**Annex 1**

**Terms of Reference**

**Independent Evaluation of the** **“Strengthening Operational Capacities of Police Contributing Countries” project**

**Background**

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges.
2. UNITAR’s first Strategic Objective calls to “Promote peace and just and inclusive societies”. The sub-objective SO 1.1 “Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace” focuses broadly on tackling violence; addressing root causes of conflict, insecurity and injustice; and strengthening governance and institutions which are essential steps to creating a more sustainable future.
3. Since 2016/2017 UNITAR has been implementing projects to strengthen capacities of Police Contributing Countries through three distinct phases of the project:
   * *“Sustaining Peace in Mali and the Sahel region through strengthening regional Peacekeeping training capacities” (2017-2019);*
   * *“Strengthening Operational Capabilities of Francophone Police Contributing Countries”* (2020); and, the current project phase
   * *“Strengthening Operational Capacities of Police Contributing Countries”* (2021).
4. The project’s 2021 phase aims to support the implementation of the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Policing (SGF) by adopting an integrated approach to the training of Individual Police Officers (IPOs) and Formed Police Units (FPUs) prior to the deployment to the five high-risk missions (MINUSMA, MONUSCO, MINUSCA, UNAMID and UNMISS), that mainstream gender, human rights and protection priorities, while promoting a close cooperation with military and civilian components of the mission. More specifically, the project aims to contribute to improving the performance of UN peace operations in complex and high-risk environments by strengthening the operational readiness of African IPOs and FPUs deployed to the above-mentioned missions.
5. By leveraging on the experience acquired by UNITAR since 2017, the 2021 project aims to reach a broader number of Police Contributing Countries (PCCs), allowing for increased standardization of preparation prior to deployment (in line with UN standards), which – in turn – shall impact positively on operations in the field and eventually on policing functions at the national level. In addition, by exposing IPOs and members of FPUs to internationally agreed standards of policing, the project is expected to indirectly impact on the policing function at the national level, and promote an approach that is representative of, responsive and accountable to the communities. Finally, by ensuring that gender is mainstreamed throughout, the project will also contribute towards advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment within the operational capabilities of police peacekeepers.
6. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and aims to complement an evaluation undertaken by the Foreign Ministry of Germany. The evaluation shall also build on an [evaluation undertaken of an earlier phase of the project](https://unitar.org/results-evidence-learning/evaluation/independent-evaluation-sustaining-peace-mali-and-sahel-region-through-strengthening-peacekeeping). Lessons from the evaluation shall not only inform possible future phases of the project but also be presented at the December 2021 Peacekeeping Ministerial at which PCCs take part.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

1. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; to identify any problems or challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation’s purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project’s improvement and broader organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the project has performed, but also seek to answer the ‘why ‘question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results.
2. While the evaluation will include an assessment of all six criteria, the evaluation’s emphasis will be placed on assessing the impact of the intervention, which may include an assessment of the impacts from the 2017-2019 (and 2020) phase(s) since implementation of the present 2021 phase will be ongoing at the time of data collection. In addition to serving as accountability function, the evaluation’s purpose is also to be as forward-looking as possible to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future phases and focus areas.

**Scope of the evaluation**

1. The evaluation will cover phases II (May 2020 to December 2020) and III (April 2021 to December 2021), with a greater focus on the 2020 phase. Although the scope of the evaluation does not include the previous project phases (2017-2019) also funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, the evaluator should take the other into account when framing the evaluation’s findings and conclusions. In addition to assessing the results achieved from 2020-2021 with a particular focus on the impact criterion, the evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases.

**Evaluation criteria**

1. The evaluation will assess project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability.

* ***Relevance:*** *Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries’ needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
* ***Coherence:*** *To what extent is the project coherent with relevant policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?*
* ***Effectiveness:*** *How effective has the project been in delivering results and in strengthening the capacities of PCCs?*
* ***Efficiency:*** *To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?*
* ***Likelihood of Impact:*** *What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes? (This criterion shall be considered the focus of this evaluation)*
* ***Likelihood of Sustainability:*** *To what extent are the project’s results likely to be sustained in the long term?*

**Principal evaluation questions**

1. The following questions are *suggested* to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project’s future orientation. The focus of the evaluation shall be on the impact criterion and the questions falling under it.

