, and who is involved. The key elements are:

- The purpose and/or objectives of the exercise.
- Its scope – thematic, geographic, chronological, etc. – and any pertinent aspects that are not included that might otherwise be expected to be.
- Any changes made from the ToR.
- Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process, including make-up and role of Evaluation Reference Group(s).

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The ToR provided the criteria to be covered and an initial list of questions to be refined and elaborated on by the evaluators. This section of the Inception Report should include the criteria and the final list of evaluation questions that have been agreed with the Evaluation Manager. These are required to incorporate cross-cutting themes (human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind and disability inclusion). Any changes from what appeared in the ToR should be explained.

SUMMARY OF DESK REVIEW MATERIAL

This section should illuminate insights gained from the review of documents and any preliminary conversations with stakeholders during the inception state. The summary should include preliminary findings for each evaluation criterion and inform the course of action for the evaluation. Any gaps in the documentation received should be identified.

STAKEHOLDER MAP

The Inception Report should include a stakeholder map (which can be in narrative, table or graphic form and be included in the main report or as an annex) that identifies all stakeholder groups (duty-bearers/implementors and supporters, and rights holders/beneficiaries) involved in the intervention being evaluated and their roles. The map should also identify those who have an interest in the evaluation and stakeholders' roles in the evaluation (as respondents, Evaluation Reference Group members, providers of logistical support, etc.). An example of a stakeholder map is provided in Annex 7(d) of the Evaluation Handbook.

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

This section should further elaborate on the methodology proposed in the ToR. This should include:

- Overall approach - a mixed-methods approach is required but other aspects of the design should also be specified and discussed (i.e., non-experimental, quasi-experimental, theory-based, participatory).
- Description of data sources, collection methods and tools (with actual tools being included in the annex). It should be clear how data may be recorded and how consent will be obtained.
- Sampling strategy for each method that shows how the diversity of stakeholders identified in the stakeholder mapping will be included.
- Analysis methods for each type of data.
- Explanation for how triangulation and data validity and reliability will be achieved.
- Description of how cross-cutting themes will be addressed.
- Quality assurance processes.
- Data safety and ethical considerations.
- Anticipated risks and limitations of the approach, and proposed mitigation strategies.
- Any changes from the ToR.

Mixed methods - It is important that a variety of methods be used as part of data collection in order to elicit the range of stakeholders' views, opinions, and assessments. The most common methods are individual and group interviews, surveys, and questionnaires as well as visits to project sites and observation. As every method has the potential to bring new information and insights, additional and innovative approaches are encouraged. It is this variety of methods and input from multiple stakeholders that helps to confirm (triangulate) the evidence obtained.

WORKPLAN

The workplan should be in table format and include activities, associated timelines, deliverables, roles, and responsibilities and well as the travel schedule for any field missions.

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Resource requirements associated with the activities and deliverables in the workplan should be explained. Assistance required from UNOCT for each activity, such as scheduling interviews, should also be specified.

ANNEXES

The mandatory annexes are listed below. Additional annexes that further explain and/or justify the methodological approach can also be attached.

1. **Evaluation matrix** – This should include the evaluation criteria, questions/sub-questions, indicators for measuring success, and data collection methods and sources. It is good practice for assumptions to also be stated.
2. **List of documents reviewed** - The list should include but is not limited to:
 - Organizational information including the UNOCT Strategic Plan and Results Framework, UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (GCTS) and its Biennial Reviews, UNOCT Organizational Structure.
 - Programme/project design documents, including any revisions.

- Programme/project progress reports, monitoring data, financial reports.
- Other relevant review material such as research reports, needs assessment, strategies, and policies.

UNOCT/UNEG Evaluation Documents -

- UNOCT Evaluation Handbook, quality assurance checklist and templates (2023)
 - UNOCT Evaluation Policy (2021) and Gender Mainstreaming Policy (2022)
 - UN Learn Better, Together: Independent Meta-Synthesis Under the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (2021)
 - UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)
 - UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and Pledge of Ethical Conduct (2020)
 - UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014)
 - UNEG Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations (2022)
3. **Data collection tools** – These should be fully developed, including introduction messages, any guidance for data collectors such as focus group discussion instructions, and fields to capture data and place as well as respondent profile information such as gender, stakeholder group, age category (if relevant).
 4. **List of stakeholders to be consulted** – This should include type of stakeholder, organization, name, position, location, email, and how it is anticipated that they will be engaged in the evaluation process. Note that names and contact information should not be included in the Evaluation Report.

