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# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>UK Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIOS</td>
<td>Department of Internal Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Medium Term Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 background

1. This document outlines standards and procedures for quality assurance of evaluations in the context of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). Its primary aim is to assist UNRWA Evaluation Managers in both headquarters (HQ) and field offices in strengthening the quality of evaluations and related processes. This document supplements UNRWA’s evaluation policy (May 2016) and should be read in conjunction with it.¹

2. This is a revised version of the 2015 report funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The initial report was prepared by an external consultant in close collaboration with the director of DIOS, the Chief of the Evaluation Division and the support of a wide range of UNRWA staff. Prior to finalization, a draft version of this document was discussed with relevant UNRWA technical staff in a workshop conducted in June 2015. The present version of the document was drafted by the Evaluation Division in DIOS in August 2016.

3. Procedures and standards outlined herewith are built on the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards, the considerable body of work that was developed since 2010 to strengthen the evaluation function in UNRWA - including the results of the professional peer review of the UNRWA evaluation function conducted in November 2015 - and international best practice in the field of evaluation.

4. The document is organized as follows: Section 3 briefly presents evaluation, its internationally-acknowledged criteria and underlying principles. Section 4 describes evaluations in the context of UNRWA. Section 5 provides an overview of the evaluation cycle across its key phases: 1) preparation and design, 2) implementation and 3) closure. Section 6 offers a set of tools for Evaluation Managers to use across the evaluation cycle, including a set of pre-formatted templates and quality assurance checklists.

5. The standards and procedures for quality assurance are updated regularly by the Evaluation Division in DIOS.

¹ Ensuring conformity with standards and procedures for quality assurance in evaluation is one of the responsibilities of evaluation managers, as per UNRWA’s evaluation policy (2016).
3 defining evaluation

6. Evaluation has been defined as ‘an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance’. Evaluations can be viewed as exercises that aim to determine whether we are doing the right thing, we are doing it right and whether there are better ways of achieving the results. Evaluations look at a number of criteria, generally known as the Organization for Economic and Social Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, including the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a given intervention. In the case of evaluations of humanitarian assistance these five criteria are complemented by additional ones, including: appropriateness, coverage, connectedness, coherence, and co-ordination.²

7. The following table offers a brief description of each evaluation criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Comments/Issues to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance           | The extent to which the objectives of the intervention are in line with beneficiary needs UNRWA’s mandate and strategy, host country requirements and donor policies. | • Responsiveness is a useful sub category of relevance in emergency situations and asks how well the initiative has been able to deal with changes on the ground/host conditions/ priorities.  
• Issues falling under this aspect include: the timeliness and speed of the response, how well targeted to those in need and how the short term objectives relate to the longer term objectives. |
| Efficiency          | How appropriately and adequately the available inputs (resources, personnel, time etc.) are being managed and used to generate the outputs. | • Key efficiency questions include: ‘could these resources have been better applied in other ways and, if so, how?’ ‘Could the same (or better) results have been attained at a lower cost and, if so, how?’  
• Answering these questions may require specialized expertise in cost-effectiveness techniques and should be indicated as a required competency for the evaluator.⁵ |
| Effectiveness       | The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. | • Timeliness is an implicit criterion of effectiveness                                                                                                                                 |

² UNEG Norms and Standards, 2016.
³ UNEG Norms, 2005.
⁴ OECD, 1999[https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2667294.pdf)
⁶ For a good introduction to cost effectiveness analysis, see the EU evaluation guidance, ‘Evalued’ at http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Focuses on how durable the effects of the intervention are if funding is reduced or terminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The extent to which humanitarian activities are tailored to local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria specific to humanitarian assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>The degree to which the programme’s actions actually reach the beneficiaries and major population groups; gender, age and vulnerability considerations should be reflected upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>The extent to which activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>The extent to which the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current trends in evaluation have led to a growing interest in conducting quasi-experimental studies that require a counterfactual (i.e. what would have happened without the intervention?), usually including control and ‘treatment’ groups. Resource and ethical considerations must be carefully weighed when considering these approaches.
- Impact can also be defined in terms of the ‘reasonable contribution’ that the intervention has made to the impacts (and by suggesting use of contribution analysis techniques in the methodology).
- In UNRWA, where most interventions are on-going and run for very long time frames, this needs to focus on how the running costs of an intervention can be covered, how likely system improvements will be maintained and how interventions affect the prospects for donor funding.
- This criterion has linkages with the relevance criterion outlined above. An example that may help understand the differences between the two criteria: improvement of nutritional status may be considered a relevant intervention, but distributing large quantities of food aid may not be the most appropriate activity for achieving this (alternatives could be cash for work).
- The extent of inclusion bias (i.e. inclusion of those in the groups receiving support who should not have been) and exclusion bias (i.e. exclusion of groups who should have been covered but were not) should be considered.
- The linkages between the relief and recovery phases, the existence of exit strategies with specific timelines, the allocation of responsibility and details on handover to government, adequate availability of funding post-response etc. should be considered.
- This criterion has become increasingly important.

intervention is complementary/in line with other interventions or policies of other actors affecting the relevant populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordination</th>
<th>How well the intervention was co-ordinated internally and also with other agencies or host countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

given recent close links between humanitarian and military actors in some countries (e.g. Afghanistan); it is often confused with coordination; it may be less relevant to consider this criterion in single-agency, single-project evaluations

8. All evaluations have the dual purpose of accountability and learning. A rigorous, independent and transparent evaluation process with systematic follow up of recommendations will reinforce accountability. Evaluation also needs to aim at generating evidence-based understanding and explanations of how interventions have performed, and what they have achieved, so that decision makers can design, implement and deliver them better in the future.

9. A number of core principles are known to underpin evaluation quality and are recognized as such in numerous statements on quality within the international evaluation literature. Of particular importance are the ‘norms and standards’ of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)/DAC. A non-exhaustive list of UNEG norms includes:

- **Independence:** refers to the degree to which evaluation is conducted without interference and is independent in its function from the process of policy making, delivering and managing programme and administrative work. It is ‘necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process.’

- **Credibility:** includes ‘transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance’. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology.

- **Utility:** refers to ‘a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions’. This hinges on a strong alignment between evaluation work plans and the agency’s annual planning processes. Evaluation topics should be selected and exercises planned in a way to ensure that evaluation findings can feed into new programming cycles. The six-year planning for centralized evaluations in UNRWA has been conducted in parallel to the establishment of the Medium Term Strategy (MTS) and the schedule of evaluations forms part of the MTS.

- **Impartiality:** includes ‘objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias’ in all stages of the evaluation.

- **Transparency:** ‘establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability.’

- **Ethics:** refers to the highest standards of integrity that evaluations must be conducted against, as well as the ‘do no harm’ principle for humanitarian assistance.

- **Human rights and gender equality:** these issues must be integrated in all stages of the evaluation process.
10. Complementary quality criteria include:

- **Participation:** refers to the inclusion and the consistent involvement of key stakeholders through all key stages of the evaluation - including when developing the terms of reference (ToRs) of the exercise, proposing key issues to be addressed, identifying credible sources of evidence, reviewing findings and assisting in their interpretation. Wide stakeholder involvement - increases the credibility, potential usefulness and sustainability of evaluation results.

- **Value for money:** refers to evaluation costs being appropriate to the scale and importance of the intervention.
4 evaluations at UNRWA

11. Evaluations at UNRWA can be centralized or decentralized. Centralized evaluations are commissioned by the Evaluation Division in DIOS, whereas decentralized evaluations are generally requested by donors. Additional key distinguishing features include: a) the scope and b) the management responsibilities of the evaluation.

- **Evaluation scope:** Centralized evaluations generally cover strategic and/or agency-wide issues, as opposed to decentralized ones which tend to focus on discrete interventions. Examples of the former include: the evaluation of UNRWA’s emergency appeals in the oPt (2016-2017) or the evaluation of the Medium Term Strategy (2013). Examples of the latter include the evaluation of UNRWA’s programme on “Education for Palestinian refugee children out of Syrian schools because of conflict.” (2016)

- **Management responsibilities:** In centralized evaluations UNRWA’s Evaluation Division manages the exercises and, therefore, assumes the role of ‘Evaluation Manager’. In these cases the Evaluation Division may commission the evaluation to one or more external consultants (‘Evaluators’) hired on an ad-hoc basis. Alternatively, when funds and human resources are available, UNRWA’s Evaluation Division is responsible for conducting the evaluation. In decentralized evaluations, the cycle is managed by programme/project managers in relevant UNRWA departments (e.g. education, health etc.), with the Evaluation Division in DIOS providing general support and additional quality control to the process. For an overview of who does what in UNRWA’s centralized and decentralized evaluations please see [table 2](#).

12. In addition to the above, centralized and decentralized evaluations currently differ with respect to the level of public access to findings/reports and their inclusion in UNRWA’s six-year work plan. Centralized evaluation reports are generally publicly available on UNRWA’s website and reflected in the six-year work plan of UNRWA. Decentralized evaluations have been object of less systematic tracking both on the agency’s website and its work plans.

13. Evaluation Managers in both centralized and decentralized evaluations are required to ensure that evaluations are conducted in accordance with the standards and procedures for quality assurance outlined in this document.

![Figure 1 – Key features of centralized and decentralized evaluations at UNRWA](image-url)
4.1 other common types of assessment in UNRWA

14. UNRWA departments may commission other types of assessments - each has its place in filling knowledge gaps to meet the needs of decision makers. These include, among others:

- **Reviews**: usually conducted in response to the needs of management for information on how best to orientate/alter an intervention or on certain operational dimensions of a given issue. The emphasis is usually on the generation of quick information rather than on methodological precision, analysis of the results chain and external reporting. Reviews may be conducted by UNRWA staff with, if needed, the collaboration of external consultants.

