**Terms of Reference**

**Evaluation of the 1st (2010-2015) and the 2d (2016-2020) Country Programmes of**

**UNFPA CO Belarus**

**INTRODUCTION**

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) is the lead United Nations agency for delivering a world where every pregnancy is wanted, every childbirth is safe and every young person's potential is fulfilled. UNFPA expands the possibilities for women and young people to lead healthy and productive lives. The strategic goal of UNFPA is to achieve the three transformative results: ending unmet need for family planning, ending maternal death, and ending violence and harmful practices against women and girls. In pursuing its goal, UNFPA has been guided by the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action (1994)[[1]](#footnote-1), the Millennium Development Goals (2000)[[2]](#footnote-2) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015)[[3]](#footnote-3).

UNFPA has been operating in Belarus since 1994. The programmes of the United Nations Population Fund in Belarus covers the following thematic areas: Sexual and Reproductive health and rights, Population and Development and Gender Equality. The programme of the Fund builds on the national priorities and is implemented in close cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Belarus, UN agencies, non-governmental organizations and international and national experts.[[4]](#footnote-4) The first UNFPA Country Programme (CP) for Belarus was implemented in 2010-2015[[5]](#footnote-5) and focused on developing and improving subnational social and population policies and programmes, establishing prevention and protection systems to reduce gender-based violence, including domestic violence; and integration of the reproductive health needs of the population in national and sectoral policies and programmes. Since 2016, UNFPA have been delivering the second UNFPA country programme (2016-2020)[[6]](#footnote-6) for Belarus.

In 2019, UNFPA Belarus country office is engaging in preparation of its 3d country programme (2021-2025). To inform this process, a more comprehensive evaluation of the two previous country programmes, covering the period 2010-2018 is to be undertaken. The evaluation will be conducted by independent evaluation team in collaboration with the UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, UNFPA Evaluation office as well as with national partners.

The country programme evaluation is a part of the country office’s evaluation plan and is in accordance with the UNFPA evaluation policy (DP/FPA/2013/5). The UNFPA country programme evaluation (CPE) will provide an independent assessment of relevance and performance of UNFPA country programme in Belarus, as well as analysis of various facilitating and constraining factors influencing programme delivery. As per the evaluation policy, the CPE will serve three main purposes:

· demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources;

· support evidence-based decision-making;

· contribute important lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate the implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action.

The evaluation will focus on the achievement of planned results of the country programme at the output and outcome levels. The findings, analytical conclusions and recommendations of the CPE will be used as inputs for the development of the new third country programme (2021-2025) and inform the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAF) that will be drafted in 2019.

The main audience and primary users of the evaluation are the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus, Government agencies and national partners of UNFPA (including civil society organizations, private sector and academic institutions), the UN Country Team in Belarus and donors operating in Belarus. The UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia and UNFPA Headquarters divisions, branches and offices will also use the evaluation as an objective basis for programme performance review and decision-making.

The evaluation will be managed by the UNFPA country office evaluation manager with guidance and support from the UNFPA Regional Advisor on Monitoring and Evaluation, and in consultations with the Evaluation Reference Group and country office staff. A team of competitively selected independent evaluators will conduct the CPE and prepare the evaluation report.

**CONTEXT**

**Country Profile**

The Republic of Belarus is a landlocked country, located geographically and geopolitically strategically between Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine and the Russian Federation. Belarus has made significant progress in its sustainable development since its independence and was in 2016 ranked 52nd among 188 countries in the Human Development Report 2016[[7]](#footnote-7). The country has now joined the list of upper-middle income countries.

Belarus has a highly educated and skilled labour force. The percentage of the population living below the national poverty line is 4.8 percent in 2014[[8]](#footnote-8). Nevertheless, Belarus still has a number of population groups that remain vulnerable to poverty, including families with three or more children, single-parent households, elderly, migrants and refugees, and people with disabilities.

Belarus has a population of 9.5 million[[9]](#footnote-9) and is facing a natural population decline despite positive trends in fertility and longevity. The decrease is a result of demographic trends observed in the country’s development since World War II, and is also due to the population’s reaction to the economic crisis and deterioration of living conditions in the 1990s. In 2014, the total fertility rate was 1.7 children per woman[[10]](#footnote-10).

In despite of a decline of maternal mortality ratio, there has been a deterioration in women’s health and maternal health. In 2016, 153308 cases of complications during perinatal period (including birth) were registered on 116935 live birth annually.The Ministry of Health is developing a national strategy on reproductive health, and is willing to revise facility-based protocols in the area of reproductive health to ensure their alignment with international standards and World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations.