Organization	Name	Designation	Location	Email	Type of engagement	Comments
Donor						
Beneficiaries						
Member States						
Civil Society						

5. **UNEG Pledge of Ethical Conduct (2020)** - Signed by all evaluation team members



Centralized Evaluation Report Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Page length – The preferred maximum length for the main body of the report, including the Executive Summary, is 60 pages. Additional information can be placed in the annexes and referenced in the main report.
- Formatting – Font type: Roboto (preferred) or Calibri. Font size and colour (a) Heading: 16pt text, all caps in the dark OCT blue bar (b) Subheadings: 13pt text in light OCT blue, underlined (c) Body text: 10pt text OCT dark and light blue or black (d) footnotes: 7pt text (e) titles for tables, figures, and other visual aids 9pt text OCT dark and light blue (f) page numbers: 12pt text in light OCT blue, centered (g) Margins: Left + right margins at 0.75. Note that OCT colours can be eye-dropped to copy.
- Numbering – all sections and major sub-sections of the report to be numbered.
- Visual aids to have numbers and title appear above, have the source identified below, and be referenced in the text.
- Additional Guidance on use of the UNOCT logo and design specifications can be found in the UNOCT Visual Identity document, which can be obtained from the Communications Unit of the OUSG.

TITLE PAGE COMPONENTS

- UNOCT logo at top of page
- Centralized Evaluation
- Full title of evaluation, including name of strategy/thematic area/programme
- Programme number if applicable
- Type of evaluation [i.e., midterm, final, ad hoc]

INSIDE COVER PAGE

The following text should be included:

This independent evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of [names and titles of external evaluators]. This report was commissioned by the Evaluation and Compliance Unit (ECU) of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT)¹⁸.

The Evaluation and Compliance Unit can be contacted at:

¹⁸ The Evaluation and Compliance Unit provides guidelines and templates to be used in evaluation processes.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this independent evaluation report are those of the evaluation team. They do not represent those of UNOCT or of any of the institutions or Member States referred to in the report. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the evaluation team.

© United Nations, [Month Year]. All rights reserved worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been professionally edited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Abbreviations and Acronyms
2. Management Response¹⁹
3. Executive Summary
4. Introduction
5. Evaluation Purpose and Scope
6. Evaluation Methodology
7. Evaluation Findings - [use only criteria that are relevant to this evaluation, which may be different than the ones listed below; a specific subsection addressing 'Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leave No One Behind' is mandatory, as is Youth if relevant to the subject under review.]
 - a. Relevance
 - b. Effectiveness
 - c. Coherence
 - d. Efficiency
 - e. Impact
 - f. Sustainability
 - g. Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leaving No One Behind
8. Conclusions
9. Lessons Learned
10. Recommendations

Annexes

Terms of Reference
Evaluation Matrix
Theory of Change and/or Results Framework
Evaluation Tools
List of Documents Reviewed
List of Stakeholders Consulted
Evaluation Team Member Biographies
Other

¹⁹ The Management Response is to be included by the evaluators if it is received within two weeks of the submission of the final evaluation report. If the Management Response is not available within that time, it will be issued as a separate document.

ACRONYMS

The following format should be used.

CT	Counter-Terrorism
ECT	Evaluation and Compliance Unit
EPS	External Partnerships Section
PKMCB	Policy, Knowledge Management and Coordination Branch
PMU	Project Management Unit
PVE	Prevention of Violent Extremism
PCVE	Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOCT	United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

[Note that the Management Response is to be included by the evaluators if it is received within two weeks of the submission of the final evaluation report. If the Management Response is not available within that time, it will be issued as a separate document.]

Introductory text - An introduction is required as a preamble to the full Management Response. Sample text is provided in the Management Response and Tracking Template.

Evaluation Recommendation #1:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		
Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
1.1			
1.2			
1.3			
Evaluation Recommendation #2:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		

Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
2.1			
2.2			
2.3			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[maximum length of 4 - 5 pages]

The Executive Summary should provide a concise overview of the most important information about the evaluation; it should be sufficient to inform decision making and able to stand alone. This section should be accessible to a range of audiences including those who are not familiar with the intervention being evaluated. It should include:

- A brief description of the intervention and its objectives.
- A short introduction to the evaluation - its purpose, scope, intended audience and methodology (including approach, methods and numbers of stakeholders reached by each method, timeframe).
- Main findings for each criterion.
- Concise overall conclusions (or combine with findings under the heading of 'Conclusions on Key Findings').
- Key recommendations.
- Key lessons learned (if applicable).

