**Annex 1**

**Draft Terms of reference**

**Independent Evaluation of the “****Strengthening Crisis Management Capacities of Malian National Police, Gendarmerie and National Guard during Elections” 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 Institution works towards supporting institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace. It incorporates activities aimed at strengthening capacities of institutions and individuals towards peaceful coexistence, conflict resolution and the development of sound regulatory frameworks in promotion of access to information and justice.
3. The **“Strengthening Crisis Management Capacities of Malian National Police, Gendarmerie and National Guard during Elections”** project responds to the urgency of supporting institutions and individuals for sustainable peace by supporting national authorities in Mali to transition towards the (re)establishment of democratic governance and the rule of law. It aimed to accomplish this objective through strengthening the crisis management capacities of Malian national police, national gendarmerie, and national guard ahead of the Mali elections scheduled in February 2024. The project was implemented between July 2021 and December 2022.
4. UNITAR has been active in Mali since 2016 following its contribution to improving the performance of UN Peace Operations through implementation of projects aimed at strengthening the capacities of police contributing countries. The project will build on these experiences to strengthen the operational readiness of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard in view of the elections. To achieve the long-term outcome, the project will focus on enhancing the capabilities (knowledge and skills), motivation and opportunities of police, gendarmerie and national guard’s members (at strategic, operational and tactical level) to ensure security prior, during and after elections.The project integrates a gender approach through integrating elements from the UNDP training manual on Gender, Human Rights and the Role of the Police during Elections and reflecting on Violence against Women in Elections The project entailed different types and phases of interventions, ranging from the provision of training, coaching and mentoring, to the delivery of equipment for the units deployed on the ground (mainly public order management equipment). In the view of ensuring long-term sustainability of the project and a broad outreach, a comprehensive training of trainers’ approach was applied to empower effective multiplication of the trainings. While in the initial phase of the project (2021) the interventions focused on Malian national police, gendarmerie and national guard, in the second phase the interventions concentrated on the promotion of inter-operability between Malian security forces and international forces present in Mali in the framework of the United Nations Mission, MINUSMA, particularly Formed Police Units (FPUs).

**Purpose of the evaluation**

1. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, 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.

**Scope of the evaluation**

1. The evaluation will cover the entire project timeframe, from 1 July 2021 to 31 December 2022. The evaluation should maintain sufficient focus to deliver findings and conclusions with actionable recommendations to inform similar projects in the country and other projects in other contexts beyond Mali. The scope, evaluation questions and data collection will be commensurate with the evaluation’s resource requirements.

**Evaluation criteria**

1. The evaluation will assess project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, 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 strengthening the operational readiness of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard in view of the elections?*
* ***Efficiency:*** *To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?*
* ***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?*
* ***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 and with regard to the project’s future orientation, as may be relevant.

**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. *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 male and female*

*Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard? Were objectives formulated sufficient to lead to behavior change/performance growth?*

1. *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, particularly when it comes to* the inter-operability between Malian security forces and international forces present in Mali*?*
2. *How well does the project complement other existing elections’ crisis management programmes by other local, national, UN and international actors including the EUCAP Sahel Mali?*
3. *To what extent does the project align with international frameworks mentioned in the project description, e.g., Women, Peace and Security Agenda (UN* *Security Council Resolution 1325 and subsequent resolutions), etc.?*

**Effectiveness**

1. *How effective is the project’s methodology (training of trainers, simulation, etc.) in achieving the long-term outcome area related to strengthened operational readiness of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard in view of the elections?*
2. *To what extent is the project contributing to changed behaviour/attitudes in a way that contributes to improving safety and security of civilians during elections or progress towards it?*
3. *To what extent is the Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard prepared adequately for the 2024 elections and pre- and post election events?*
4. *To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disability considerations 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. *To what extent and how is the project contributing to changed behaviour and improved performance of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard, including reduction of Human Rights Abuses (reaction instead of prevention and protection)?**What is missing, if anything?*
6. *How effective has the promotion of inter-operability between Malian national security forces and international forces present in Mali been and to what extent has it led to enhanced collaboration?*