- **Monitoring**: the systematic and iterative collection of data on specified indicators to provide insights on progress towards intended results and use of allocated funds. Data collected from monitoring is an important source of information for evaluation.

- **Research**: Like evaluation, research involves the rigorous marshaling of evidence using valid and reliable methods. It differs in that it does not have a-priori focus on establishing the merit or worth of a given intervention, nor does it necessarily involve judgment and recommendations on corrective action.

- **Lessons Learned Exercise**: a lighter exercise, which may use evaluative methods yet does not involve the full rigor of an evaluation, for identifying areas that work well and/or require improvement. This is used to quickly provide feedback to senior management to enable decision-making on critical issues.

- **Peer Review**: staff with similar functions in the Agency review and critically assess the implementation of specific initiatives.

- **Inspection**: includes on-site physical verification of tangible assets and a limited assessment of processes in place to safeguard assets.

- **Advisory Services**: provided upon the request of managers, with whom the nature and scope of the services are agreed, to improve UNRWA’s governance, risk management and control processes. Examples include counseling, advice, facilitation and training.

- **Audit**: provide independent and objective assurance on the effectiveness and efficiency of governance, risk management and control processes. The internal audit activity assesses the adequacy of processes in place to ensure that: (a) resources are acquired economically and used efficiently; (b) assets are safeguarded; (c) significant programme results, plans, and business objectives are achieved; (d) significant financial, managerial and operating information is accurate, reliable and timely; and (e) activities comply with regulations, rules and other administrative issuances, policies and procedures.

- **Investigation**: Covers various forms of misconduct including but not limited to: fraud; corruption; workplace harassment; sexual harassment; abuse of authority; or failure to observe regulations, rules and other administrative issuances, policies and procedures. DIOS is mandated to be the central point for the receipt of all allegations and complaints in relation to misconduct.

15. The table below offers a snapshot of the key roles and responsibilities in both centralized and decentralized evaluations. Please refer to UNRWA’s evaluation policy for a complete list of roles and responsibilities of fields, headquarter departments and the Evaluation Division in DIOS.

---

9 See the OECD ‘Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management’ (reprinted 2010) for more information on the terms used in evaluation. [http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf)
### Table 2: Key roles and responsibilities in UNRWA’s centralized and decentralized evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>Key Responsibilities</th>
<th>Centralized Evaluations</th>
<th>Decentralized Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation Manager | • Designs and manages the evaluation  
 • Prepares the ToRs  
 • Issues the contract for the Evaluator(s) and manages the Evaluator(s)  
 • Makes all relevant documentation available to the Evaluator(s) at the start of the inception phase  
 • Provides first-level technical support on quality assurance by ensuring compliance of deliverables (ToRs, inception report and evaluation report) and processes with UNRWA’s standards and procedures for quality assurance  
 • Organizes contracting and logistical arrangements throughout the evaluation  
 • Keeps the evaluation focal point and Chief of Evaluation Division in DIOS in copy in all correspondence and consults with the Evaluation Division on quality and technical support.  
 • Is advised by the evaluation Steering Committee (where present) on strategic issues such as scope, approach, and selection of stakeholders  
 • Liaises with procurement and human resources divisions to ensure terms of reference compliance with both procurement and recruitment rules  
 • Consolidates comments for stakeholder feedback on draft reports in the respective field/HQ department  
 • Initiates and leads follow-up of recommendations with clients of decentralized evaluations in August and February each year  
 • Should not influence substantively the evaluator(s) | • A staff member from the Evaluation Division in DIOS | • Department-level staff member(s) with sufficient technical knowledge on the subject matter and on evaluation.  
 • Should not be/have been involved in the implementation of the intervention that will be evaluated  
 • Potentially, Field Programme Support Officer (FPSO), M&E Officers etc.  
 • Generally appointed by the Director of the relevant UNRWA Department. Ideally, an abstract of the curriculum vitae of the Evaluation Manager is shared with DIOS in the case of decentralized evaluations. |
| Evaluator     | • Undertakes the evaluation in consultation with UNRWA, in full accordance with the ToR and in full compliance with the UNEG’s norms and standards for evaluation | • Contractor(s) or staff members of the Evaluation Division in DIOS  
 • Can comprise one individual or more | • Contractor(s)  
 • Can comprise one individual or more (evaluation team) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Steering Committee</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evaluation Focal Point</strong></th>
<th><strong>(evaluation team)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Approves evaluation ToRs  
• Approves the inception report  
• Engages actively and periodically with the substance of the evaluation, providing preliminary feedback to the evaluator(s) during all meetings/debriefs which require the Committee’s participation and/or deliberation  
• Provides comments to the draft evaluation report  
• Resolves any unforeseen issue related to the evaluation that requires guidance and/or deliberation  
• Acts as a collective group and, to the extent possible, does not represent national/organizational interests.  
• Helps provide contractor(s) with access to information  
• Supports and monitors the methodological rigor, relevance and utility of the evaluation | • Supports the Evaluation Manager in ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are consulted and kept informed of the evaluation’s progress  
• Helps with logistical arrangements of the evaluation  
• Liaises with his/her field or headquarter department on all evaluations  
• Provides second-level quality assurance for the Evaluation Manager  
• Liaises with the Evaluation Division in DIOS for backstopping/additional support to the evaluation  
• Liaises with the Evaluation Division in DIOS on recommendations follow up and dissemination and use of evaluations  
• Must be kept in copy on all correspondence concerning evaluation matters and processes | • Mandatory  
• The chair should be a senior manager who is not directly involved in the management of the programme/project object of the evaluation  
• Strongly recommended for evaluations with fieldwork lasting 4 weeks or more  
• The chair should be a senior manager who is not directly involved in the management of the programme/project object of the evaluation  

• N/A  
• Appointed by the Director of the relevant UNRWA Department  
• Potentially, a staff member who works in the Department whose intervention will be evaluated (e.g. RBM staff etc.)
5 the evaluation cycle

16. The evaluation cycle can be defined by the following three stages: 1) Evaluation preparation and design; 2) Evaluation implementation and 3) Evaluation closure. The following figure and section summarize and describe, respectively, the key steps within each stage.

![Diagram of the evaluation cycle]

- Ensuring the ‘evaluability’ of the intervention
- Budgeting for the evaluation
- Preparing the terms of reference
- Commissioning the evaluation

- Inception report drafting
- Data collection
- Data analysis and development of findings
- Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations
- Report drafting
- Report commenting and revisions

- Management response and finalization of the evaluation report
- Recommendation follow-up and tracking
- Lessons learning and client satisfaction

5.1 evaluation preparation and design

5.1.1 ensuring the ‘evaluability’ of the intervention

17. Quality evaluations hinge on thorough assessments of whether the conditions are in place for the evaluation to take place or, in other words, of whether the intervention is, in fact, ‘evaluable’. The presence of a logical framework or ‘theory of change’ for the intervention plays a key role in the level of its ‘evaluability’. All interventions should have a clearly outlined logical map of expected results and related measures of attainment as well a defined set of inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes, to track and assess progress in relation to objectives. The presence of a formalized intervention logic also ensures that UNRWA staff involved in the programme/project at decentralized and centralized levels share a common understanding of what the intervention intends to achieve and how. Data access and availability (including baselines and time series) should be part of a sound evaluability assessment.

5.1.2 budgeting for the evaluation

18. The budget for the evaluation should be allocated as early on in the process as possible – possibly at the time the evaluation topic is identified. This may require requests to donors for funds. The budget should be realistically costed according to market-day rates for the expertise required.
5.1.3 preparing the terms of reference (ToRs) of the evaluation

19. ToRs for the evaluation are generally prepared by the designated Evaluation Manager, in consultation with key stakeholders of the evaluation, and establish the overall logic and design of the exercise. \(^{10}\) They are used to hire the evaluator(s) and form the basis of the contract of work. ToRs may fill common evaluability gaps in the initiative under study – including its theory of change (which may not have been developed by programme/projects managers yet should be outlined by the time the evaluation starts), and description of the context, rationale, objectives and operational arrangements of the initiative. ToRs also define the purpose of the evaluation, its scope, the main questions driving the exercise and the methodology to be applied. ToRs also set out the key steps, timings and resources dedicated to the process.

20. ToRs must be circulated to all relevant senior management in field and HQ for feedback prior to finalization. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for quality-assurance on the evaluation ToRs against the standards and procedures for quality assurance outlined herewith.

21. For an evaluation ToRs quality assurance checklist please see here. For an evaluation ToRs template please see here.

5.1.4 commissioning the evaluation

22. Two separate commissioning procedures are available for contracting the Evaluator(s): procurement of contractors (company or individuals) and recruitment of individual consultants. Procurement and recruitment processes need to be transparent, fair, timely and efficient. Most importantly, these processes should be task rather than time-based, with the evaluator(s) being assessed and paid on the basis of deliverables accomplished as opposed to time spent on specific activities. The process should be accessible by as many relevant market players as possible in the interest of both sound competition and equality of access. The process is governed by organizational directive 29 and employs a competency-based framework, tailored to the specific competencies required for the exercise. The creation of rosters of pre-qualified experts should be encouraged to support increased efficiency in the commissioning and recruitment processes.

23. Bid evaluation criteria and contractors requirements should be fully defined in the request for proposals/ terms of reference. All evaluations require evaluators with sound evaluation expertise (preferably a mix of qualitative and quantitative) and a track record of conducting evaluations in similar contexts and fields (at least three evaluations for the team leader of the evaluation). Strong presentation and report-writing skills are also essential requirements, alongside familiarity with gender and human rights-based approaches to evaluation and evaluation ethics. Where an evaluation team is required, this should aim to be gender balanced and include local consultants, if possible.

24. Once the profile required is defined and outlined, the evaluation opportunity should be advertised as widely as possible (examples of websites for announcing the vacancy include: UNRWA, UNEG, EvalMena, IPDET, ReliefWeb, Devex, European Evaluation Society, IOCE and ALNAP).