INTRODUCTION

[suggested length of 3 - 5 pages]

This section should enable the reader to understand the intervention and its context. It should briefly describe:

- The intervention, including its purpose, main activities, location, timeline, budget, implementation status, link to the Global Compact Pillar(s) and most relevant SDG targets and indicators.
- Information on context as applicable (i.e., institutional, political, policies, socio-economic, cultural aspects).
- The stakeholders involved including rights holders (and their needs) and duty bearers, along with their roles and relationships. This can be presented in narrative form or in a stakeholder map/table (a template is provided in Annex 7(d) of the Evaluation Handbook).
- The main intended results. This can be in the form of a brief description, table or graphic of the logical framework and/or the theory of change (ToC). A fuller logical framework and/or ToC should also be included in the annexes. If only parts of the results chain are being assessed by the evaluation, the focus should be on those areas but with reference being made to the entire intervention. Note that evaluators are normally expected to construct a ToC or assess and reformulate an existing one (if there are weaknesses), for the purposes of the evaluation.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

[suggested length of 2 - 3 pages]

This section should clarify why the evaluation is being carried out, what it covers and who is involved.

The key elements are:

- The purpose and/or objectives of the exercise.
- Its scope – thematic, geographic, chronological, etc. – and any pertinent aspects that are not included that might otherwise be expected to be.
- Evaluation questions agreed to in the Inception Report.
- Any changes made from the purpose, scope, key criteria/questions from the ToR.
- Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process, including make-up and role of Evaluation Reference Group(s).

METHODOLOGY

[suggested length of 4-6 pages]

This section is important for communicating the credibility of the evaluation process. It should provide an updated account of the approach and methods that were proposed in the Inception Report. Supplementary information can be provided in the annexes but should also be referenced in the text of this section. The main elements should include:

- The evaluation approach/design and rationale.
- A description of the evaluation matrix (which should be attached as an annex and include measurable indicators/benchmarks and assumptions from which the analysis is based).
- Data collection methods, sources of information, reliability of sources.
- The sampling process for each method. The final sample should be communicated in a table showing the number of evaluation participants for each method disaggregated by stakeholder group, gender, and other relevant category (age, location, disability, etc.).
- The analysis process for each method.
- A subsection on how the evaluation process was responsive to human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, disability inclusion, and youth (if applicable).
- A subsection on ethical considerations and safeguards for both in-person and remote data collection methods, as well as adherence to the UNEG Ethical Principles for Evaluators (preferably the signed Ethical Pledge is attached).
- A subsection on methodological limitations (including any issues related to data reliability) and mitigation strategies for overcoming each limitation.

FINDINGS

[suggested length of 15 - 35 pages]

This section should be organized by criteria and systematically address all questions with the analysis based on the indicators in the evaluation matrix. One of the criteria is to cover human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion. Each criteria section should state the relevant key questions and conclude with a text box that has a concise summary of findings (2-5 sentences). Findings should be evidence-based with data sources identified in the text or in footnotes. The perspectives of different stakeholder groups should be reflected, including through the use of pull-out, transcribed quotes.

CONCLUSIONS

[suggested length of 1.5 - 2 pages]

This section is normally organized by criteria. It should convey the overall strengths and shortcomings of the intervention in meeting the intended results, highlight accomplishments and areas for improvement, and discuss any significant unintended results/impact. The conclusions must draw from, while presenting a higher-level overview of, the findings. Preferably, each main conclusion statement is numbered.

LESSONS LEARNED

[suggested length of 1-2 pages]

Lessons should be the most important ones that emerged from the evaluation process about what worked well and/or did not work in the process of planning and implementing the intervention. They should convey information that is useful to a wider audience beyond the intervention, be applicable to other situations, and therefore contribute to organizational knowledge. Lessons should be concisely presented with each being numbered and the topic highlighted. The Evaluation Compliance Unit will pull lessons that appear most useful for organizational learning into the Lessons Learned Repository.