**Relevance**

1. *To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute’s efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the UNITAR strategic framework (2018-2021), and particularly SO 1.1.?*
2. *To what extent is the project aligned with the 2017 Report on “*[*Improving Security of United Nations Peacekeepers*](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/improving_security_of_united_nations_peacekeepers_report.pdf) *(“Cruz Report”), the* [*Strategic Guidance Framework for* International Policing](https://police.un.org/en/strategic-guidance-framework-international-policing), the [UNSC Resolution 2242 (2015) on Women and Peace](https://www.un.org/press/en/2015/sc12076.doc.htm#:~:text=Through%20resolution%202242%20%282015%29%2C%20adopted%20unanimously%20ahead%20of,concerns%20across%20all%20country-specific%20situations%20on%20its%20agenda.), *the* [*Policy on United Nations Police*](https://police.un.org/sites/default/files/sgf-policy-police-2014.pdf) *(2014) and the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda, the Call to Action for Human Rights, the SG’s Data Strategy, the Behavioural Science Guidance Note and the Human Rights Due Diligence Policy and the (2018) report on Forced Police Unit Command Staff Training Needs Assessment?*
3. *How relevant are the objectives and the design of the trainings to the identified and new capacity needs, priorities and the performance improvement of beneficiaries of francophone PCCs, including those arising from the COVID-19 pandemic? Are they building upon the needs assessments and action plans? Were objectives formulated sufficient to lead to behaviour change/performance growth?*
4. *How relevant is the needs assessment design for anglophone PCCs?*
5. *How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women’s empowerment?* ***(GEEW)***

**Coherence**

1. *How well does the project complement other UNITAR programming in the area of pre-deployment training funded by other donors?*
2. *How well is the project aligned with standards for training of trainers?*
3. *How well does the project complement and foster synergies with other existing capacity building programmes and projects by other actors, such as FPU and IPU training by the Department of Peace Operations (DPO) once personnel is being deployed, COESPU “train of trainers” and UNODC’s training for police? How well is the project aligned with a One United Nations approach to United Nations policing?*

**Effectiveness**

1. *Is the achievement of the project’s 2021 outputs and objectives on track? To what extent did the project achieve planned outputs and outcomes for the second phase (2020)? What are the factors affecting the project’s and the individual’s performance?*
2. *Have the project’s structure and partnerships been effective, including the performance of implementing partners in Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Kenya, Mali, Rwanda, Tanzania, Togo and with The African Peace Support Trainers Association?*
3. *How well do the project pre-deployment activities complement further national induction and in-mission training?*
4. *To what extent are a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project and more specifically in the design and delivery of training events?* ***(GEEW)***
5. *How effective were the training events delivered by FPU trainers?*
6. *To what extent have francophone PCCs delivered gender sensitive pre-deployment training to male and female members of FPUs?* ***(GEEW)***
7. *To what extent and how is the project contributing to changed behaviourand improved performance of police, including reduction of Human Rights Abuses (reaction instead of prevention and protection)?* ***(GEEW)*** *What is missing, if anything?*
8. *Looking back at learning from pre-deployment and practical learning during employment, what lessons can be drawn to make future pre-deployment training more effective? What is the relation between the training activities and performance and what explains this relation? What can be done more or differently to lead to behaviour change? What is not effective?*

**Efficiency**

1. *To what extent has the project been able to link to other initiatives and collaborated with UN DPO and as part of the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Policing (IATF-P)?*
2. *To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through partnership arrangements (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches) or is likely to?*
3. *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been?*
4. *To what extent has the project adjusted to the COVID-19 related context, particularly for awareness-raising sensitization campaigns in Burkina Faso, and how efficient has it been?*

**Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact (the following questions shall be considered the focus of this evaluation)**