25. Criteria defined should be strictly adhered to in the assessment of the bid/candidates and a bid/recruitment evaluation committee should be established to support the process. The committee should comprise a minimum of three persons with a mix of evaluation and domain expertise. In the case of decentralized evaluations, the Evaluation Division should be invited to appoint a representative on the committee. The committee will be chaired by the Evaluation Manager or the representative from the Evaluation Division.

---

\(^{10}\) In the case of centralized evaluations where the Evaluation Division in DIOS conducts the evaluation, ToRs are developed by the Evaluation Division’s staff in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
26. The assessment process should enable a sound demonstration of appropriate technical and evaluation competencies, experience and understanding of the forthcoming exercise. Application processes might comprise the request to submit a short statement in which the applicant(s) set out their understanding of the context and conditions of the initiative and how the methodology should be best finessed to address the key questions and stakeholder requirements.

27. All proposals submitted under procurement shall be required to conform to UNRWA procurement rules. The department of international human resources at UNRWA can be approached for support and advice in this phase of the evaluation cycle. Award of the contract will be made to the proposal/applicant(s) offering best value for money. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for arranging and issuing the contract(s) for the evaluator(s). For a contract template please see [here](#).

5.2 evaluation implementation

5.2.1 inception report drafting

28. Shortly after contracting the Evaluator(s), the Evaluation Manager shares all relevant background material on the evaluation with the Evaluator(s). Following the examination of the documentation (which may take a few person days) and a start-up meeting, scheduled by the Evaluation Manager with the Evaluator(s) and its key stakeholders, the Evaluator(s) draft the inception report for the evaluation. The time spent on drafting the inception report may range from a few days to two weeks (in the case of larger evaluations).

29. The inception report offers the Evaluator(s) the opportunity to demonstrate and formalize the understanding of the evaluation ToRs, reflect on them and provide a more comprehensive and realistic picture of what the evaluation will achieve and how. At this stage the Evaluator(s) should be encouraged to propose amendments to the methodology or other aspects of the ToRs (e.g. scope, objectives, evaluation questions). The inception report should, in fact, specifically focus on issues where the Evaluator has a different understanding from what is presented in the ToRs. Any suggested modification to the ToRs should be backed up and justified with solid reasoning. The document should also fine-tune the timeline and key milestones of the exercise (key deliverables, presentation of findings etc.) and highlight whether complementary evaluations are being/have been recently undertaken and propose strategies for appropriate alignment.

30. In cases where the evaluation foresees a Steering Committee, the inception report is reviewed and discussed by the Committee at the inception meeting, after quality assurance has been conducted by the Evaluation Manager. Only after the Steering Committee deems the quality of the report satisfactory and approves the inception report, will arrangements be made for the launch of the fieldwork. In cases where there is no Steering Committee, the inception report is approved by the Evaluation Manager.

31. In all cases the Evaluation Manager is responsible for quality-checking the inception report against the standards and procedures for quality assurance outlined herewith.

32. For an inception report quality assurance checklist please see [here](#). For an inception report template please see [here](#).

5.2.2 data collection

33. During data collection the best evidence is gathered to answer the evaluation questions. The tools and approaches used flow directly from the evaluation design and generally include a mixed-method methodology (quantitative and qualitative data) to maximize technical credibility. Examples of data collection methods include the following:

- Desk review/document review;
- Interviews (structured/semi-structured);
• Focus groups;
• Self-administered surveys;
• Field-based surveys/population surveys;
• Analysis of secondary data; and
• Direct observation

34. All methods listed above have advantages and limitations. The best combination of data collection methods to use will depend on various factors and conditions which will have been carefully considered in the evaluation design and outlined in the inception report. For reviews of data collection methods please see: OIOS-IED’s Inspection and Evaluation Manual (2014, page 53); UNRWA Programme/Project Cycle Management Handbook (2008); and UNDP’s Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results (2009, pages 173-175).

5.2.3 data analysis and development of findings

35. Prior to delving into data analysis, the data collected must be always double-checked for validity (i.e. measurement accuracy - are the data measuring what was actually supposed to be measured?) and reliability (i.e. measurement consistency - do the data collected ‘hold true’ if (re)collected under similar conditions?). Data analysis consists of reviewing what the different data sources ‘say’ against the evaluation questions and carving out the main ‘narrative’. As a good practice, any suggested ‘story’ or information should be ‘triangulated’ or, in other words, ‘stress-tested’ against several (three or more) independent sources.

5.2.4 presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations

36. Prior to the preparation of the final report, the Evaluator(s) should be invited to present and discuss the work conducted and its findings with key stakeholders of the evaluation (i.e. management, relevant technical or methodological experts, Steering Committee, evaluand etc.). It is advisable that the Evaluation Manager meets with the Evaluator(s) before the preliminary findings are presented for a quick ‘run through’ of the presentation and its findings.

37. Stakeholder preliminary review of evaluation findings reinforces the utility of the exercise, allows for final fine-tuning of the findings and recommendations and, in turn, the likelihood of their buy-in and uptake. If negative findings are discussed with management well in advance of the final draft report, measures may be identified and concrete mitigation plans presented in the final report.

5.2.5 report drafting

38. Following feedback on the preliminary findings of the evaluation, the Evaluator(s) will produce a draft evaluation report. An indicative structure of the report should be specified in the evaluation ToRs, with the finalized structure being agreed upon prior to submission of the draft.

39. The evaluation report should include a two to three-page executive summary comprising a good summary of the evaluation conducted, including its conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The executive summary of the evaluation report should be translated into Arabic and, following publication of the report, be made available on-line to stakeholders. The report should be written in accessible language and suitable for distribution to all relevant stakeholders in order to optimize learning within the organization.

40. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for quality-checking the evaluation report against the standards and procedures for quality assurance outlined herewith.

41. For an evaluation report quality assurance checklist please see here. For an evaluation report template please see here.
5.2.6 report commenting and revisions

42. Following quality assurance on the draft evaluation report, the document is circulated among relevant stakeholders for formal comments. Comments should be returned to the Evaluation Manager within two weeks from receipt of the draft report. The process of review of comments should be transparent and formalized: the Evaluator is encouraged to consolidate comments received and indicate the extent to which they have been incorporated in the final version of the report. Clear explanations should be provided in cases where comments are not accepted or taken on board.

43. The final report should incorporate improvements and reflect stakeholder comments insofar as these do not interfere with the autonomy of the contractor in respect of the conclusions reached and the recommendations made.

44. For a comments matrix template please see here.

5.3 evaluation closure

5.3.1 management response and finalization of the evaluation report

45. Once comments are carefully considered and revisions, if need-be, made, to the document, the evaluation report can be considered to be in its finalized version. The final evaluation report is then shared with the client of the evaluation together with the management response template. The management response consists of a formal reply from those to whom the recommendations have been directed, to the Evaluation Division in DIOS (in the case of centralized evaluations) or the Evaluation Manager (for decentralized evaluations). The management response includes both a general comment on the evaluation and information about the client’s plans regarding the implementation of the recommendations. The management response should be actionable, time-bound and comprise performance targets that the considered department or field office should adopt and work towards.

46. Clients are requested to complete their part of the management response template within four weeks. The client of the evaluation can decide to reject some of the recommendations. Such cases require approval from the Executive Office. The management response is formally authorized by DIOS and submitted, upon completion, to the Executive Office together with the final report.

47. For a management response template please see here.

5.3.2 recommendation follow-up and tracking

48. All accepted recommendations (or the parts of them) should be entered in UNRWA’s Results-Based Management (RBM) system and followed up on a regularly basis until their closure. In the case of centralized evaluations, the Evaluation Division in DIOS is responsible for recommendation tracking by sending reminders to clients, with links to the RBM system as well as a paper-based attachment, and scheduling follow-up meetings with them every six months (in February and August each year) to discuss the status of the recommendations. In the case of decentralized evaluations this responsibility lies with the evaluation focal point with support from DIOS.

5.3.3 lesson learning and client satisfaction

49. The Evaluation Manager is encouraged to convene a meeting with the stakeholders of the evaluation to trigger reflection on the exercise conducted and identify and document possible improvements for future exercises. This process may include the administration of a quick survey to the client of the evaluation to allow for formal feedback. The client satisfaction questionnaire is generally sent to clients with the management response template.

50. For a client satisfaction questionnaire template please see here.
6 toolkit - useful templates and checklists for evaluation managers

Below are a set of generic annotated templates and quality assurance checklists to support Evaluation Managers and Evaluators across the evaluation cycle.

6.1 TEMPLATES

The following set of templates should serve as guidance for Evaluation Managers at UNRWA during key stages of the evaluation cycle. Templates should be used in a flexible way, completed and fine-tuned to the subject area and specificities of the evaluation.

• Sections in italics should be viewed as instructions to guide Evaluation Managers during document writing. Other sections may be considered standard language (and formatting) for Evaluation Managers to incorporate directly (and fill) in the relevant document, as deemed appropriate.

Evaluator(s) should receive copies of UNRWA’s evaluation inception report template and evaluation report template as part of the documentation shared during the inception phase.
evaluation terms of reference

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

1. background, context and programme/project objectives

1. UNRWA is a United Nations agency established by the General Assembly in 1949 and is mandated to provide assistance and protection to a population of some 5 million registered Palestine refugees. Its mission is to help Palestine refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, West Bank and the Gaza Strip to achieve their full potential in human development, pending a just solution to their plight. UNRWA’s services encompass education, health care, relief and social services, camp infrastructure and improvement, microfinance and emergency assistance. UNRWA is the largest UN operation in the Middle East with more than 30,000 staff. UNRWA is funded almost entirely by voluntary contributions.