RECOMMENDATIONS

[suggested length of 2-3 pages]

This section should align with the evaluation purpose and include the main recommendations (usually no more than 10) emerging from the evaluation process. Only the main recommendations will require a management response. Any important additional operational recommendations can be provided in an annex.

This section should begin with a brief description of stakeholder involvement in their development and/or validation. The following format is suggested.

[Topic Area]	
[#] [Recommendation statement]	
Relevant Conclusion # (or Criteria):	Priority Level: [high, medium, low]
Responsibility: [who is responsible for action]	Timeframe for Implementation:
Explanation: [this should provide a brief description of how the recommendation can be implemented (with sub-recommendations if relevant) and its operational requirements including relevant resources needed.]	

ANNEXES

If the full report with the annexes will exceed approximately 100 pages, the annexes should be provided in a separate document and labeled as "Volume 2". "Volume 1" should then appear on the title page of the main report.

1. Terms of Reference
2. Evaluation Matrix (including measurable indicators/benchmarks and assumptions from which the analysis is based)
3. Theory of Change and/or Results Framework
4. Evaluation Tools
5. List of Documents Reviewed
6. List of Stakeholders Consulted
7. Evaluation Team Member Biographies
8. Other (i.e., stakeholder map, additional information on methodology, list of field sites visited, additional information to support findings)

Annex 7(h) - Evaluation Report Template: Independent Programme/Project Evaluations



UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF COUNTER-TERRORISM

Independent Programme/Project Evaluation Report Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Page length – The preferred maximum length for the main body of the report, including the Executive Summary, is 40 pages. Additional information can be placed in the annexes and referenced in the main report.
- Formatting – Font type: Roboto (preferred) or Calibri. Font size and colour (a) Heading: 16pt text, all caps in the dark OCT blue bar (b) Subheadings: 13pt text in light OCT blue, underlined (c) Body text: 10pt text OCT dark and light blue or black (d) footnotes: 7pt text (e) titles for tables, figures, and other visual aids 9pt text OCT dark and light blue (f) page numbers: 12pt text in light OCT blue, centered (g) Margins: Left + right margins at 0.75. Note that OCT colours can be eye-dropped to copy.
- Numbering – all sections and major sub-sections of the report to be numbered.
- Visual aids to have numbers and title appear above, have the source identified below, and be referenced in the text.
- Additional Guidance on use of the UNOCT logo and design specifications can be found in the UNOCT Visual Identity document, which can be obtained from the Communications Unit of the OUSG.

TITLE PAGE COMPONENTS

- UNOCT logo at top of page
- Independent Programme/Project Evaluation
- Full title of programme/project
- Programme/project number
- Date of final evaluation report [month year]

INSIDE COVER PAGE

The following text should be included:

This independent evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of [names and titles of external evaluators]. The Evaluation and Compliance Unit (ECU) of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) provides guidelines and templates to be used in evaluation processes.

The Evaluation and Compliance Unit can be contacted at: OCT-ECU@un.org

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this independent evaluation report are those of the evaluation team. They do not represent those of UNOCT or of any of the institutions or Member States referred to in the report. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the evaluation team.

© United Nations, [Month Year]. All rights reserved worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been professionally edited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Management Response²⁰

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Evaluation Purpose and Scope
4. Evaluation Methodology
5. Evaluation Findings [use only criteria that are relevant to this evaluation, which may be different than the ones listed below; however, a specific subsection addressing 'Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leave No One Behind' is mandatory, as is Youth if relevant to the subject under review.]
 - i. Relevance
 - ii. Effectiveness
 - iii. Coherence
 - iv. Efficiency
 - v. Impact
 - vi. Sustainability
 - vii. Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leaving No One Behind
6. Conclusions
7. Lessons Learned
8. Recommendations
9. Annexes

Terms of Reference

- Evaluation Matrix
- Theory of Change and/or Logical Framework
- Evaluation Tools
- List of Documents Reviewed
- List of Stakeholders Consulted
- Evaluation Team Member Biographies
- Other

²⁰ The Management Response is to be included by the evaluators if it is received within two weeks before the submission of the final evaluation report. If the Management Response is not available within that time, it will be issued as a separate document.

ACRONYMS

The following format should be used.

CT	Counter-Terrorism
ECT	Evaluation and Compliance Unit
EPS	External Partnerships Section
PKMCB	Policy, Knowledge Management and Coordination Branch
PMU	Project Management Unit
PVE	Prevention of Violent Extremism
PCVE	Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOCT	United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

[Note that the Management Response is to be included by the evaluators if it is received within two weeks after the submission of the final evaluation report. If the Management Response is not available within that time, it will be issued as a separate document.]