1. *To what extent has the project contributed to strengthened operational readiness and the performance of African FPUs deployed to MINUSMA, MINUSCA and MONUSCO?*
2. *What real difference does the project make to the role of female officers deployed to MINUSMA, MINUSCA and MONUSCO as part of an FPU? What has been the “parcours” of female officers and what grades/ranks do they typically operate at?* ***(GEEW)***
3. *To what extent has the project contributed to improved policing functions at the national level?*
4. *To what extent has the project strengthened training centre capacities and the autonomy of trainers? Are there any differences between the nature of the centres (e.g. police schools now also working on pre-deployment training, long-standing partners such as EMPABB, etc.)?*
5. *What other observable end-results or organizational changes* (*positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred or are likely to occur related to the 2020 project implementation?*

**Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability**

1. *To what extent are the project’s results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term?*
2. *What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability, of the project?*
3. *To what extent are the current design and exit strategies likely to contribute to sustained capacity of training centres? To what extent are training centres learning from each other?*
4. *What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming?*

**Gender equality and women empowerment (GEEW)**

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with **“*GEEW”*** *in the above.*

**Evaluation Approach and Methods**

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](http://www.unitar.org/sites/default/files/uploads/pprs/monitoring-and-evaluation_revised_april_2017.pdf) and the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation, and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914) The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME).

1. In order to maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project partners, the UN Country Teams, the participants, the donor and other stakeholders. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; review of the log frame (reconstructed) baseline data and the theory of change; key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.
2. It is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:

* **Individual dimension** relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
* **Organizational dimension** relates to public and private organizations, civil society organizations, and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
* **Enabling environment dimension** refers to the context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

Table 1: Capacity areas within the three dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual** | Skills levels (technical and managerial skills)  Competencies | Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence, Professional identity, Norms, Values, Intentions, Emotions, Environmental barriers and enablers (among others) |
| **Organizations** | Mandates  Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms  Motivation and incentive systems  Strategic leadership  Inter/intra institutional linkages  Programme management  Multi-stakeholder processes | Organizational priorities  Processes, systems and procedures  Human and financial resources  Knowledge and information sharing  Infrastructure |
| **Enabling environment** | Policy and legal framework  Political commitment  and accountability framework  Governance | Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power  Legal, policy and political environment |

1. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

**Data collection methods:**

*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C.

If baseline data available allows for it, the evaluator should consider using quantitative approaches to assess the impact assessment related evaluation questions.

The evaluator should also consider whether [Outcome mapping](http://www.betterevaluation.org/resources/outcome_mapping/ilac) / [Outcome harvesting](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/Outome%20Harvesting%20Brief%20FINAL%202012-05-2-1.pdf) / [outcome evidencing](http://ifsa.boku.ac.at/cms/fileadmin/IFSA2016/IFSA2016_WS12_Douthwaite.pdf) are suitable tools for answering the evaluation questions.

*Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

* Implementing partner institutions in Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Kenya, Mali, Rwanda, Tanzania, Togo and with The African Peace Support Trainers Association;
* The donor (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany);
* Other partners such as DPO;
* Beneficiaries/participants;
* IPOs, FPUs, project consultants serving as expert trainers/facilitators;
* UN Country Teams;
* Host (local and national) governments;
* Etc.

*Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.  
  
*Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of contacts is available in Annex A. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level.

*Focus groups*

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

*Field visit*

A field visit for interviews and focus groups with logistical support from Project Management shall be organised to at least four of the following countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Tanzania.

Observation may also prove useful if activities are being implemented simultaneously to the local field visit.

**Gender and human rights**

1. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, country status/classification and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality.
2. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow **ethical** and professional standards([UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)).

**Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

1. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from September 2021 (initial desk review and data collection) to December 2021 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
2. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.
3. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
4. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex D. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.
5. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex G by 5 December 2021. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 12 December 2021. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe: August 2021 – December 2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **November** | **December** |
| Evaluator selected and recruited |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation design/question matrix |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft evaluation report  consulted with UNITAR  evaluation manager and  submitted to Project Management |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Management reviews draft evaluation  report and shares comments  and recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation of the evaluation findings and lessons learned |  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **From** | **To** | **Deadline** |
| Evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 6 September 2021 |
| Comments on evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 13 September 2021 |
| Zero draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 29 October 2021 |
| Comments on zero draft | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 12 November 2021 |
| Draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 29 November 2021 |
| Comments on draft report | Project Management | Evaluation manager | 5 December 2021 |
| Final report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 12 December 2021 |
| Presentation of the evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned | Evaluator/evaluation manager | Project Management | 12 December 2021 |

**OPTIONAL:** A reference group is considered a good practice in independent evaluations. Members of the reference group could be a representative from project management, from the donor and several representatives from the implementing partners for example. These stakeholders would then be included throughout the evaluation phases and would e.g. be able to provide comments on the draft report.

**Communication/dissemination of results**

1. The evaluation report shall be written in English with the Executive Summary both in English and French. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

**Evaluation management arrangements**

1. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) (‘evaluation manager’).
2. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR’s Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR’s evaluation function’s independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.
3. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

**Evaluator Ethics**

1. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project’s design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102).

**Professional requirements**

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

* MA degree or equivalent in international relations, peace studies or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, including training of trainers approaches and in areas related to peacekeeping and police training.
* At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
* Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of peacekeeping related topics, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts to develop policing capacities in broader peacekeeping missions.
* Field work experience in Africa.
* Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
* Excellent writing skills.
* Strong communication and presentation skills.
* Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
* Availability to travel.
* Fluency in oral and written French and English.
* **Annexes:**

1. **List of contact points**
2. **Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
3. **List of documents and data to be reviewed**
4. **Structure of evaluation report**
5. **Project logical framework**
6. **Audit trail**
7. **Evaluator code of conduct**

**Annex A: List of contact points**

**Project Management to complete as no contacts available on EMS**

**B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.1.2020-31.12.2020**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Admin entity** | **Start date (Y-m-d)** | **End date (Y-m-d)** | **Event title** | **Event ID** | **Thematic Area** | **Pillar** | **Type of Location** | **Location city** | **Location country** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-06-22** | **2020-08-14** | **Blended pre-deployment training of FPUs** | **6586** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Ouagadougou** | **Burkina Faso** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-10-26** | **2020-11-06** | **Gestion des crises lors des élections** | **7139** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Ouagadougou** | **Burkina Faso** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-10-26** | **2020-11-06** | **Formation des formateurs police (generique)** | **7140** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Ouagadougou** | **Burkina Faso** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-23** | **2020-12-18** | **Formation des formateurs police (Unités de Police Constituées)** | **7141** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Lome** | **Togo** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-10-19** | **2020-12-18** | **Formation des formateurs police (Unités de Police Constituées)** | **7142** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Cotonou** | **Benin** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-12-02** | **2020-12-04** | **Formation des Unités de Police Constituées** | **7143** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Bamako** | **Mali** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-09** | **2020-12-25** | **Formation des formateurs police (Unités de Police Constituées)** | **7144** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Niamey** | **Niger** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-16** | **2020-11-20** | **Training of police trainers (Formed Police Units)** | **7145** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Moshi** | **Tanzania** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-23** | **2020-12-11** | **Training of Formed Police Units** | **7146** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Moshi** | **Tanzania** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-16** | **2020-12-11** | **Training of Formed Police Units** | **7147** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Gishari** | **Rwanda** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-11-16** | **2020-12-11** | **Training of police trainers (Formed Police Units)** | **7148** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Gishari** | **Rwanda** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-12-07** | **2020-12-11** | **Post-Conflict, Peacebuilding and Reconstruction** | **7150** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Nairobi** | **Kenya** |
| **PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme** | **2020-12-14** | **2020-12-18** | **UN Personnel Safety and Security Training** | **7152** | **Other** | **Peace** | **City/Country** | **Musanze** | **Rwanda** |

**Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed**

* Annual narrative and finance reports
* Legal Agreement
* Logical Framework and outcome areas
* Project Description
* UNITAR website content
* Event Management System Data
* Documents related to the 2017-2020 earlier project phases
* Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