• Briefly describe the intervention that will be evaluated. Only provide key information – the objective here is to get the readers acquainted with relevant aspects of the context, not to overwhelm them with information. Aspects you may want to highlight include the programme rationale and objectives in relation to identified needs and conditions, target beneficiaries, the geographical coverage, changes in its orientation over time etc.). Make sure to locate the intervention within UNRWA’s strategic framework.

• You may want to annex or provide links to additional information on the programme, including the theory of change and/or intervention logic showing the expected causal links between the intended outcomes of the programme and the actions and inputs intended to achieve them.

2. evaluation purpose, objectives and criteria

• Explain why the evaluation is relevant, why it is being conducted at this point in time, who commissioned it and how it will be used and by whom.

• The criteria of the evaluation should reflect the DAC criteria and applied as appropriate to the objectives of the evaluation. The trade-off between addressing all criteria and the depth of the exercise should be carefully considered in the scoping phase.

2. The objective of the evaluation is to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness [INSERT AS RELEVANT] of UNRWA’s...

3. In accordance with UNEG norms and standards (2016), this evaluation has a dual purpose of accountability and learning. It will therefore support...

4. The evaluation will incorporate gender and human rights perspectives throughout all stages of the evaluation.11

3. scope

• The scope refers to the ‘boundaries’ of the evaluation: outline the aspects of the intervention that will be covered and why – geographical areas, time phase of the intervention, target groups etc.

5. The evaluation will cover UNRWA’s [name of intervention] in [location] over the period [years]...

4. **evaluation questions**

- *Evaluation questions drive the exercise and should be kept in mind at all stages of the exercise. All questions should be brought back to each of the relevant criteria selected for the purpose of the evaluation. The ToRs should outline the overarching set of questions which should, in turn, at a later stage be broken down into more specific questions.*

- *The logical framework (see paragraph on evaluability) can be used to develop questions on efficiency, effectiveness and impact in particular. The map of expected effects links to questions on their progress or achievement and the contribution of the specific programme actions to the result. It is important to keep in mind that the intervention logic, though useful, is nonetheless a normative pre-ordinate map that tends to hide variability within the results chain.*

6. The evaluation will attempt to answer the following set of questions, organized around the DAC/UNEG evaluation criteria…

5. **methodology**

- *The methodology strictly follows from the questions posed and should outline the approach adopted and the ways in which the questions will be answered. Generally, mixed methods approaches which include a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, are the most appropriate to answer evaluation questions.*

7. The evaluation will adopt a mixed-method approach to answer the research questions outlined above, including both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Information collected will be triangulated to ensure soundness of the analysis.

8. Data and information collection methods will include, but are not limited to: (1) structured document review and content analysis of key documents (e.g. INSERT); (2) secondary analyses of data (INSERT etc.); (3) semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with [INSERT]; and…

9. The analysis and the presentation of data and information will, to the extent possible, be gender-disaggregated and take into consideration the needs of vulnerable groups.

- *Limitations of the evaluation methodology should also be presented in this section including any restriction on access to data, field locations etc.*

- *Evaluation Managers are strongly encouraged to develop a draft evaluation matrix. Evaluation matrices are useful tools that summarize how each evaluation question (and sub-question) will be answered i.e. through which indicators, data collection tools and sources (or ‘means of verification’). While the evaluation matrix should be part of the deliverables of the inception report, it can be a useful tool for Evaluation Managers in supporting the process of planning and budgeting for the evaluation.*

- *For a template evaluation matrix please see [here](#).*

6. **timing and deliverables**

- *This section should describe the time frame of the evaluation deliverables, the key steps in the process and the formal meetings from contract award to post-evaluation briefings.*

- *Key steps/deliverables and timeframes can be easily presented in table format, alongside the anticipated number of person-days for each component, as suggested below:*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>key milestones/tasks</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>person days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>start up briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desk review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inception phase and report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data collection and field work phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data analysis and development of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report drafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing of report for comments</td>
<td>[allow 2 weeks]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consolidation of comments and revisions to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management response</td>
<td>[allow 4 weeks]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client satisfaction questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional debriefs/dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Access restrictions or security issues should be discussed and proposals for mitigation provided (e.g. video/tele conference meetings and interviews, arrangements for delivery of survey questionnaires to inaccessible informants, specific data collection roles for local evaluator applicants).

- This section should also outline a tentative structure for the final report. For a final report template please see [here](#).

7. arrangements for managing the evaluation

- This section sets out the responsibilities of each of the parties directly involved in the evaluation, reporting lines and any relevant work arrangement

10. The Evaluator will report to [INSERT] (the Evaluation Manager) in UNRWA. The Evaluation Manager will provide all documents and information required to the Evaluator, facilitate access to staff and visits to UNRWA offices, organize meetings/transactions with relevant UNRWA staff, provide backstopping and liaise regular on the progress of the evaluation with internal UNRWA management. The evaluation deliverables will be quality-assured by the Evaluation Manager. Evaluation ToRs and inception report are approved by the Steering Committee, if present. Provision of office space will be clarified with the Evaluator.

11. The Evaluator is expected to undertake the evaluation in consultation with UNRWA, in full accordance with the terms of references outlined herewith and in full compliance with the UNEG’s norms and standards for evaluation.
8. evaluation team composition and required competencies

- This section details the specific experience, skills and competencies of the Evaluator(s), as appropriate to the domain of the intervention. Strong evaluation expertise is an essential requirement and all evaluations must be led by an appropriately qualified and experienced evaluation specialist. The team must not include any person with a conflict of interest through paid involvement in any aspect of the intervention under study.

12. The Evaluator should hold an advanced university degree (Masters or equivalent) in [INSERT], or a related field, and have completed training on evaluation, research and analysis. Practical experience may be substituted for formal education and training. The Evaluator (if one individual is contracted) or the Evaluation Team leader (if an evaluation team is contracted) should have led at least three independent evaluations, comprising field work for primary data collection. Previous experience evaluating [INSERT] projects and/or with UNRWA or other UN Agencies would be a distinct advantage. The Evaluator should have experience living and working in the Middle East and be based in the region or willing to travel to the region for the evaluation including in [INSERT]. Excellent oral and written communications skills in English, high level analytical and report writing skills and experience writing clear and concise reports for a range of audiences are required. A good knowledge of Arabic language is considered an asset.

- Composition and responsibilities of the evaluation Steering Committee should also be specified, where relevant. For an outline of key responsibilities of a Steering Committee please see here.

9. budget and payment terms

- This section outlines the terms and conditions of payment. Staged payment plans are recommended, with final payment dependent on satisfactory completion of the final evaluation report. Arrangements should be made for advances for travel and subsistence.

10. proposal/application submission

- Evaluations requiring a team of consultants should be contracted through a joint procurement and recruitment procedure. The specific procedural requirements for submission of applications by individual consultants and those of organizations should be set out in a single terms of reference. For a template contract please see here.

- A quality bid rests upon informed consideration of the key elements of the programme and its context. Provide as much relevant information on the programme and on UNRWA mandate, operations and strategy as feasible.

13. Applicants should submit: i) a proposal; ii) a cover letter; iii) a CV; iv) 3 professional references and v) his/her expected lump sum including professional fees and all evaluation costs to [INSERT email address], specifying [INSERT] in the subject line of the message.

14. The deadline for submission of applications is [INSERT DATE] (late applications will not be considered).

15. UNRWA is an equal opportunity employer and welcomes applications from both women and men. UNRWA encourages applications from qualified and experienced female candidates. Only those applicants short-listed for interview will be contacted. UNRWA is a non-smoking environment.

11. additional information on the programme [or links] including the theory of change/ intervention logic

- ToRs may include additional information on the programme [or links] to be evaluated, including the theory of change / intervention logic and relevant information on cross-cutting issues in line
with the UNRWA MTS, such as youth, disability, protection / human rights / gender challenges in service delivery; violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of at risk groups including gender related concerns.
steering committee terms of reference

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

1. background

   • *Provide a brief outline on the purpose, objectives and criteria of the evaluation – as per evaluation ToRs*

2. composition

   1. The Steering Committee will comprise the following internal members [INSERT] and external (AdCom) members [INSERT]. The Steering Committee will be chaired by [INSERT]

3. responsibilities

   2. The Steering Committee will be responsible for the following:

      • Approving the evaluation ToRs
      • Approving the evaluation’s inception report
      • Engaging actively and periodically with the substance of the evaluation, providing preliminary feedback to the evaluator(s) during all meetings/debriefs which require the Committee’s participation and/or deliberation (i.e. ToRs approval, inception report approval, presentation of preliminary findings);
      • Providing comments to the draft evaluation report;
      • Resolving any unforeseen issue related to the evaluation that requires guidance and/or deliberation

   3. The Steering Committee will strive to reach consensus on issues discussed which require deliberation. Minority views will be documented in cases where this should not be possible (e.g. with regard to comments on the draft evaluation report, minority views will be annexed to the finalized version of the evaluation report).

   4. Participants will act as a collective group and, to the extent possible, will not represent national/organizational interests.
contract for consultant/contractor

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT TYPE:</th>
<th>Consultant __ Contractor __</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT NO:</td>
<td>(To be provided by Admin DIOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET/EXPENDITURE CODE:</td>
<td>(To be provided by Admin DIOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Contract is entered into between the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and, the Consultant / Contractor ([Please insert])

The Agency desires to avail itself of the Consultant's services as described in, and in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in, this Contract, including the general terms and conditions in the annex, which form an integral part of this Contract. The Consultant, representing him/herself to be fully qualified and having the necessary expertise and resources to effectively and efficiently provide the same, undertakes to perform such services in accordance with the following terms and conditions.

ADDRESS AND CONTACT DETAILS OF CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR

Address: [Please insert]

Email: [Please insert]

NATURE OF SERVICES/ASSIGNMENT

Hiring Department/Office: [Please insert]

Location from which Consultant/Contractor will work: [Please insert]

Terms of Reference (Attach additional pages if necessary):

(Please enter a description of the terms of reference here)

(For consultants only there needs to be a description of the key deliverables)

The consultant will provide the following deliverables:

Deliverable 1: [Please insert]

Deliverable 2: [Please insert]

Details and conditions of any official travel required in connection with the assignment:

(Please specify expected travel with locations)

UNRWA rules and regulations regarding travel and subsistence apply.