Introductory text: An introduction is required in the published evaluation report as a preamble to the full Management Response. Sample text is provided in the Management Response and Tracking Template.

Evaluation Recommendation #1:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		
Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
1.1			
1.2			
1.3			
Evaluation Recommendation #2:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		

Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
2.1			
2.2			
2.3			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[maximum length of 3-5 pages]

The Executive Summary should provide a concise overview of the most important information about the evaluation; it should be sufficient to inform decision making and able to stand alone. This section should be accessible to a range of audiences, including those who are not familiar with the intervention being evaluated. It should include:

- A brief description of the intervention and its objectives.
- A short introduction to the evaluation - its purpose, scope, intended audience and methodology (including approach, methods and numbers of stakeholders reached by each method, timeframe).
- Conclusions on Key Findings (for each criterion).
- Key recommendations.
- Key lessons learned (if applicable).

INTRODUCTION

[suggested length of 3 pages]

This section should enable the reader to understand the intervention and its context. It should briefly describe:

- The intervention, including its purpose, main activities, location, timeline, budget, implementation status, link to the Global Compact Pillar(s) and most relevant SDG targets and indicators.
- Information on context as applicable (i.e., institutional, political, policies, socio-economic, cultural aspects).
- The stakeholders involved including rights holders (and their needs) and duty bearers, including their roles and relationships. This can be presented in narrative form or in a stakeholder map/table (a template is provided in Annex 7(d) of the Evaluation Handbook).
- The main intended results. This can be in the form of a brief description, table or graphic of the logical framework and/or the theory of change (ToC). More details and a fuller results framework and/or ToC should also be included in the annexes. If only parts of the results chain are being assessed by the evaluation, the focus should be on those areas but with reference being made to the entire intervention. Note that evaluators are normally expected to construct a ToC or assess and reformulate an existing one (if there are weaknesses), for the purposes of the evaluation.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

[suggested length of 2 pages]

This section should clarify why the evaluation is being carried out, what it covers, and who is involved.

The key elements are:

- The purpose and/or objectives of the exercise.
- Its scope – thematic, geographic, chronological, etc.
- Evaluation questions agreed to in the Inception Report.
- Any changes made from the purpose, scope, key criteria/questions from the ToR, and the rationale for the change.
- Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process, including make-up and role of Evaluation Reference Group(s).

METHODOLOGY

[suggested length of 3 - 4 pages]

This section is important for communicating the credibility of the evaluation process. It should provide an updated account of the approach and methods that were proposed in the Inception Report. Supplementary information can be provided in the annexes but should also be referenced in the text of this section. The main elements should include:

- The evaluation approach/design and rationale.
- Data collection methods, sources of information, reliability of sources.
- The sampling process for each method. The final sample should be communicated in a table showing the number of evaluation participants for each method disaggregated by stakeholder group, gender, and other relevant category (age, location, disability, etc.)
- The analysis process for each method.
- A subsection on how the evaluation process was responsive to human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion.
- A subsection on ethical considerations and safeguards for both in-person and remote data collection methods, as well as adherence to the UNEG Ethical Principles for Evaluators (preferably the signed Ethical Pledge is attached).
- A subsection on methodological limitations (including any issues related to data reliability) and mitigation strategies for overcoming each limitation.

FINDINGS

[suggested length of 15 - 20 pages]

This section should be organized by criteria and systematically address all questions with the analysis based on the indicators in the evaluation matrix. One subsection is to cover human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion, as well as youth if relevant to the topic under review. Each criteria section should state the relevant key questions and conclude with a text box that has a concise summary of findings (2-5 sentences). Findings should be evidence-based with data sources identified in the text or in footnotes. The perspectives of different stakeholder groups should be reflected, including through the use of pull-out, transcribed quotes.

CONCLUSIONS

[suggested length of 1.5 - 2 pages]

This section is normally organized by criteria. It should convey the overall strengths and shortcomings of the intervention in meeting the intended results, highlight accomplishments and areas for improvement, and discuss any significant unintended results/impact. The conclusions must draw from, while presenting a higher-level overview of, the findings. Preferably, each main conclusion statement is numbered.