**Annex D: Structure of evaluation report**

1. Title page
2. Executive summary
3. Acronyms and abbreviations
4. Introduction
5. Project description, objectives and development context
6. Theory of change/project design logic
7. Methodology and limitations
8. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
9. Conclusions
10. Recommendations
11. Lessons Learned
12. Annexes
    1. Terms of reference
    2. Survey/questionnaires deployed
    3. List of persons interviewed
    4. List of documents reviewed
    5. Evaluation question matrix
    6. Evaluation consultant agreement form

**Annex E: 2020 Project Logical Framework and outcome areas**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LogFrame: Projekt-Nr. / Project no.: \_\_\_  PROJEKTTITEL / Project title: Strengthening Operational Capabilities of Francophone Police Contributing Countries | | | | | | |
| INTERVENTIONSLOGIK Intervention logic | | PROJEKTBESCHREIBUNG  Project Description | INDIKATOREN  Indicators | QUELLEN DER NACHPRÜFBARKEIT  Sources of Verification | ANNAHMEN UND RISIKEN  Assumptions and Risks |
| INTERVENTIONSEBENE  Level of intervention | Long-term outcome(s) | Strengthened operational readiness of African FPUs deployed to MINUSMA, MINUSCA and MONUSCO | % of PCCs being positively evaluated by UN Police Division prior to deployment (FPAT) and during deployment Baseline: 0%  Target: 80%  **Actual: n/a – not assessable within the time frame of the project. However, information is being collected and will be submitted as part of an independent evaluation report at the end of the year**. | Reports from evaluation missions | Bitte nicht ausfüllen/leave empty. |
| Strengthened role of female officers deployed to MINUSMA, MINUSCA and MONUSCO as part of an FPU | % of increase in the participation of female officers into African FPUs within 6 months from the completion of the project  Baseline: (to be determined at the beginning of the project / per country)  Target: baseline +5%  **Actual: n/a – not assessable within the time frame of the project. However, information is being collected and will be submitted as part of an independent evaluation report at the end of the year**. | List of deployed personnel |
| Improved policing functions at the national level | % of representatives from PCCs confirming a linkage between training and improved policing functions at the national level  Baseline: 0%  Target: 60%  **Actual: n/a – not assessable within the time frame of the project. However, information is being collected and will be submitted as part of an independent evaluation report at the end of the year**. | Reports from interviews with PCCs |
| Short term outcome(s) | Improved training capabilities of francophone PCCs to deliver gender sensitive pre-deployment training to male and female members of FPUs | % of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training of trainers  Baseline: 0  Target: 80%  **Actual: 100%**  **Note: this percentage refers to participants attending the TOT in its entirety and not to the actual certification. Please refer to the report for additional information.**  % of female trainers integrated within training teams at PCCs level  Baseline: 0  Target: 40%  **Actual: 30%**  % of participants attending the training sessions delivered by the newly trained trainers within 6 months from the completion of the project rating the delivery as fully or mostly satisfactory  Baseline: 0  Target: 80%  **Actual: n/a – not assessable within the time frame of the project. However, information is being collected and will be submitted as part of an independent evaluation report at the end of the year**. | Reports from training sessions | *Please refer to section 2 par. 8 for a detailed description of risks and assumptions* |
|  | Improved knowledge, skills and behavior of male and female members of African FPUs deployed to MINUSMA, MINUSCA and MONUSCO | % of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program  Baseline: 0  Target: 80%  **Actual: 100%**  **Note: this percentage refers to participants attending the training in its entirety. Please refer to the report for additional information.** | Report from training sessions | *(same as above)* |
| Increased awareness among female officers of their central role in UN peace operations | % of participants attending the awareness raising sessions stating an increased understanding  Baseline: (to be determined during the needs assessment)  Target: (to be determined during the needs assessment)  **Actual: n/a – due to** **COVID-19 pandemics it was not possible to implement the awareness raising campaigns except for one country (Burkina Faso).** **Please refer to the report for additional information.** | Report from awareness raising sessions | *(same as above)* |