Duration of assignment and working schedule:

From: [Please insert date] To: [Please insert date]

(for contractors) The contractor will observe the regular UNRWA working hours.
DETAILS OF FEE PAYMENT (Attach additional page if necessary):
Currency: USD  Total Fee: USD
Travel and subsistence costs are not included in above fee. Travel and subsistence will be provided in addition to the fee according to UNRWA rules and regulations.
(for consultants)
Payment Schedule - By deliverable that is identified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment condition</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Release of payment to be certified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable</td>
<td>(Add deliverable from the terms of reference)</td>
<td>(Specify amount and percentage of total fee)</td>
<td>(Typically, the Division Chief)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for contractors)
Payment Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment schedule</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Satisfactory performance during the month certified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of (Enter respective month and year)</td>
<td>(Estimated number of days) x daily rate of USD (xxxxx)</td>
<td>(Typically, the Division Chief)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUING OFFICER on behalf of UNRWA (Field Director/Headquarters Department Director):
Name (block letters)  Job Title
XXXXXX  Director/DIOS

Signature  Date

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR:
Name of Contractor / Consultant

Name (block letters)  Signature  Date
1. annex (1) - general terms and conditions of consultant/contractors contracts awarded by UNRWA

1. service related requirements

1.1 official holidays: No leave of any type is provided under this Contract. The Consultant/Contractor shall only enjoy official Agency holidays if they are working from an Agency office/facility, in which case they will be entitled to the official holidays recognized by the Agency for that location.

1.2 medical requirements: If the Consultant/Contractor’s assignment involves travel, prior to the commencement of Services he/she shall submit a statement/certificate of good health from a registered medical practitioner stating fitness for duty in, and travel to, all areas in which the Services may require the Consultant/Contractor to attend. The Consultant/Contractor is fully responsible for the accuracy of such statement(s)/certificate(s), including confirmation that the Consultant/Contractor is aware of inoculation requirements for locations to which the Consultant/Contractor may be required to travel.

1.3 private insurance: The Consultant/Contractor acknowledges that no life, health, disability or other insurance is provided by the Agency in connection with this Contract. Prior to the commencement of Services, the Consultant/Contractor shall confirm and acknowledge in writing, and provide proof of the existence of, self-procured adequate private insurance against medical, disability and accident for the duration of this Contract.

1.4 travel: If it is not indicated in the first page of this Contract that travel and subsistence costs are included in the fee and travel, including assignment travel, is necessary in connection with the Services, such travel shall be authorized on the basis of Agency standards and the Consultant/Contractor will receive an amount equivalent to the travel subsistence allowance that would be paid to staff members undertaking similar travel for official purposes.

1.5 security: The Consultant/Contractor shall comply with appropriate security guidelines and instructions established by the UN Area Security Management Team.

1.6 UNRWA vehicle: If the Consultant/Contractor is permitted to use any Agency vehicle, he/she shall comply with all applicable Agency rules, instructions and procedures relating to the use thereof.

1.7 no assignment: The Consultant/Contractor may not assign, transfer, pledge or make other disposition of this Contract or any part thereof, or any of the Consultant/Contractor’s rights, claims or obligations under this Contract.

1.8 provision of information: The Consultant/Contractor undertakes to provide the Agency with any information it may request for the proper management of this Contract.

2. termination

2.1 notice period: This Contract may be terminated by either party at any time by giving the other party written notice of seven calendar days for contracts of less than six months, and fourteen calendar days for contracts of more than six months. However, in the event of termination initiated by the Agency due to a failure by the Consultant/Contractor to conform to the obligations set out herein, the Contract can be terminated immediately upon notice from the Agency.

2.2 payment upon termination: In the event of any termination by the Agency under this Paragraph, the Consultant/Contractor shall take immediate steps to terminate the Services in a prompt and orderly manner and to minimize losses and further expenditures to the Agency. No payment shall be due from the Agency to the Consultant/Contractor except for Services satisfactorily performed in conformity with the terms of this Contract. Any payment due to the Consultant/Contractor shall be calculated on a pro rata basis for the actual amount of work performed to the satisfaction of the Agency.

2.3 requests for repayment: If payments already made to the Consultant/Contractor by the Agency
prior to termination exceed the sum finally due, the additional amount shall be repaid in full by the Consultant/Contractor upon termination of the contract.

3. consideration

3.1 currency of payment: Payments shall be made in accordance with the terms of the payment instructions in this Contract, which shall also specify the currency of payment. No adjustments will be made by UNRWA for changes in rates of exchange to any other currency.

3.2 entitlements: Except as set forth in sub-Section 1.4 and 3.1, the Consultant/Contractor will not be eligible to any right, benefit, payment, subsidy, compensation or entitlement and no other amount shall be payable by the Agency to the Consultant/Contractor, including with respect to sickness, injury or death associated with the performance of the Services or otherwise arising in connection with this Contract.

3.3 taxes: The Agency shall not be liable for taxes, duties or other similar charges payable by the Consultant/Contractor in respect of any amounts paid to the Consultant/Contractor under this Contract which shall be the Consultant/Contractor’s responsibility, and the Consultant/Contractor acknowledges that the Agency will not issue any statement of earnings to the Consultant/Contractor in respect of any such payments.

4. status of the consultant/contractor

4.1 independent contractor: The Consultant/Contractor shall be considered as having the legal status of an independent contractor, and shall not be considered in any respect as being a staff member, employee or agent of the Agency. The Consultant/Contractor is neither a “staff member” under the Staff Regulations of the Agency nor an “official” for the purposes of the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

4.2 personal capacity: The Consultant/Contractor shall serve in his/her personal capacity and not as a representative of a government or of any other authority external to the Agency.

5. additional obligations of the consultant/contractor

5.1 rights and obligations: The Consultant/Contractor acknowledges and agrees that his/her rights and obligations are strictly limited to the terms and conditions of this Contract.

5.2 compliance: The Consultant/Contractor shall at all times comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations relating to the performance of his/her obligations under the terms of this Contract.

5.3 representations: The Consultant/Contractor represents and warrants that all statements contained in the Consultant/Contractor’s application and as otherwise provided in connection with this Contract are true and correct in all material respects and do not fail to include any matter necessary to make the statements contained therein not misleading, and any falsification, misrepresentation or omission of facts shall be cause for immediate termination of this Contract, regardless of when or how discovered.

5.4 transactions: The Consultant/Contractor represents and warrants that neither the Consultant/Contractor nor any of his/her associates has been or is engaged in, and covenants that he/she shall not engage in, any transactions, or the provision of resources or support to individuals and organizations associated with, receiving any type of training for or engaged in any act or offense, described in Article 2, Sections 1, 3, 4 or 5 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted by General Assembly of the United Nations in Resolution 54/109 of 9 December 1999.

5.5 infringement: The Consultant/Contractor covenants that, in the delivery of the Services, the Consultant/Contractor shall not infringe or cause the Agency to infringe any patent, copyright, trade name, trademark or other proprietary or industrial right of any third party, and the
Consultant/Contractor shall, at his/her sole expense, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Agency, its officials, agents, servants and employees, from and against all suits, claims, demands and liability of any kind, including costs and expenses, arising out of any infringement thereof.

5.6 standards of conduct: The Consultant/Contractor shall conduct him/herself with due diligence and efficiency, in conformity with the highest ethical principles and standards of conduct and in a manner that at all times protects the interests of UNRWA. The Consultant/Contractor shall respect the impartiality and independence of the Agency as an organ of the United Nations and shall neither seek nor accept instructions regarding the Services from any Government or other authority external to the Agency. During the period of performance of the Services, the Consultant/Contractor shall not engage in any conduct that would adversely reflect on the Agency and shall not engage in any activity that is incompatible with the aims and objectives of the Agency. The Consultant/Contractor has read the applicable UNRWA Staff Rules and Regulations related to expected standards of conduct and, notwithstanding Section 4 above, shall conform his/her conduct in accordance therewith. Without limiting the foregoing, the Consultant/Contractor shall not engage in any behaviour that constitutes prohibited conduct in accordance with the Agency’s policies on prevention of discrimination, harassment – including sexual harassment – and abuse of authority and on sexual exploitation and abuse. The Agency’s policies on retaliation for reporting misconduct apply to the Consultant/Contractor.

5.7 confidentiality: All maps, drawings, photographs, plans, reports, recommendations, estimates, documents and all other data compiled by or received by the Consultant/Contractor under this Contract shall be the property of the Agency, shall be treated as confidential and on completion of work under this Contract shall be delivered by the Consultant/Contractor to authorized officials designated by the Agency. The Consultant/Contractor shall not communicate at any time to any other person, Government or authority external to the Agency, any information known to the Consultant/Contractor by reason of his/her association with the Agency which has not been made public except with the authorization of the Agency; nor shall the Consultant/Contractor at any time use such information to private advantage. The obligations of this Paragraph shall survive the expiration or termination of this Contract.

5.8 association: The Consultant/Contractor shall not advertise or publicize his/her association with the Agency under this Contract, nor shall the name, emblem, or official seal of the Agency be used for business or professional purposes or otherwise without the prior written approval of the Agency. This provision shall survive the expiration or termination of this Contract.

5.9 liability: The Consultant/Contractor shall be solely liable for, and shall indemnify and hold harmless the Agency with respect to, claims by third parties arising in connection with the performance of the Consultant/Contractor’s obligations under this Contract, including but not limited to the negligent acts or omissions of the Consultant/Contractor, and for any financial loss suffered by the Agency as a result of the Consultant/Contractor’s negligence or violation of any of the terms or conditions of this Contract, the amount of which may be deducted from any sums payable to the Consultant/Contractor under this Contract.