LESSONS LEARNED

[suggested length of 1 - 2 pages]

Lessons should be the most important ones that emerged from the evaluation process about what worked well and/or did not work in the process of planning and implementing the intervention. They should convey information that is useful to a wider audience beyond the intervention, be applicable to other situations, and therefore contribute to organizational knowledge. Lessons should be concisely presented with each being numbered and the topic highlighted. The Evaluation Compliance Unit will pull lessons that appear most useful for organizational learning into the Lessons Learned Repository.

RECOMMENDATIONS

[suggested length of 1.5 - 2 pages]

This section should align with the evaluation purpose and include the main recommendations (usually no more than 10) emerging from the evaluation process. Only the main recommendations will require a management response. Any important additional operational recommendations can be provided in an annex.

This section should begin with a brief description of stakeholder involvement in their development and/or validation. The following format is suggested.

[Topic Area]	
[#] [Recommendation statement]	
Relevant Conclusion # (or Criteria):	Priority Level: [high, medium, low]
Responsibility: [who is responsible for action]	Timeframe for Implementation:
Explanation: [this should provide a brief description of how the recommendation can be implemented (with sub-recommendations if relevant) and its operational requirements including relevant resources needed.]	

ANNEXES

If the full report with the annexes will exceed 100 pages, the annexes should be provided in a separate document and labeled as "Volume 2". "Volume 1" should then appear on the cover page of the main report.

1. Terms of Reference
2. Evaluation Matrix (including measurable indicators/benchmarks and assumptions from which the analysis is based)
3. Theory of Change and/or Logical Framework
4. Evaluation Tools
5. List of Documents Reviewed
6. List of Stakeholders Consulted
7. Evaluation Team Member Biographies
8. Other (i.e., stakeholder map, additional information on methodology, list of field sites visited, additional information to support findings)



Internal Evaluation Report Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Page length – The preferred maximum length for the main body of the report, including the Executive Summary, is 30 pages. Additional information can be placed in the annexes and referenced in the main report.
- Formatting – Font type: Roboto (preferred) or Calibri. Font size and colour (a) Heading: 16pt text, all caps in the dark OCT blue bar (b) Subheadings: 13pt text in light OCT blue, underlined (c) Body text: 10pt text OCT dark and light blue or black (d) footnotes: 7pt text (e) titles for tables, figures, and other visual aids 9pt text OCT dark and light blue (f) page numbers: 12pt text in light OCT blue, centered (g) Margins: Left + right margins at 0.75. Note that OCT colours can be eye-dropped to copy.
- Numbering – all sections and major sub-sections are to be numbered.
- Visual aids to have numbers and title appear above, have the source identified below, and be referenced in the text.
- Additional Guidance on use of the UNOCT logo and design specifications can be found in the UNOCT Visual Identity document, which can be obtained from the Communications Unit of the OUSG.

OPENING PAGES

Title Page Components

- UNOCT logo at top of page
- Internal Evaluation
- Full title of programme/project
- Programme/project number
- Date of final evaluation report [month year]

Inside Cover Page

The following text should be included:

This internal evaluation report was prepared by the [name of Unit or Section] of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT). Independent external evaluators were engaged to *[insert role of external evaluation consultants in the evaluation process or delete this sentence if there was no involvement of external consultants]*. The UNOCT Evaluation and Compliance Unit (ECU) provides guidelines and templates to be used in all evaluation processes.

The Evaluation and Compliance Unit can be contacted at:

OCT-ECU@un.org

© United Nations, [Month Year]. All rights reserved worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms

Management Response

Executive Summary

Introduction

Evaluation Context, Purpose, and Scope

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation Findings [use only criteria that are relevant to this evaluation, which may be different than the ones listed below; however, a specific subsection addressing 'Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leave No One Behind' is mandatory, as is Youth if relevant to the subject under review.]