Improved access to and quality of family planning services contributed to a reduction in the abortion rate, from 46 abortions per 1,000 women aged 15 to 49 years in 2000 to 12,2 per 1,000 women in 2016. However, there is no regular account of the contraceptive prevalence rate by women.

Youth aged 15-24 years were constituting 10 percent of the population in 2017. They remain the most vulnerable group in the area of sexual and reproductive health. In 2016, 20% of medical abortions in the country took place among young females under 15- 24 years. The HIV epidemic in Belarus has a low prevalence among the general population (0.2 per cent in 2017) and higher rates among key affected populations. Sexual contact remains the main way by which people contract the illness, at 62 per cent in 2017. The state’s response to HIV is regulated by the state programme on HIV prevention. Enhanced education for young people about safe sexual behaviour is important in preventing unintended pregnancies, especially among adolescents, and the sexual transmission of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

In 2017, life expectancy at birth was 69.3 years for men and 79.2 years for women.[[11]](#footnote-11) The difference in life expectancy between men and women in rural areas is higher. It is calculated that 23.31 percent of the population will be above working age in 2018. Belarus needs to develop a coherent policy framework for the elderly in line with the Madrid International Plan of Action[[12]](#footnote-12) to strengthen national capacity in that area. The Government recognizes the importance and urgency of the demographic problem, and has proposed a legislative framework that aims to address the problem. The law on demographic security was adopted in 2002 and is being implemented through the national programmes for demographic security.

In 2000, WHO ranked the Belarusian health-care system 53 out of 190 countries, considering its overall health system one of the best in that region. However, Belarus should consider undertaking health-care reform to ensure the effectiveness of and to strengthen disease prevention and primary health care. It should also enlarge the share of doctors working as general practitioners and providing primary care.

Non-communicable diseases represent a significant challenge for the quality of life of Belarusians. According to official statistics data, the mortality rate was 1256,1 per 100,000 in 2017, with 907,7 deaths (75 percent) caused by non-communicable diseases. Of this, the proportional mortality (percentage of total deaths) for cancer amounted to 16 per cent. In the past decade (2005-2015), the number of breast cancer cases increased by 35 per cent. The cervical cancer mortality rate in Belarus was currently 6.8 per 100,000 per year. The main cause of high mortality due to breast and cervical cancers is the lack of comprehensive screening programmes for early detection. Pilot projects of screening programmes are currently being undertaken only in Minsk.

Belarus has made progress in complying with international human rights treaty obligations, including the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. UNDP Global Human Development Report 2014[[13]](#footnote-13) ranks Belarus at 32 in the world based on gender-related development index (GDI) and at 28 based on the gender equality index. However, gender inequalities persist. Women experience an up to 25 per cent wage gap compared to men; women are underrepresented in decision-making and men’s engagement in parenthood and domestic duties is limited. Existing gender stereotypes significantly contribute to gender-based discrimination, including domestic violence. Despite progress, domestic violence is still widespread and underreported, with almost every third surveyed woman and every fourth surveyed man experiencing physical violence. Women, the elderly and migrants are especially vulnerable to domestic violence. The effective intersectoral response mechanism to prevent and counteract domestic violence throughout the country is not yet in place. The capacity of key service providers to respond to gender-based violence must be strengthened; a separate law on domestic violence does not exist. National efforts to address gender inequality and gender-based violence need further support.

**UNFPA Country Programme Background and Design**

The legal basis for the relationship between the Government of Belarus and United Nations was signed in May 1992. UNFPA assistance to Belarus began in 1994.

*First Country Programme (2011-2015)*

The fund implemented its first country programme for Belarus (2011-2015), which covered three focus areas: sexual and reproductive health and rights, population and development, and gender equality. The approved budget was a total of US$3.7 million composed of US$2.3 million regular resources and US$1.4 million other resources. Regular sources and other sources combined for each component make up following in the programme: $0.9 million for sexual and reproductive health and rights component, $1 million for gender equality component and $1.5 million for population and development. The first programme was approved by UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS Executive Board at its second regular session in 2010.

The Government and UNFPA implements the programme in the three UNFPA focus areas: (a) reproductive health and rights; (b) population and development; and (c) gender equality and women’s empowerment.

The country programme contributed to three of the five UNDAF[[14]](#footnote-14) (2011-2015) outcomes: (a) sustainability of social and economic development; (b) protection from risks detrimental to health; and (c) effectiveness of the governance system. The outcomes and outputs of the UNFPA country programme are linked to the UNDAF.