6. title rights

All right, title and interest, including copyrights, in all works and other materials, whether in written or electronic form and including all derivative works thereof, produced in the performance of this Contract shall be vested exclusively in, and the Consultant/Contractor shall without further consideration assign, whether as works for hire or otherwise, the same to, the Agency.

7. force majeure; other changes in conditions

7.1 definition: Force majeure, as used in this paragraph, means acts of God, war (whether declared or not), invasion, revolution, insurrection, or other acts of a similar nature or force which are beyond the control of the Parties; provided, however, that the parties recognize that the Services may be
provided under difficult conditions which shall not, alone, constitute force majeure under this Contract.

7.2 procedure: In the event of and as soon as possible after the occurrence of any cause constituting force majeure, the Consultant/Contractor shall give notice and full particulars in writing to the Agency, of such occurrence or change if the Consultant/Contractor is thereby rendered unable, wholly or in part, to perform his/her obligations and meet his/her responsibilities under this Contract. The Consultant/Contractor shall also notify the Agency of any other changes in conditions or the occurrence of any event which interferes or threatens to interfere with his/her performance of this Contract. The notice shall include steps proposed by the Consultant/Contractor to be taken including any reasonable alternative means for performance that is not prevented by force majeure. On receipt of the notice required under this Article, the Agency shall take such action as, in its sole discretion, it considers to be appropriate or necessary in the circumstances, including the granting to the Consultant/Contractor of a reasonable extension of time in which to perform his/her obligations under this Contract.

7.3 termination due to force majeure: If the Consultant/Contractor is rendered permanently unable, wholly, or in part, by reason of force majeure to perform his/her obligations and meet his/her responsibilities under this Contract, the Agency shall have the right to suspend or terminate this Contract on the provision of written notice of seven calendar days.

8. dispute settlement

8.1 amicable settlement: The parties shall use their best efforts to settle amicably any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of, or relating to this Contract or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof. Where the parties wish to seek such an amicable settlement through conciliation, the conciliation shall be conducted in accordance with the Optional Conciliation Rules of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, as in effect on the date of this Contract. The number of conciliators will be one.

8.2 arbitration: In the event of any dispute, controversy or claim between the parties arising out of this Contract or the breach, termination or validity thereof not settled amicably, the affected party may refer the matter to arbitration before the Permanent Court of Arbitration in accordance with its Optional Rules for Arbitration between International Organizations and Private Parties in force on the date of this Contract. The appointing authority shall be the Secretary General of the Permanent Court of Arbitration following a written request submitted by either party. The arbitration proceedings shall be held in Amman, Jordan and shall be conducted in the English language, applying general principles of international commercial law. The Arbitrator’s decision shall be binding on the parties, provided the Arbitrator shall have no authority to award interest or punitive damages, and there shall be no appeal. These provisions for arbitration shall be in lieu of any other procedure for the settlement of disputes among or between the parties.

9. privileges and immunities

Nothing in or relating to this Contract shall be deemed a waiver, express or implied, of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs.

10. authority to modify

This Contract may be amended only by written instrument executed by the authorized representatives of the parties. No waiver, or waiver of any breach of, any provision of this Contract shall be deemed to be a waiver of any other provision or of any future breach of that provision. This Contract, as the same may be amended, represents the entire agreement and understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof.
2. annex (2) - Cod./A/59/Rev.25/Amend.92, 1 June 2006, STAFF RULE 107.14

terminal expenses

1. For all official travel, except for travel by road within the Agency’s area of operation, a staff member may claim reimbursement of terminal expenses for each required trip between the airport or other point of arrival or departure and the hotel or other place of dwelling, as follows:

(A) For each journey by means of public conveyance, the reimbursement shall be $38 in respect of the staff member and $13 for each family member authorized to travel at the Agency expense.

(B) For each journey by Agency transport, the reimbursement shall be $11 in respect of the staff member and $6 for each family member authorized to travel at the Agency expense.

2. In the case of official travel by road within the Agency’s area of operations, a staff member may claim reimbursement of terminal expenses for each required trip between the terminal or other point of arrival or departure and the hotel or place of dwelling as follows:

(A) For each journey by means of public conveyance, the reimbursement shall be $15 in respect of the staff member and $5 for each family member authorized to travel at the Agency expense.

(B) For each journey by Agency transport, the reimbursement shall be $7.50 in respect of the staff member and $2.50 for each family member authorized to travel at the Agency expense.

No terminal expenses shall be reimbursable in respect of official travel undertaken by private vehicle or Agency user/driver vehicle.

3. No expense shall be reimbursable in respect of an intermediate stop:

(A) Which is not authorized; or

(B) Which does not involve leaving the terminal; or

(C) Which is exclusively for the purpose of an onward connection.

4. Terminal expenses shall include all expenditure for means of public conveyance between the airport or other point of arrival or departure and the hotel or other place of dwelling, including transfer of accompanied baggage or other related incidental charges except the cost sending to a residence any authorized heavy baggage by railway express or any other similar agencies.
Annex 3

IMPORTANT NOTES

1. The TSA rates for duty travel extending beyond 60 days and up to 120 days shall be 75% and after 120 days shall be 60% of the standard rates for the first 60 days.

2. If a staff member stays in a hotel where the amount paid for bed and breakfast exceeds the cost of accommodation in the standard TSA rate, the difference may be paid as a supplement to the TSA, subject to a maximum of 30% of the standard TSA rate. The staff member must attach the hotel bill to the claim for reimbursement of travel expenses.

3. The special rate for specified hotels should be paid only upon presentation of hotel receipts for the actual number of days the staff member remains in one of the specified hotels, otherwise the elsewhere rate should apply.

4. Staff members will normally be expected to draw their TSA entitlements from the Finance Officer in the local currency of the Field Office to or in which they are travelling. Alternatively, staff members may pick up a US dollar advance up to 100 percent of their TSA entitlements at the point of departure if available.

5. Staff members who are provided free lodging and/or meals shall receive 50% of TSA if only lodging is provided, 70% if only meals are provided and 20% if both lodging and meals are provided.

6. For International staff, where travel does not involve an overnight stay away from residence but it involves a journey of 10 hours or more a meal allowance, amounting to 40 percent of the appropriate TSA rate, shall be paid.

7. For area staff, where travel does not involve an overnight stay away from residence but it involves a journey of 8 hours or more a meal allowance will be paid in accordance with Staff Circular No. AG/06/2004 dated 21 October 2004.

8. Staff members are requested to submit their travel claims on form 36A within 30 days after completion of the travel, failing which any outstanding TSA advances will be recovered in full from the next available payroll.

Bernhard Laufenberg
Director of Finance
UNRWA HQ (Amman)
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Evaluation Sub-questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool(s)</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g. Relevance</td>
<td>To what extent was the programme in line with the needs of beneficiaries?</td>
<td>….</td>
<td>Perception survey - Questions 1 and 4</td>
<td>If question 1 is answered xxx and question 4 xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review of strategic documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


evaluation inception report

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

1. understanding and reflections on project/programme

- In this section the Evaluator(s) should briefly describe the intervention that is evaluated, including its rationale, history and intervention logic/theory of change.

2. clarification of scope, objectives and key questions in ToRs

- In this section the Evaluator(s) should elaborate on the scope, objectives and questions of the evaluation, suggesting changes or amendments to the ToRs and providing a sound justification for such changes

- Examples of amendments in this respect may include: revisions of evaluation questions; modification to the scope of the evaluation (e.g. years or locations covered by the evaluation etc.)

3. clarification of methodology in ToRs

- As above, the Evaluator(s) should elaborate on the methodology of the evaluation, suggesting changes or amendments to the ToRs and providing a sound justification for such changes

- The Evaluator(s) should provide further details about the data collection methods outlined in the ToRs, for instance, specifying the number of planned key informant interviews, the tentative list of planned key informant interviews etc.

- Examples of amendments in this respect may include: collection of primary data through population survey as opposed to reliance on secondary data (as per ToRs) due to access issues

4. detailed Work plan

- This section should be filled in only for larger evaluations [where an evaluation team is in place and fieldwork lasts 4 weeks or more]

- In such cases, the work plan should outline timing for key activities and estimated person-days

5. arrangements for the management of the evaluation

- This section should be filled in only for larger evaluations [where an evaluation team is in place and where fieldwork lasts 4 weeks or more]

- In such cases, roles and responsibilities of each team member should be outlined, as well as internal quality assurance arrangements (e.g. backstopping arrangements in case of non-performance – this can include request for permission from the Evaluation Manager to sub-contract this element of work and re-allocate the evaluation duties and payments for additional work required)
evaluation report

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

1. executive summary
   - Should provide a succinct yet thorough summary of the evaluation and include all conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
   - Should not exceed 3 pages
   - Keep in mind it is the section that will be translated into Arabic for dissemination and should be geared to a non-specialist reader

2. background of the intervention
   - Should provide a clear description of the project/programme/topic evaluated, including the underlying theory of change or logical framework

3. evaluation purpose, objectives and scope
   - Please see ToRs template

4. evaluation methodology and limitations
   - Please see ToRs template

5. evaluation findings and recommendations
   a. Finding 1
      - Presentation of findings can be arranged in different ways including: the DAC criteria; the key questions underlying the evaluation; other logical categorizations that allow for ‘telling a story’ etc.
      - All findings should be clearly informed/backed up by the evidence collected (it should be clear how they originated – i.e. which data sources) and triangulated
      - All findings should be numbered
      - Keep in mind that all data and evidence should be available to the Evaluation Division in DIOS
      - Recommendations should flow logically from each findings section They should be actionable, directed to specific stakeholders and should be previously discussed with them
      - All recommendations should be numbered

6. conclusions (optional)

7. lessons learned
   - This section should provide generalizations from the conclusions that are applicable for wider use