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Coherence
- Efficiency
- Impact
- Sustainability
- Human Rights, Gender Equality and Leaving No One Behind

Conclusions

Lessons Learned

Recommendations

Annexes

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation Matrix
- Theory of Change and/or Results Framework
- Evaluation Tools
- List of Documents Reviewed
- List of Stakeholders Consulted
- Other

ACRONYMS

Provide a full list and explanation of all acronyms and abbreviations that appear more than once in the report. The full name/title should be provided the first time each is used in the report.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE			
Evaluation Recommendation #1:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		
Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
1.1			
1.2			
1.3			
Evaluation Recommendation #2:			
Accepted? (Yes/Partially/No)	Rationale (if Partially or No): <i>[insert response]</i>		
Priority (High/Medium/Low)	Timeframe (Short/Medium/Long-Term)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual (position)
<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>	<i>[insert response]</i>
Key Actions			
2.1			
2.2			
2.3			

<p>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY [maximum length of 3 pages]</p> <p>The Executive Summary should provide a concise overview of the most important information about the evaluation. This section should be accessible to a range of audiences, including those who are not familiar with the intervention being evaluated. It should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very brief description of the intervention and its objectives. • A short introduction to the evaluation - its purpose, scope, intended audience and methodology (approach, data sources, data collection methods and numbers of stakeholders reached by each method, timeframe). • Conclusions on the key findings for each criterion. • Key recommendations. • Key lessons learned (if applicable).
--

<p>INTRODUCTION [suggested length of 1-2 pages]</p> <p>This section should enable the reader to understand the intervention and its context. It should briefly describe:</p>
--

- The intervention, including its purpose, main activities, location, timeline, budget, implementation status, link to the Global Compact Pillar(s) and most relevant SDG targets and indicators.
- Any information on context that is important for the reader to know (i.e., institutional, political, policies, socio-economic, cultural aspects). Links can be provided to supplemental information.
- The stakeholders involved in the intervention including rights holders/beneficiaries and their needs, and duty bearers (implementors, funders, other partners), including their roles and relationships. This can be presented in narrative form or in a stakeholder map/table (a template is provided in [Annex 7\(d\)](#) of the Evaluation Handbook).
- The main intended results. This can be in the form of a brief description, table, or graphic of the logical framework and/or the theory of change (ToC). A fuller logical framework and/or ToC should also be included in the annexes.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

[suggested length of 1 page]

This section should clarify why the evaluation is being carried out, what it covers and who is involved.

The key elements are:

- The purpose and/or objectives of the exercise.
- Its scope – thematic, geographic, chronological, etc.
- Key evaluation questions.
- Any changes made from the purpose, scope, key criteria/questions from the ToR, and the rationale for the change.
- Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process – who conducted the evaluation, who were involved as respondents and advisors, etc.

METHODOLOGY

[suggested length of 2 – 3 pages]

This section is important for communicating the credibility of the evaluation process. It should provide an updated account of the approach and methods that were proposed in the Inception Report. Supplementary information can be provided in the annexes but should also be referenced in the text of this section. The main elements should include:

- The evaluation approach/design and rationale.
- Data collection methods and sources of information.
- The sampling process for each method. The final sample should be communicated in a table showing the number of evaluation participants for each method disaggregated by stakeholder group, gender, and other relevant category (age, location, disability, etc.).
- The data analysis process for each type of data collected.
- A brief paragraph on how the evaluation process considered human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion.
- A brief paragraph on ethical considerations and safeguards for both in-person and remote data collection methods.
- A table on methodological limitations (including any issues related to data reliability) and mitigation strategies for overcoming each limitation.

FINDINGS

[suggested length of 10-15 pages]

This section should be organized by criteria and systematically address all questions in the Inception Report with the analysis based on the indicators in the evaluation matrix. One mandatory criterion is “human rights, gender equality, leave no one behind, and disability inclusion” (as well as youth if relevant). Each criteria section should state the relevant key questions and conclude with a text box

having a concise summary of findings (2-5 sentences). Findings should be evidence-based with data sources identified in the text or in footnotes. The perspectives of different stakeholder groups should be reflected, including through the use of pull-out, transcribed quotes. Visual aids (such as maps, info graphics, tables, and charts) should be included where possible.

CONCLUSIONS

[suggested length of 1 - 2 pages]

This section is normally organized by criteria. It should convey the overall strengths and shortcomings of the intervention in meeting the intended results, highlight accomplishments and areas for improvement, and any significant unintended results/impact. The conclusions must draw from, while presenting a higher-level overview of, the findings. It is suggested that this section conclude with a brief SWOT analysis that bullet points the intervention's main strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

Strengths

- XX
- XX
- XX

Opportunities

- XX
- XX
- XX

Weaknesses

- XX
- XX
- XX

Threats

- XX
- XX
- XX

LESSONS LEARNED

[suggested length of 1 - 2 pages]

Lessons should be the most important ones that emerged from the evaluation process about what worked well and/or did not work in the process of planning and implementing the intervention. They should convey information that is useful to a wider audience beyond the intervention, be applicable to other situations, and therefore contribute to organizational knowledge. Lessons should be concisely presented with each being numbered and the topic highlighted. The Evaluation Compliance Unit will pull lessons that appear most useful for organizational learning into the Lessons Learned Repository.