Second Country Programme (2016-2020)

Second programme was approved by UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS Executive Board at its second regular session in September 2015. Country programme was approved by the council of ministers of the Republic of Belarus in 23 of March 2016. The programme covers the period from 2016-2020. The UNFPA financial commitment over the 5 years towards the programme is approved at $3.7 million: $1.5 million from regular resources and $ 2.2 million through co-financing modalities and/or other resources, including regular resources. Regular sources and other sources combined for each component make up following in the programme: $0.9 million for sexual and reproductive health and rights component, $1.1 million for gender equality component and $1.5 milion for population and development.

The second country programme aimed at: 1) Strengthened policy and national capacity to deliver integrated sexual reproductive health information and services with focus on vulnerable groups, 2) Strengthened national legislation, policies, and intersectoral mechanisms to enhance comprehensive and coordinated response to gender based violence, with emphasis on domestic violence, 3) Strengthened national capacity to ensure compliance of national policies with international commitments advancing gender equality, and 4) Strengthened national institutional capacity for the formulation and implementation of rights-based policies that integrate evidence on population dynamics and their links to sustainable development.

The second country programme is contributing to two out of four UNDAF strategic areas 1) inclusive responsive and accountable governance and 2) Sustainable development of human capital: health, education, social inclusion and protection, comprehensive post-chernobyl development. Within these two strategic areas, UNFPA is contributing to six different outcomes a) effective partnerships between civil society and private sector b) responsiveness of state institutions c) strengthened health system

d) access to prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care of communicable diseases e) access to healthcare and f) system for ensuring life safety of children and adults. (see more in depth information under each and one of the outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4)[[15]](#footnote-15)

The first country programme development was guided by the UNFPA Strategic Plan

2008-2013[[16]](#footnote-16), while the second was guided by the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2014-2017 SP 2018-2021[[17]](#footnote-17). The plans defined three broad programmatic areas: reproductive health and rights, population and development, and gender equality, to all of which the programme contributed.

**UNFPA Country Programme Management**

The country programme, managed by the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus, is led by an UNFPA Director and Assistant representative, with guidance and advisory support from the UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The country office’s programme staff comprises programme officers for sexual and reproductive health and youth, gender equality, a partnership specialist, a programme assistant and lastly a communications officer. The operations staff consists of an administration and finance associate and technical assistant. Furthermore various projects staff is contributing to the programmatic and operational matters. The programme is coordinated with the work of other UN agencies through the UN Country Team (UNCT) meetings and various UN working groups.

Both the country programmes has been/is implemented through both a direct execution (DEX) modality and through a national implementation (NEX) modality. The DEX modality refers to when the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus is operationally implementing the programme activities in consultations with the national counterparts, while NEX modality is used when UNFPA provides funds to a government, NGO, or academic institution to implement one or more of the outputs in the programme. The programmes has mostly focused on collaboration with the governmental and non-governmental partners at the central level.

 **OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

Objectives of evaluation:

The country programme evaluation will contribute to the accountability of UNFPA for results, analyze the relevance and performance of the UNFPA Country Programmes for Belarus 2011-2015 as well as the years 2016-2018 of the second programme cycle (2016-2020). The evaluation will also improve strategic positioning of the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus during its implementation, facilitate organizational learning and support evidence-based programming.

The CPE will assess the programme’s contribution to achieving the development results at the country level, including constraining and facilitating factors of programme design and performance. The evaluation will apply appropriate methodology for assessing the equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights in the programmes It will be based on the guiding principles, norms and standards for evaluations adopted at UNFPA, and will use specific evaluation criteria and evaluation questions.

The **overall objectives** of the evaluation are:

· Enhanced accountability of UNFPA to its donors, partners and other stakeholders for the relevance and performance of the country programme;

· Broadened evidence base, including lessons learned and practical recommendations, for input tot the third programme cycle (2021-2025), and will inform the UNDAF that will be drafted in 2019.

The CPE results will also inform and improve the ongoing programme, and will help UNFPA to become a better fit-for-purpose organization. Towards the achievement of the overall objectives, the evaluation will have the following **specific objectives**:

· To provide the UNFPA national stakeholders, UNFPA Country Office in Belarus, UNFPA EECARO, UNFPA Headquarters, as well as wider audience, with an independent assessment of the relevance and progress of country programmes towards the expected outputs and countcomes set forth in the results and resources frameworks of country programmes; · To provide an assessment of the UNFPA country office’s positioning within the development community and national partners, with regard to its ability respond to national needs while adding value to the country’s development;

· To draw key lessons from past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear, specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next programming cycle.