8. annexes
   - All relevant information should be annexed, as appropriate, including: original terms of reference;
inception report; full description of methodology (in addition to summaries in the main report); data instruments (e.g. survey questionnaires; interview guides etc.)
comments matrix on draft evaluation report

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

General comments:

Specific comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>comments received from</th>
<th>comments related to paragraphs no.</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>response (from evaluator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[INSERT RELEVANT DEPARTMENT/STAKEHOLDER]</td>
<td>[INSERT PARAGRAPH NUMBER AS PER EVALUATION REPORT]</td>
<td>[INSERT CONTENT]</td>
<td>[INSERT: Accepted/Not Accepted. If Not Accepted please explain why]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
management response

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

general response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date of management Response:</th>
<th>[INSERT]</th>
<th>reference number:</th>
<th>[INSERT]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Office and person coordinating the management response / recommendation follow up: [INSERT]

How has this evaluation influenced the [INSERT NAME] Programme: [ELABORATE]

response to specific recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recommendation</th>
<th>management response (agree, partially agree, disagree):</th>
<th>action planned / taken / reason for partially agreeing or disagreeing</th>
<th>planned date for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommendation 1: [INSERT]</td>
<td>[INSERT]</td>
<td>[INSERT/ELABORATE] N.B. The management response should be actionable, time-bound and comprise performance targets that the considered department/field office should work towards and measure progress against.</td>
<td>[INSERT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Client Satisfaction Questionnaire

[INSERT NAME OF THE EVALUATION]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate each of the following by checking the appropriate box</th>
<th>very poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>satisfactory</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The extent to which the evaluation met your needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluator’s understanding of your operations and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professionalism of evaluator(s) (demeanour, communication and responsiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The quality of the report in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Accuracy and validity of findings and conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Balance and objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e. The extent to which the recommendations were appropriate and helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f. The extent to which evaluator(s) considered your comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your overall satisfaction with the conduct of the evaluation and its results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any further comments you may have on how the evaluation process was conducted. This is a valuable opportunity to let us know what is being done well and what can be improved:
6.2 QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLISTS

The following set of quality assurance checklists should serve as a prompt for Evaluation Managers at UNRWA during key stages of the evaluation cycle.

The Evaluator(s) should receive copies of UNRWA’s evaluation quality assurance checklists for inception reports and evaluation reports as part of the documentation package in the inception phase.
quality assurance checklist for evaluation ToRs

The following quality checklist will be applied by Evaluation Managers to all evaluation ToRs. Where there is a Steering Committee, the Evaluation Manager quality-assures the ToRs prior to sharing the document with the Steering Committee. The Committee then agrees on the acceptability of the ToRs and approves them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quality criterion</th>
<th>Yes / No?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. background, context and programme/project objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes the key features of UNRWA’s mandate, functions and the relevant economic, social and political context in which the intervention operates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes the intervention including its rationale, objectives, history, geographical coverage and target beneficiary groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. evaluation purpose, objectives and criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• States why the evaluation is being conducted and why now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the terms of reference include a clear statement of the purpose of the evaluation and how it is intended to be used (for example the kind of learning or, programme improvement, or for scaling up, or accountability purposes) and who are the main audiences including the primary decision makers and other stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the evaluation objectives clearly stated and are they logically consistent with the purpose and intended use of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are they realistic and feasible given the time frame and resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have evaluation criteria been specified (such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, coherence, co-ordination, protection, responsiveness)? Is the choice of criteria the most appropriate to the evaluation objectives and to the characteristics of the intervention (phase of implementation, type of assessment/learning expected, type of intervention, context of operation)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are those aspects that should be prioritized in the evaluation stated clearly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. evaluation scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the scope of the evaluation clearly outlined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it in line with the evaluation objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it include all the relevant aspects the evaluation has to cover such as: intervention timeframe, geographical location(s), target groups, organizational and implementation arrangements etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the questions representative of the diverse stakeholder interests (including management, donors and beneficiaries)? Is there evidence from the breadth and type of questions that a fully consultative process engaging relevant stakeholders has been undertaken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the questions clear, sufficiently concise and consistent with the objectives and criteria of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the questions focused in a way that will provide a real understanding of what works in the intervention, how, for whom, in what circumstances and how it can be made to work better in order to allow for maximum learning for stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the intervention logic or theory of change for the intervention been presented in the terms of reference and have the questions required to assess the expected results and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of this logic been included?
• Do the questions cover unanticipated consequences of the intervention?
• If applicable - have relevant questions on cross cutting issues in line with the UNRWA MTS been included, such as protection / human rights / gender challenges in service delivery; violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of at risk groups including gender related concerns?
• Is it feasible that sound evidence-base to answer the questions be acquired, given the time and resources available to the evaluation?

5. methodology
• Are the methods for data collection and analysis, including the overall methodological design, appropriate to answering the evaluation questions and in a fair, unbiased, credible way?
• Do the terms of reference invite evaluation bidders to elaborate or propose amendments to the methodology?
• Are the expected data sources established, and do they allow for multiple lines of enquiry? Do techniques include mixed methods capable of triangulation and preferably inclusive of qualitative and quantitative data, disaggregated where appropriate?
• Do samples or case studies cover an appropriate range of situations and experiences?
• Are the methods inclusive of the relevant cross cutting issues in line with the UNRWA MTS and inclusive of all key stakeholders, including hard to reach groups?
• Are limitations of the evaluation methods and implications for coverage and validity discussed – for example access to certain geographical locations? If security may be an issue, how will this be handled / mitigated?

6. timing and deliverables
• Is the workplan of the evaluation (from contract award to any post evaluation briefings) indicated? (showing phases and deliverables covering desk review period, startup briefing(s), inception and reporting, data collection / field work phase, meetings/workshops) together with an estimate of the number of person days required and with consideration given to stakeholder consultations/workshops at appropriate points for feedback on reports and verification / dissemination of findings and recommendations?
• Is the plan realistic and adequate to the task?

7. arrangements for managing the evaluation
• Has the terms of reference established the roles and responsibilities of: UNRWA management of the evaluation, including support and administrative services and duties of the steering committee and other relevant stakeholders? Has it considered the evaluation team responsibilities for internal quality assurance of evaluation process and products? This section should state a requirement for internal team co-ordination and backstopping arrangements, in the event of unsatisfactory performance of the team.
• Has adequate provision been made for stakeholder consultation particularly during the reporting phase?
• Have provisions been made for disseminating the report – e.g. presentations by the evaluation team?
• Do these arrangements support the credibility, inclusiveness, impartiality and transparency of the evaluation?

8. evaluation team composition and required competencies
• Are the evaluator competency/experience profiles stated with sufficient precision to allow for their systematic and faithful application in a fair and transparent bid evaluation/recruitment process?
• Do the terms of reference specify the appropriate mix of skills required of the contractor, including evaluation competencies and experience covering methodological expertise and relevant evaluation management experience; track record in quality report writing skills, relevant domain expertise? Does the terms of reference make clear that it aspires to commission a gender-balanced team and regional expertise where possible?
• If proficiency in Arabic is not specified as a requirement, have any relevant interpretation or translation requirements been included?

9. budget and payment terms

• Are the resources provided for the evaluation adequate in terms of funds, staff and skills, to ensure that the objectives of the evaluation can be fulfilled effectively?
• Is the budget ceiling stated in the terms of reference and, if so, is it clear that contract will be awarded on a best value for money basis?
• Are payments staged according to deliverables with significant weighting given to the delivery of an acceptable final report?

10. general issues

• Does it look like the evaluation will generate a sound evidence based understanding of the intervention including its variability and diversity? Is it likely to result in useful evaluation findings, evidence-based conclusions, lessons to be learned, and recommendations that can be implemented?
• Is the requirement of adherence to UNEG standards and codes of ethics and conduct specified?
• Is the terms of reference sufficiently comprehensive and concise (preferably no more than 5 pages excluding annexes)? Are annexes or links provided to relevant additional information on the intervention to ensure that proposers have a sound grasp of the intervention and its context?
### quality assurance checklist for inception report

The following quality checklist will be applied by Evaluation Managers to all evaluation inception reports. Where there is a Steering Committee, the Evaluation Manager quality-assures the inception report prior to sharing the document with the Steering Committee. The Committee then agrees on the acceptability of the inception report and approves it. This checklist is part of the documentation provided to the Evaluator(s) during the inception phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quality criterion</th>
<th>Yes / No?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. understanding and reflections on the programme and the project/programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based on their initial desk review of all relevant available information and discussions with UNRWA evaluation management, does the contractor present an up to date description of the intervention and identify issues and problematic of particular relevance to the evaluation? This should include a critical review of the existing data and evidence on the programme including the monitoring data and key gaps in knowledge about the intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it include the contractor’s understanding and clarification of the theory or change / intervention logic including critical assessment of the assumptions underlying it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall, does the contractor present a sufficient understanding of the key issues of the intervention relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. clarification of the scope, objectives and key questions in the ToRs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In describing the scope, objectives and key questions do the contractors discuss any evaluation challenges and risks associated with them and discuss how they will be addressed in the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do the contractors set out the evaluation questions and elaborate and, where appropriate, add to them? Do they provide sound reasons for adding or proposing to amend or delete questions? Do they indicate priority questions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. clarification of the methodology in ToRs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the methodology include proposals based on the intervention logic to show how the contribution of the intervention to the results and outcomes will be assessed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is a framework for addressing the criteria and questions included – for example a matrix setting out the questions related to each criterion, the data sources, means of verification, how and by whom the data will be collected? Is it robust, coherent and fit for purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the report include a stakeholder analysis indicating for each stakeholder or stakeholder group: their interest in the evaluation, how they may use the findings and how they will be involved in the evaluation process (such as data collection, soundings for key interests, consulted on evaluation findings, briefed with presentations on the final report). If not, does the report specify the criteria for identifying and selecting stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the expected data sources established, and do they allow for multiple lines of enquiry? Do techniques include mixed methods capable of triangulation and preferably inclusive of qualitative and quantitative data, disaggregated (including by gender) where appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the report discuss the data collection tools to be used (e.g. survey instruments,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 These criteria have been developed to meet the specific needs of UNRWA and are informed by international best practice in quality assurance of evaluation reports. They draw on multiple sources including guidance and standards prepared by UNEG, DFID, Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, DAC/OECD, USAID, together with a range of guidance used by other UN Agencies working in cognate areas.
**Interview guides, focus groups topic lists.** Are the choices of techniques for data collection and processing justified? Do samples or case studies cover an appropriate range of situations and experiences?
- Are limitations of the evaluation methods and implications for coverage and validity discussed – for example access to certain geographical locations? If evaluation team security may be an issue, how will this be handled / mitigated?
- Does the report describe the process for analysis of data?
- Are the methods inclusive of human rights and gender based considerations and all key stakeholders, including hard-to-reach groups?
- Are the methods for data collection and analysis, including the overall methodological design, appropriate to answering the evaluation questions and in a fair, unbiased, credible and rigorous way?