**Efficiency**

1. *To what extent has the project been able to link to other initiatives and collaborated with other partners and the host government?*
2. *To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through partnership arrangements with implementing partners including EMPABB (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches) or is likely to?*
3. *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the project been and to what extent have environmental externalities been mitigated? (ENVSUSE)*
4. *To what extent has the initiative created benefits of integrating gender equality (or not) and what were the related costs?*

**Early indication of impact**

1. *To what extent is the project likely to contribute to strengthened safety and security under the context of preparing for the Malian elections and the performance of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard? What on-the-ground indicators are likely to provide the basis of such an assessment?*
2. *To what extent has the project contributed to improved capacities of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard during pre-election events?*
3. *What other observable end-results or organizational changes* (*positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred related to the project?*

**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. *To what extent has the training of trainers led to indications of sustainability?*
3. *What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability, of the project?*
4. *To what extent is the current design likely to contribute to sustained capacity?*
5. *What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming?*

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

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with **“*GEEW”*** *in the above. Other considerations for disability-inclusion and human-rights may be included in the questions.*

**Environmental Sustainability in Evaluation (ENVSUSE)**

The evaluation questions with the evaluation sustainability dimension are marked with “***ENVSUSE”*** in the above.

**Evaluation Approach and Methods**

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy](https://unitar.org/sites/default/files/media/file/UNITAR%20Evaluation%20Policy.pdf) and [Operational Guidelines](https://unitaremail.sharepoint.com/unitarnet/Documents/Operational%20Guidelines_Indepdendent%20Evaluation.pdf), as well as 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  and the theory of change (reconstructed); 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:

* German Federal Foreign Office;
* Implementing partners: Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center (KAIPTC), Ecole de Maintien de la Paix “Alioune Blondin Beye” (EMPABB)
* Beneficiaries/participants from Malian national police, gendarmerie and national guard, FPUs and civilian protection units;
* Trainers/facilitators;
* UN Country Teams;
* Host (local and national) governments;
* UNITAR staff in Geneva and Mali
* The Police Component of MINUSMA
* Project Board members
* **United Nations Department of Peace Operations / Police Division / Standing Police Capacity (SPC)**
* 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. The evaluator should be able to undertake data collection entirely remotely should travel restrictions be imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**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 and age grouping and be included in the draft and final evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality and empowerment of women.
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 May 2022 (initial desk review and data collection) to September 2022 (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 and the donor to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex F by 2 May 2023. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 29 May 2023. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe: December 2022 – June 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **December 2022** | **January 2023** | **February 2023** | **March 2023** | **April 2023** | **May 2023** | **June 2023** |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Management reviews draft evaluation  report and shares comments  and recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dissemination and publication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **From** | **To** | **Deadline\*** |
| Evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 9 December 2022 |
| Comments on evaluation design/question matrix | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 16 December 2022 |
| mission plan submitted | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 20 December 2022 |
| Zero draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 10 April 2023 |
| Comments on zero draft | Evaluation manager | Evaluator | 24 April 2023 |
| Draft report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 2 May 2023 |
| Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned | Evaluator/evaluation manager | Programme Management | To be defined |
| Comments on draft report | Programme Management | Evaluation manager | 15 May 2023 |
| Final report | Evaluator | Evaluation manager | 29 May 2023 |
| Dissemination and publication of report | Evaluation manager |  | June 2023 |

**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.
2. **Evaluation management arrangements**
3. 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’).
4. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. In accordance with UNITAR’s 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.
5. 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 G 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 and conflict management and resolutions or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, including training of trainers approaches and in areas related to crisis management and peacekeeping.
* 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 crisis and peacekeeping related topics, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts to develop crisis management 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. **Logframe**
6. **Audit trail**
7. **Evaluator code of conduct**