Scope of evaluation:

The evaluation will cover all activities planned and/or implemented during the period 2010-2018 within each programme area: reproductive health and rights, youth, population and development,gender equality, and cross cutting areas: partnership, resource mobilization, and communication. The scope of evaluation is extended beyond the current programme period is to assess achievement/non-achivements of higher level development results (outcomes and possible impacts). Besides the assessment of the intended effects of the programme, the evaluation also aims at identifying potential unintended effects. The CPE should analyze the achievements of UNFPA against expected results at the output and outcome levels, its compliance with the UNFPA Strategic Plans for 2008-2013, 2014-2017 and 2018-2021, the national development priorities and needs. The evaluation will reconstruct the programme intervention logic and assess the extent to which the ongoing country programme has chosen the best possible modalities for achieving the planned results in the current development context. The evaluation will examine the programme for such critical features as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coordination, and added value, and will cover both the development and humanitarian interventions.

Based on the conclusions and recommendations of the CPE evaluation, the UNFPA country office will prepare a formal management response to ensure that all CPE recommendations are considered and/or acted upon.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

In accordance with the methodology for CPEs as set out in the UNFPA Handbook “How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation” (2013)[[18]](#footnote-18), the evaluation will be based on finding answers to a number of questions covering the following evaluation criteria:

**Relevance**

EQ1. To what extent are the objectives of the programme adapted to the needs of women, adolescents and youth, people at risk of HIV infection, and older persons

EQ2. To what extent are the objectives of the programme , aligned with the the national priorities and policies and UNDAF,

EQ3. To what extent are the objectives of the programmealigned with the UNFPA strategic plans (2012-17 & 2018-21) in particular goals, principles, programme mode of engagement,

**Effectiveness**

EQ4 To what extent have the intended programme outputs[[19]](#footnote-19) been achieved?

. To what extent did the outputs contribute to the achievement of the planned outcomes i. increased utilization of integrated SRH Services by those furthest behind, ii. increased the access of young people to quality SRH services and sexuality education, iii. mainstreaming of provisions to advance gender equality, and iv. developing of evidence-based national population policies?

EQ5. To what extent has UNFPA policy advocacy and capacity building support helped to ensure that sexual and reproductive health (including Family Planning), and the associated concerns for the needs of young people, gender equality, and relevant population dynamics are appropriately integrated into national development instruments and sector policy frameworks in the programme country?

EQ6. To what extent has UNFPA contributed to an improved emergency preparedness in the area of maternal health/sexual and reproductive health, prevention of gender based violence including MISP?

**Efficiency**

EQ7. To what extent the country office made good use of its human, financial and technical resources and has used an appropriate combination of tools and approaches to pursue the achievements of programme outputs?

**Sustainability**

EQ8. Are programme and cross-cutting results sustainable in short and long-term perspectives?

· **UNCT Coordination**

EQ9. To what extent did UNFPA contribute to coordination mechanisms in the UN system (UNCT) in Belarus?

· EQ 10, To what extent did UNFPA contribute to ensuring programme complementarity, seeking synergies and avoiding overlaps and duplication of activities among development partners working in Belarus?

**Added value**

·

EQ11. What is the main UNFPA comparative strengths and added value in the Belarusian context as perceived by UNCT and key national stakeholders?

The evaluation team will develop specific questions, define methodology and tools which , will be agreed upon at the evaluation design phase following consultations with the Evaluation Reference Group, and presented in the evaluation design report.

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH**

**Data Collection**

The evaluation will use a multiple-method approach to data collection , including documentary review, group and individual interviews, focus groups and field visits to programme sites as appropriate. The collection of evaluation data will be carried out through a variety of techniques ranging from direct observation to informal and semi-structured interviews and focus/reference groups discussions. The evaluators will be required to take into account ethical considerations when collecting information.

**Validation Mechanisms**

The evaluators will use a variety of methods to ensure the validity of the data collected. Besides a systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection methods and tools, the validation of data will be sought through regular exchanges with the UNFPA programme staff and the Evaluation Reference Group. Counterfactual analysis is to be applied wherever possible to explore the cause-to-effect relationships within the programme being evaluated.