| Ergebnisse  Expected results /outputs | * FPU training package / learning reinforcement tools are adapted to MINUSCA and MONUSCO; * Briefing package for PCCs on pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment is developed; | Number of training package / learning reinforcement tools adapted to MINUSCO and MONUSCO  Baseline: 0  Target: 2  **Actual: 2**  Number of briefing packages developed  Baseline: 0  Target: 1  **Actual: 1** | * Training packages * Briefing packages | *(same as above)* |
| For countries already participating in the project:   * Training of FPU trainers and certification is attended by gender-balanced group of participants; * Training of FPU members is attended by gender-balanced group of participants; | Number of participants attending the training of FPU trainers and admitted to certification  Baseline: 0  Target: 60  **Actual: 62 (attended the TOT) / 48 (admitted to certification)**  Number of participants attending the training of FPU members  Baseline: 0  Target: 640  **Actual: 625** | * Report of the training sessions | *(same as above)* |
| For countries not yet participating in the project:   * Training of FPU trainers and certification is attended by gender-balanced group of participants; * Training of FPU members is attended by gender-balanced group of participants; | Number of participants attending the training of FPU trainers and admitted to certification  Baseline: 0  Target: 45  **Actual: 54 (attended the TOT) / 40 (admitted to certification)**  Number of participants attending the training of FPU members  Baseline: 0  Target: 960  **Actual: 934** | * Report of the training sessions | *(same as above)* |
| For the whole region (West Africa):   * Action plans are developed in each country (as result of the needs assessment); * Information / sensitization campaign are implemented in each country; * Training of FPU trainers is attended by female police trainers; | Number of action plans developed  Baseline: 0  Target: 7  **Actual: 7**  Number of information / sensitization campaigns implemented  Baseline: 0  Target: 7  **Actual: 1 – due to** **COVID-19 pandemics it was not possible to implement the awareness raising campaigns except for one country (Burkina Faso).** **Please refer to the report for additional information.**  Number of female police officers attending the training of FPU trainers and admitted to certification  Baseline: 0  Target: 20  **20 (attended the TOT) / 12 (admitted to certification)** | * Action plans * Reports of the information / sensitization campaigns * Report of the training sessions | *(same as above)* |
| Beyond the region:   * Needs assessment for the potential expansion of activities to anglophone PCCs / missions is implemented. | Number of needs assessment conducted  Baseline: 0  Target: 1  **Actual: 1** | * Report of the needs assessment | *(same as above)* |
| AKTIVITÄTEN/ Maßnahmen 1  Activities/ Tasks 1 (training) | * Adaptation of FPU training package / learning reinforcement tools to MINUSCA and MONUSCO * Development of a briefing package for PCCs on pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment (briefing to be delivered in conjunction with training sessions) | Number of training package / learning reinforcement tools adapted to MINUSCO and MONUSCO  Baseline: 0  Target: 2  **Actual: 2**  Number of briefing packages developed  Baseline: 0  Target: 1  **Actual: 1** | * Training packages * Briefing packages | *(same as above)* |
|  | For countries already participating in the project:   * Delivery of training of FPU trainers * Delivery of FPU training | Number of training of FPU trainer delivered  Baseline: 0  Target: 4  **Actual: 4**  Number of FPU training delivered  Baseline: 0  Target: 4  **Actual: 4** | * Report of the training sessions | *(same as above)* |
|  | For countries not yet participating in the project:   * Delivery of training of FPU trainers * Delivery of FPU training | Number of training of FPU trainer delivered  Baseline: 0  Target: 3  **Actual: 3**  Number of FPU training delivered  Baseline: 0  Target: 6  **Actual: 6** | * Report of the training sessions | *(same as above)* |

**Annex F: Evaluation Audit Trail Template**

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)*

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the evaluation of the “Strengthening Operational Capacities of Police Contributing Countries” project**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form\*

**The evaluator:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. He/she must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[1]](#footnote-2)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

1. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)