**Annex A: List of contact points**

**Project Management to complete**

**B: Event data available on the Event Management System**

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

* Narrative and finance reports (in the absence of interim reporting requirements, internal reporting and monitoring data shall be provided, including self-evaluations, logframe updates etc.)
* Legal Agreement
* Logical Framework and outcome areas
* Monitoring and self-evaluation data
* Implementing partner documentation
* Stakeholder contacts
* Rehabilitation and construction-related documentation
* Project Description
* UNITAR website content
* Event Management System Data
* 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: Project logical framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intervention Logic** | **Description  of objectives and results** | **% of 24:36  Baseline: 0% Target value: 80%** | **Sources of Information** | **Assumptions and Risks** | **Interim Report 1 (Period: 1 Jul - 31 Oct 2021)**  **Target Value / Value achieved** | | **Interim Report 2 (Period: 1 Nov - 31 Mar 2022)**  **Target Value / Value achieved** | | **Interim Report 3 (Period: 1 Apr - 31 Dec 2022)**  **Target Value / Value achieved** | | **Final Report   Target Value / Value achieved** | | **Comments** |
| **Overall Objective (Impact)** | *Strengthened operational readiness of Malian national police, gendarmerie, and national guard in view of the elections* | Please leave these fields empty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Objective 1 (Outcome)** | *Enhanced capabilities (knowledge and skills), motivation and opportunities of police, gendarmerie and national guard’s members (at strategic, operational and tactical levels) to ensure security prior, during and after elections* | **% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training programs   Baseline: 0% Target value: 80%** | *Reports* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0%* | *94%* | *0%* | *94%* |  |  |  |
|  |  | **% of police, gendarmerie and national guard fully equipped  Baseline: tbd (assessment mission) Target value: tbd (assessment mission)** | *Reports* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0% (activity planned beyond reporting period)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.1 (Output)** | *Training packages addressing strategic, operational and tactical levels of police, gendarmerie and national guard developed* | **Number of training packages developed  Baseline: 0 Target value: 3 (each covering the three levels)** | *Training packages* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *3* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *3* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *3* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.2 (Output)** | *Training packages for civilian protection units developed (sensitization)* | **Number of training packages developed  Baseline: 0 Target value: 1** | *Institutional frameworks* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.3 (Output)** | *Simulation exercise developed* | **Number of simulation exercises developed  Baseline: 0 Target value: 1** | *Institutional frameworks* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* | *1* | *1 (please refer to interim report)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.4 (Output)** | *Training of master trainers delivered to participants* | **Number of master trainers trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 18** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *18* | *24* | *18* | *24* | *18* | *24* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.5 (Output)** | *Training of trainers delivered to participants* | **Number of trainers trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 48** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *48* | *60* | *48* | *60* | *48* | *60* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.6 (Output)** | *Training of police, gendarmerie and national guard units delivered to participants* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 1200** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *1200* | *1504* | *1200* | *1504* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.7 (Output)** | *Preparation training delivered to 10 Formed Police Units deployed with MINUSMA* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Original target value: 2800 Amended target value: 0** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *2800* | *0* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.8 (Output)** | *Simulation exercise delivered in 8 locations* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Original target value: 3000 Amended target value: 0** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *375* | *400* | *3000* | *400* | *3000* | *400* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.9 (Output)** | *Sensitization of civil protection units delivered to participants* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 380** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *380* | *376* | *380* | *376* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.10 (Output)** | *Equipment provided to police, gendarmerie and national guard’s members* | **Number of equipment provided  Baseline: tbd (assessment mission) Target value: tbd (assessment mission)** | *Reports* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.11 (NEW) (Output)** | *Command post exercise organized for CECOGEC staff and relevant partner* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 60** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.12 (NEW) (Output)** | *Simulation exercise organized following CEPEX* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 1200** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* |  |  |  |
| **Result 1.13 (NEW) (Output)** | *Training of FSM, MSPC, CECOGEC delivered to participants* | **Number of participants trained  Baseline: 0 Target value: 80** | *Reports from training activities* | *(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* | *0 (activity planned beyond reporting period)* |  |  |  |

**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 Crisis Management Capacities of Malian National Police, Gendarmerie and National Guard during Elections)” 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)