**Data Analysis**

The evaluation team will ensure the following in analyzing data, formulating finding and reaching to conclusions.

i. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?

ii. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?

iii. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?

iv. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?

v. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?

vi. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?

vii. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?

viii. Does the analysis elaborate on **cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?**

**Stakeholder Participation**

The evaluation will adopt an inclusive approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders. The evaluation manager will perform a stakeholders mapping in order to identify both UNFPA direct and indirect partners (i.e. partners who do not work directly with UNFPA and yet play a key role in a relevant outcome or thematic area in the national context). These stakeholders may include representatives from the government, civil society organizations, the private sector, UN organizations, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and most importantly, the beneficiaries of the programme. The evaluation team will validate the stakeholders map and draw sample for data collection.

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established by the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus comprising key programme stakeholders (national governmental and non-governmental counterparts, UNFPA Regional Advisor on Monitoring and Evaluation, Evaluation Manager from the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus). The ERG will review and provide inputs to the CPE terms of reference, , provide feedback to the evaluation design report, facilitate access of evaluators to information sources, and provide comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, in particular the final report at the draft stage.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The country programme evaluation will be implemented in five sequential phases, each of them including several steps, with respective deliverables as follows:

**1. Preparation**

This phase, managed by the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus, will include:

· Drafting of country programme evaluation (CPE) terms of reference (ToR)

· Establishing an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

· Receiving comments from the ERG on the CPE ToR

· Receiving comments on the CPE ToR from the UNFPA EECARO

· Receiving approval of the CPE ToR from the UNFPA Regional Office

· Selecting potential evaluators

· Receiving pre-qualification of potential evaluators from the UNFPA Regional Office

· Recruiting evaluators and establishing an Evaluation Team chaired by the Evaluation Team Leader

· Preparing the initial set of documentation for the CPE, including list of Atlas projects, stakeholder map, programme and financial data, all corporate and country specific reports e.g. Country Office Annual Report (COAR)

 The preparation phase may include a short *scoping mission* to the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus located in Minsk by the Evaluation Team Leader to gain better understanding of the development context, UNFPA programme and partners, refine the evaluation scope, identify potential sites for field visits etc.

**2. Design**

During the design phase, the Evaluation Team will perform the following tasks:

· Documentary review of all relevant documents available at the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus, Regional Office and Headquarters levels regarding the first and second UNFPA Country Programme for Belarus for 2010-2018

· Mapping of stakeholders relevant to the CPE, including state and civil society stakeholders and indicating the relationships between different sets of stakeholders; the stakeholder map will be used for stakeholder sampling for data collection

· Reconstruction of the intervention logicof the programme, i.e. the theory of change meant to lead from planned activities to the intended results of the programme

· Finalization of the list of evaluation questions and preparation of the *evaluation matrix*

· Development of a data collection and analysis strategy, as well as a concrete workplan for the field phase

Once all the interviewees and field trips have been identified by the evaluators, the UNFPA Evaluation Manager (together with the country office staff) will organize the required logistical arrangements

At the end of the design phase, the evaluation team will produce an evaluation design report summarizing the results of the above-listed steps and tasks. This report must demonstrate how the evaluators have understood the purpose and objectives of the CPE, its scope and criteria, the country’s development context and programme intervention logic, selected evaluation questions, and should convincingly illustrate how the evaluators intend to carry out the evaluation and ensure its quality.

The design report must include the evaluation matrix, stakeholders map, final evaluation questions and indicators/criteria, evaluation methods to be used, information sources, approach to and tools for data collection and analysis, calendar work plan, including selection of field sites to be visited – prepared in accordance with the UNFPA Handbook “How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation” and the structure of the final report. The design report should also present the reconstructed programme intervention cause-and-effect logic linking actual needs, inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes of the programme. The design report will be reviewed by the ERG and approved by the Evaluation Manager and UNFPA Regional Evaluation Adviser before the the CPE field phase commences.

**3. Field data collection**

After the design phase, the Evaluation Team will undertake a two-three week mission in Belarus to collect and analyse the data required in order to answer the evaluation questions consolidated at the design phase, and to analyze the findings with a view to formulate the preliminary conclusions. At the end of the field phase, the Evaluation Team will provide the UNFPA country office with a debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the evaluation, with a view to validating these preliminary findings and testing tentative conclusions and/or recommendations.