### 4. Detailed Workplan – Only for Larger Evaluations [Where an Evaluation Team is in Place and Fieldwork Lasts 4 Weeks or More]
- Is the workplan of the evaluation fully elaborated, showing the timing and sites for data collection/field work phases, meetings/workshops? Is there an estimate of the number of person days required and which team member is allocated to each task?
- Does it include stakeholder consultations / workshops at appropriate points in time for feedback on reports and verification/dissemination of findings and recommendations?
- As appropriate, have interpretation and or translation requirements been included (and costed) in the workplan?
- Is the workplan realistic and adequate to the task? Does it allow for addressing unanticipated issues?

### 5. Arrangements for the Management of the Evaluation – Only for Larger Evaluations [Where an Evaluation Team is in Place and Fieldwork Lasts 4 Weeks or More]
- Does the report describe the roles and responsibilities of each team member, including the specific duties of the team leader in managing the evaluation on the contractor’s side and the nature of the contractor’s internal quality assurance processes?
- Are internal team quality assurance processes clarified? E.g. lines of communication/responsibilities; arrangements for backstopping should a team member’s performance prove unsatisfactory etc.

### 7. General Issues
- Has/have the Evaluator(s) been given the quality checklists for inception report?
- Have the Evaluator(s) been provided with links to UNEG standards for evaluation, codes of conduct/ethics and UNEG guidance on incorporating Gender and Human Rights Based approaches in evaluation?
- Does/do the Evaluator(s) confirm work will be conducted in line with the principle of respect for persons, safeguarding confidentiality and anonymity, where possible, and with due attention paid to cultural, legal and ethical issues in line with UNEG codes of conduct and ethics?
- Is the body of the report no more than 5 pages?
quality assurance checklist for evaluation report

The following quality checklist will be applied by Evaluation Managers to all evaluation reports. The Evaluation Manager quality-assures the evaluation report prior to sharing it for comments. This checklist is part of the documentation provided to the Evaluator(s) during the inception phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quality criterion</th>
<th>Yes / No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. general contents check</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do the opening pages include the following information? - evaluation title; date of final report; commissioning UNRWA entity; authors; list of acronyms; and table of contents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the report, at a minimum, include the following sections? - executive summary; background of the intervention; evaluation purpose, objectives and scope; evaluation methods (including limitations); findings of the evaluation (either arranged by the DAC criteria, crosscutting issues and other findings or in other sections that cover these topics but are better suited to the specific intervention); conclusions; recommendations and lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do the annexes include the following? - original terms of reference; inception report; full description of methodology (in addition to summaries in the main report) including data instruments and sampling frames.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. executive summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it provide a good overview of the report and does it include the following? – background essentials; objectives and methodology; main findings; conclusions; recommendations and lessons learned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it accessible to a non-specialist readership and is it designed for widespread distribution in order to maximize learning from the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall is the summary clear? Does it provide a readable and faithful digest of the main report?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a clear and concise description of the evaluated intervention, including: its rationale (what needs it aims to meet in relation to the socio/political/economic context); its main expected accomplishments and implementation modalities used (main resources/inputs and operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the theory of change of the intervention (or logical framework) explained so that the reader can understand what the intervention aimed to accomplish and are assumptions underlying this logic also discussed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the evaluated intervention has undergone changes during the relevant period are these described together with their implications for the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. evaluation purpose, objectives and scope</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a clear statement of the purpose and scope (including time frame, problems being addressed, locations,) of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 These criteria have been developed to meet the specific needs of UNRWA and are informed by international best practice in quality assurance of evaluation reports. They draw on multiple sources including guidance and standards prepared by UNEG, DFID, Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, DAC/OECD, USAID, together with a range of guidance used by other UN Agencies working in cognate areas.
- Is pre-existing evidence relevant to the intervention discussed?
- Is there an explanation of why the evaluation has been done at this time, who the key stakeholders are and how the evaluation is intended to inform decision making?
- Does the report provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives including the evaluation criteria and main evaluation questions? Do the objectives logically flow from the purpose?
- Are cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender, human rights etc.) covered?

### 5. Methodology

- Does the report provide a full description of the methodology used?
- Does the report detail the data sources and the methods used in their collection, including the choice of tools, sampling frames and case studies?
- Are limitations clearly stated and is their impact on the evaluation explained? Have any limitation on their representativeness or possible bias been explained (e.g. sample selection and size, limitations on access to hard-to-reach or other groups) together with implications for the robustness of the findings? Are attempts to remedy these limitations stated?
- Does the methodology include adequate measures to show that tools were developed rigorously to ensure the validity and reliability of the data (including piloting or testing of questionnaires, interview schedules)? If not, are caveats clearly outlined?
- Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data to show difference between groups, particularly issues of diversity and also gender? Does it also enable the analysis of variability of interests and experience within groups?
- Does the report provide a description of and rationale for the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation?
- Does the methodology discuss which DAC evaluation criteria\(^\text{14}\) have been applied, why and how they have informed the methods used for answering the evaluation questions?
- From the descriptions of methods and approach is there evidence that the evaluation was governed by the principle of respect for persons, safeguarding confidentiality and anonymity where possible and with due attention paid to cultural, legal and ethical issues in line with UNEG codes of conduct and ethics?
- To the degree possible (subject to informant agreement and with consideration given to security or privacy concerns) does the report include a list of people interviewed?

### 6. Findings

- Are the findings and analyses clearly associated with the data on which they are based (evidence)? Is there a clear logical link between the evidence and the findings?
- Are the analyses and interpretations systematic, logical and coherent? Have the data been presented in a way that allow for the reader to judge the reasonableness of the interpretations made?
- Are the findings discussed in relation to the criteria set out in the terms of reference? Is there a systematic analysis of the questions in relation to the criteria? Are the criteria that were identified in the terms of reference discussed and if criteria were added or removed, is there a justification for these alterations?
- Are the data triangulated and is the analysis drawn from multiple data sources/lines of evidence and analytic processes? Are any assumptions in the analysis made clear and is the validity and reliability of the findings critically assessed?
- Have findings, as appropriate to cross-cutting issues, been included, such as protection/human rights challenges in service delivery; violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of at risk groups including gender related concerns? Is the analysis here based upon disaggregated data?

---

\(^{14}\) See: [http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm) These criteria were set out by the OECD Development Assistance Committee to help structure evaluations
- Where appropriate, is qualitative data analyzed in relation to quantitative data in ways that enrich its power to explain how, why and in what contexts the intervention affected informants? Are alternative or conflicting points of view presented?
- Are unanticipated consequences of the intervention discussed?
- Do the findings address all the questions in the evaluation and, if not, are explanations for this provided? Do they address all the priority issues/questions?
- Has the analysis included an assessment of the theory of change of the intervention and presented evidence to indicate the likely contribution of the intervention to the outcomes and impacts or the causal relationships leading to the intervention’s results?
- Does the report adequately engage with UNRWA’s complex conditions of operations – exploring contextual factors, changes on the ground, multiple contributory factors, emergent challenges/opportunities, ongoing constraints? Does it seek alternative explanations in the analysis? Or does it tend to oversimplify and offer generic, simplistic or under-nuanced findings?
- Has it presented negative findings reasonably so that individuals are not held fully accountable where system failures or diverse factors are involved?

### 7. recommendations and lessons learned

- Are the recommendations clear, distinct and do they follow logically from the findings and conclusions?
- Are they directed to one or more authority that can act on them?
- Are they practical, realistic and informed by a sound understanding of the complex conditions of UNRWA’s work? Do they consider resource implications and constraints to follow up?
- Have the recommendations been explicitly informed by consultation with the stakeholders, in particular those responsible for responding to or implementing them?
- Are recommendations action-oriented and aimed at improving effectiveness of the intervention?
- Is there a section on ‘lessons learned’ incorporating generalizations from the conclusions that are applicable for wider use?

### 8. general issues

- Has/have the evaluator(s) been given the quality checklists for evaluation reports?
- Is the report generally well structured, well written and accessible by all the different stakeholder audiences? Has it been properly proof-read (no typos, grammatical errors, well formatted etc.)?
- Are the findings, recommendations and lessons learned useful?
- Are gender and human rights issues adequately addressed in the report? Do the findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned provide sufficient information on the gender and human rights aspects of the intervention?
- As appropriate, does the evaluation report discuss any issues of conflict of interest, or differences of opinion with respect to members of the evaluation team, those managing the evaluation or the intervention? If so, are implications for the impartiality and independence of the evaluation made clear?
- Have the relevant stakeholders been fully consulted during the draft reporting phase and have their comments been reflected in the final report where these concern the accuracy, fairness or relevance of the report?
- Is the body of the report no more than 20 pages?