RECOMMENDATIONS

[suggested length of 1 - 2 pages]

This section should align with the evaluation purpose and include the main recommendations (usually no more than 8) emerging from the evaluation process. Any important additional operational recommendations can be provided in an annex.

This section should begin with a brief description of stakeholder involvement in the development and/or validation of the recommendations. The following format is suggested.

[Topic Area]	
[#] [Recommendation statement]	
Relevant Conclusion # (or Criteria):	Priority Level: [high, medium, low]
Responsibility: [who is responsible for action]	Timeframe for Implementation:

Explanation: [this should provide a brief description of how the recommendation can be implemented (with sub-recommendations if relevant) and its operational requirements including relevant resources needed.]
--

ANNEXES

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation Matrix (including measurable indicators/benchmarks and assumptions from which the analysis is based)
- Theory of Change and/or Logical Framework
- Evaluation Tools
- List of Documents Reviewed
- List of Stakeholders Consulted
- Other (i.e., stakeholder map, additional information on methodology, list of field sites visited, additional information to support findings)



Management Response and Tracking Template

Date of Issue: May 2023

Title of Evaluation	
Date of Final Report	
Type of Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> CE <input type="checkbox"/> IPE <input type="checkbox"/> IE
Responsible Unit	
Prepared by (name, position)/date	
Cleared by (name, position)/date	
Entered into EMTT (name, position) / date	

Introductory text An introduction is required for Centralized Evaluations and Independent Programme/Project Evaluations and will appear in the published evaluation report as a preamble to the full Management Response. Sample text is as follows:

"The UNOCT wishes to congratulate the OIOS on the draft report of the recent evaluation exercise on 'Strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery, and policy directives' for the 2018-2019 biennium'.

UNOCT is in agreement with the recommendations that have been presented to enhance the evaluation functions across entities in the Secretariat in general and specifically for UNOCT. UNOCT recognizes the importance of achieving and demonstrating results of its interventions. The Office has since initiated processes to develop and enhance its results-focused culture, among which has been the development and launch of the UNOCT Evaluation Policy. Presented below are actions that UNOCT will undertake to enhance its evaluation capabilities. The Office has no further comments on the evaluation report."

Evaluation Recommendation #1:				
Accepted? (Yes/Partial/No)		Rationale (if Partial or No):		
Evaluator Priority (H/L/M)	Evaluator Timeframe (S/M/L)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual	Completion Date
Key Actions			Tracking	

			Status (no action, initiated, completed, no due date)	Comments
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
Evaluation Recommendation #2:				
Accepted? (Yes/Partial/No)		Rationale (if Partial or No):		
Evaluator Priority (H/L/M)	Evaluator Timeframe (S/M/L)	Target Implementation Date	Responsible Individual	Completion Date
Key Actions			Tracking	
			Status (no action, initiated, completed, no due date)	Comments
2.1				
2.2				
2.3				

Legend:

CE = Centralized Evaluation IPE = Independent Programme/Project Evaluation IE = Internal Evaluation
H/L/M = High/Low/Medium S/M/L = Short term/Medium-term/Long-term

Annex 7(k) – Evaluation Brief Template

Date of Issue of the attached: May 2023

An Evaluation Brief is a required deliverable for Centralized Evaluations and for Independent Programme/Project Evaluations.



[Category of Evaluation: Centralized Evaluation, Independent Programme/Project Evaluation]

Title of Evaluation

Descriptive Information including, as relevant: location of intervention; timeframe of intervention; funders; implementing partners; date of evaluation; evaluation team; URL for evaluation report

Background and Context

Key Findings

Key Lessons

Insert photo, map, chart, or other visual aid.

Recommendations

1. Text
2. Text
3. Text
4. Text
5. Text
6. Text
7. Text
8. Text

Methodology

Use this space to highlight other key information such as a SWOT analysis, participant quotes, photo, chart, or other visual aid [this should be a different type of visual aid than what was used on page 1].