**4. Reporting**

During this phase, the Evaluation Team will continue the analytical work initiated during the field phase and prepare a first draft of the final evaluation report, taking into account comments made by the country office at the debriefing meeting. This *first draft final report* will be submitted to the Evaluation Reference Group for written comments. Comments made by the ERG and consolidated by the UNFPA Evaluation Manager will then allow the Evaluation Team to prepare a *second draft final evaluation report.*

This second draft final report will be disseminated among key programme stakeholders (including key national counterparts) and presented in a stakeholder workshop/meeting for final comments. The second draft final report will be reviewed by the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser including comments provided by the Country Office staff and stakeholders. The *final report* will be drafted shortly after the workshop, taking into account comments made by the programme stakeholders. A formal evaluation quality assessment (EQA) will take place at the reporting phase.

**5. Dissemination and Follow-Up**

During this phase, the country and regional offices, as well as relevant divisions at UNFPA headquarters will be informed of the CPE results. The evaluation report, accompanied by a document listing all recommendations, will be communicated to all relevant units within UNFPA, with an invitation to submit their response. Once filled, this document will become the *management response* to the evaluation. The UNFPA Country Office in Belarus will provide the management response within six weeks of the receipt of the final evaluation report.

The evaluation report, along with the CPE ToR and management response, will be published in the UNFPA evaluation database within eight weeks since their finalization. The evaluation report will also be made available to the UNFPA Executive Board and will be widely distributed within and outside the organization.

**EXPECTED OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluation Team will produce the following deliverables during their evaluation assignment:

· Design report (MS Word/Excel as required, 50 pages maximum) including (as a minimum): a) a stakeholder map; b) the evaluation matrix (including the final list of evaluation questions and indicators); c) reconstructed programme intervention logic, and d) the overall evaluation design and methodology including sampling , with a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase

· Debriefing presentation document (MS PowerPoint) synthesizing the main preliminary findings, conclusions of the evaluation, to be presented and discussed with the country office during the debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase

· First and second draft final evaluation reports, second draft taking into account potential comments from the Evaluation Reference Group

· Evaluation presentation document (MS PowerPoint) for the dissemination workshop to be held in Minsk during the CPE reporting phase

· Final report (MS Word, 70 pages maximum plus annexes) taking into account all the comments made during the dissemination workshop in one single document

. Evaluation brief-- a summary of evaluation report (maximum 5 pages) to communicate evaluation results to stakeholder in and outside of Belarus

All deliverables will be drafted in English. All reports should follow the structure and detailed outlines provided in the [UNFPA Handbook “How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation”](http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/Evaluation%20Handbook.pdf). This reference document, as well as relevant graphs and tables for the design and final evaluation reports, is accessible at<http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/how-design-and-conduct-country-programme-evaluation-unfpa>.

The final evaluation report and its presentation document will be translated into russian by the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus.

**WORKPLAN / INDICATIVE TIMEFRAME**

The table below indicates the specific activities and milestones of the CPE process, their target dates and responsibilities for their completion/achievement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **PHASES/DELIVARABLES** | **RESPONSIBLE** | **PARTNERS** | **DEADLINE** |
| **Preparation phase** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Establishment of Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) | Evaluation Manager (EM), programme staff, Personal Asst to the Rep | Key programme stakeholders | 13 November  |
|  | Finalization of ToR with inputs from programme staff (PS), ERG and RO M&E Adviser (M&EA); ToR approval by Evaluation Office (EO) | EM, ERG, PS  | Rep, M&EA, | 10 December |
|  | Selection of potential evaluators with inputs from RO M&E Adviser; pre-qualification of potential evaluators by EO; recruitment of external evaluators | EM, Administration and Finance Associate (AFA) | AFA, M&EA | 14 December |
|  | Compilation of initial list of documentation, stakeholder mapping and list of Atlas projects | EM, PS | AFA | 14 December |
|  | Scoping mission by Evaluation Team Leader | EM, PS, ERG | Rep | 18 January |
| **Design phase** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Preparation and submission of a design report | Evaluators | EM, M&EA, PS, ERG | 18 February |
|  | Review and approval of design report | Rep, EM | M&EA, PS | 25 February |
| **Fieldworks** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Data collection and analysis, including field trips as required | Evaluators | EM, PS, ERG, AFA | 1 March |
|  | Debriefing meeting on the preliminary findings, testing elements of conclusions and tentative recommendations | Evaluators | EM, PS, ERG | 22 March |
| **Reporting** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Production of the first draft final report | Evaluators | EM | 29 March |
|  | Written feedback by the ERG | ERG | EM | 5 April |
|  | Production of the second draft final report | Evaluators |  | 12 April |
|  | EQA of the second draft final report | EM | Rep, M&EA | 19 April |
|  | Production of the final report | Evaluators |  | 25 April |
|  | EQA of the final evaluation report | EM, M&EA | Rep | 2 May |
|  | Final EQA | EO | EM, M&EA | 8 May |
| **Dissemination and follow-up**  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Management response submission | Rep | EM, PS | 20 May  |
|  | CPE report, final EQA and Management response published on CO website and UNFPA evaluation database  | EM, Communications Officer | EO | 20 May  |

**COMPOSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM**

The evaluation will be carried out by a competitively selected independent Evaluation Team consisting of an Evaluation Team Leader and two Evaluators who are external to UNFPA. The team members will combine knowledge and experience in evaluation with technical knowledge and expertise in areas related to the UNFPA thematic areas (reproductive health and rights, gender equality, population and development, youth policies). UNFPA will ensure gender representation when forming the evaluation team.

The **Evaluation Team Leader** will hold the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the CPE process. She/he will be responsible for the production and timely submission of all expected deliverables of the CPE, including design report, draft and final evaluation reports, and Evaluation Brief. She/he will lead and coordinate the work of the Evaluation Team and ensure quality of the evaluation products. The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible for covering at least one programmatic area of the country programme. The Evaluation Team Leader should have the following qualifications:

· Advanced degree in social sciences, political science, public administration, economics or related fields

· Minimum 7 years of experience in leading complex evaluations, preferably in development aid for UN agencies or international development organizations

· Specialization in one of the programmatic areas covered by the evaluation (reproductive health and rights, gender equality, population and development, youth policies)

· Good knowledge and experience of programme evaluation

· Familiarity with UN and/or UNFPA mandate and activities

· Excellent management skills and ability to work with multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural teams

· Excellent analytical, communication and writing skills

· Excellent command of both spoken and written English is required. Working knowledge of Russian is a plus.

Two evaluators (Evaluation Team member), will each provide expertise in one programmatic area of the evaluation. The evaluators will take part in the data collection and analysis work, and will provide substantive inputs into the evaluation processes through participation at methodology development, meetings, interviews, analysis of documents, briefs, comments, as advised and led by the Evaluation Team Leader. The modality and participation of evaluators in the CPE process, including participation in interviews/meetings, provision of technical inputs and reviews of the design report, drafting parts of the evaluation reports, will be agreed by the Evaluation Team Leader and done under her/his supervision and guidance. The necessary qualifications of the evaluators will include:

· Advanced degree in social sciences, political science, public administration, economics or related fields

· Minimum 3 years of experience in evaluation

· Expertise in one of the programmatic areas covered by the evaluation (complementary to the specialization of the Evaluation Team Leader)

· Good knowledge and experience of programme evaluation

· Familiarity with UN and/or UNFPA mandate and activities

· Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work in a multi-cultural team

· Excellent analytical, communication and writing skills in English

· Excellent command of both spoken and written English and Russian is required

All Evaluation Team members should have in-depth knowledge of UNFPA programmatic areas and issues and challenges in the country. All must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivering outputs within the agreed timeframe. All should be knowledgeable of issues pertaining to gender equality and human rights. The team might be assisted by a translator/interpreter, according to its needs

The work of the Evaluation Team will be guided by the Norms and Standards established by the UN Evaluation Group. Team members will adhere to the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators in the UN system and the Code of Conduct also established by UNEG. The evaluators will be requested to sign the Code of Conduct prior to engaging in the evaluation exercise.

**REMUNERATION AND DURATION OF CONTRACT**

The provisional allocation of workdays among the evaluation team will be the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation phase** | Teamleader | Evaluator 1  | Evaluator 2 |
| Desk Review | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Scoping Mission | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Design | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| Fieldworks | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Reporting, including: -first draft report-Second Draft Final ReportEvaluation Brief-Preparation and facilitation of stakeholder workshop  | 153211 | 103111 | 103111 |
| **Total** | 59 | 40 | 40 |

The exact number of workdays and workload distribution will be proposed by the Evaluation Team in the evaluation design report, subject to approval by UNFPA. Workdays will be distributed as necessary between the contract signing date and the end date, 11 April 2019.

Payment of the evaluation consultancy fees will be made in three tranches against the following milestones:

· 20% Upon approval of the evaluation design report by UNFPA

· 40% Upon acceptance of the second draft l evaluation report by UNFPA

· 40% Upon acceptance of the final evaluation report by UNFPA

Daily subsistence allowance for the evaluators will be paid in accordance with the current UNFPA Duty Travel Policy using the applicable UN rates for the place of mission. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

**MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION**

The CPE will be guided by these terms of reference approved by the UNFPA Evaluation Office[[20]](#footnote-20), and the UNFPA Handbook “How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation”. The CPE will be conducted by an independent **Evaluation Team** whose members are pre-qualified by the UNFPA Evaluation Office, but will be managed by the UNFPA Country Office in Belarus.

UNFPA Assistant Representative will work as the **Evaluation Manager** and will perform as country office’s primary focal point for the evaluation exercise, with support by a designated UNFPA Country Office staff. The Evaluation Manager will support the Evaluation Team in designing the evaluation, will provide ongoing feedback for quality assurance during the preparation of the design report and the final report. The Evaluation Manager provides Evaluation Quality Assessment for the final draft evaluation report and the final evaluation report in consultations with the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser, approves the CPE deliverables and sends the final CPE report and EQA to the UNFPA Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Manager also ensures dissemination of the final evaluation report and the main findings, conclusions and recommendations, and leads the preparation of the management response to the evaluation.

The Evaluation Manager will be assisted by the **Evaluation Reference Group** composed of the programme officers from the UNFPA country office, representatives of key national counterparts in Belarus, Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser from the UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as representatives from relevant services of UNFPA Headquarters. The role of the reference group will be of a technical nature. Its main tasks will be to:

· Discuss the CPE terms of reference drawn up by the Evaluation Manager

· Provide the evaluation team with relevant information and documentation on the programme under assessment

· Facilitate the access of the Evaluation Team to key informants during the field phase

· Discuss and provide comments on the reports produced by the Evaluation Team

· Advise on the quality of the work done by the Evaluation Team

· Assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation into future programme design and implementation

The UNFPA country office will provide the Evaluation Team with all the necessary documents, reports and references to web-based materials. The UNFPA country office’s management and staff will make themselves available for interviews and technical assistance as appropriate. The country office also commits to provide logistical support to the evaluators in terms of making appointments and arranging travel and site visits as may be required. Access to office space and IT infrastructure may be provided if needed.

The Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Team and Evaluation Reference Group will communicate mostly via e-mail, although “virtual” meetings (via tele or videoconference) may also be convened.

**Annexes:**

**Annex 1: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG/UNFPA Evaluations**

# **Annex 2: Evaluation Quality Assurance and Assessment: Tools and Guidance (**[**https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/evaluation-quality-assurance-and-assessment-tools-and-guidance**](https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/evaluation-quality-assurance-and-assessment-tools-and-guidance)**)**

# **Annex 3: How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA (**[**https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/how-design-and-conduct-country-programme-evaluation-unfpa**](https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/how-design-and-conduct-country-programme-evaluation-unfpa)**)**

# **Annex 4: Equity-focused and gender-responsive lens evaluation (**[**https://www.evalpartners.org/evalgender/no-one-left-behind#guidance**](https://www.evalpartners.org/evalgender/no-one-left-behind#guidance)**)**

**Annex 5: Implementation Plan**

**Annex 1: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG/UNFPA Evaluations**

Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business. In particular:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent,** implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy- setting/programming, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interests and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.

2. Evaluators should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual informants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

3. Evaluations sometimes uncover suspicion of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.

4. Evaluators should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

5. Evaluators are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions and recommendations.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System [http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG%2BEthical%2BGuidelines)<http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21>

**[Please date, sign and write “Read and approved”]**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY AND RESOURCES (See footnotes and below)**

Handbook “How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA” (<http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/how-design-and-conduct-country-programme-evaluation-unfpa>

UNFPA Evaluation Webpage (<http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation>)

**ANNEXES**

· Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG/UNFPA Evaluations

· List of Atlas projects for the period under evaluation

· Information on main stakeholders by areas of intervention

· Short outlines of the design and final evaluation reports

· Evaluation Quality Assessment template and explanatory note (see p. 208 in the Handbook)

· Management response template (p. 206 in the Handbook)

**ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNEG/UNFPA EVALUATIONS**

Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business. In particular:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent,** implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting/programming, design or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interests and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.

2. Evaluators should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual informants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

3. Evaluations sometimes uncover suspicion of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.

4. Evaluators should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

5. Evaluators are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions and recommendations.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms

for Evaluation in the UN system:

http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines

http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\_id=21

**[Please date, sign and write “Read and approved”]**
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