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1. **INTRODUCTION**

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) is an international development agency that promotes the right of every woman, man and child to enjoy a life of health and equal opportunity. It works toward delivering a world where every pregnancy is wanted, every childbirth is safe and every young person's potential is fulfilled. UNFPA is a subsidiary organ of the United Nations General Assembly and it plays a unique role within the United Nations System by addressing population and development issues, with an emphasis on sexual and reproductive health (SRH), reproductive rights, and gender equality, within the context of the International Conference of Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action (PoA) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDGs 3 and 5.

One of the major themes of UNFPA’s work is on gender-based violence (GBV). GBV is a significant public health concern in the world, and poses many consequences for the health, social, and economic wellbeing of individuals, especially women and girls who make up the overwhelming majority of GBV survivors. GBV is an impediment to sustainable development, so much so that it was included as Target 2.5 under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to underline the global commitment to end violence against women and girls.

Backed by evidence on the prevalence of GBV and its consequences, countries have been taking significant steps to promote gender equality and address GBV by collaborating with UN agencies, civil society and non-governmental organizations, and other national and international partners.

Within this context, UNFPA together with the Government of Mongolia and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) launched the Combating Gender-Based Violence (CGBV) in Mongolia Project in 2016. The four-year CGBV Project aimed to strengthen the national capacity to prevent and respond to GBV, and it is one of the first and most comprehensive multi-stakeholder initiatives to respond to and prevent GBV, especially domestic violence (DV) in the country.

The Project had 3 key successes thus far:

* **Data Generation:** The Project brought to light the pressing issue of GBV in the country by generating data on the true prevalence of GBV in the country through the landmark National GBV Study, and then by ensuring that this data is communicated to the public and to decision-makers. This increased the public’s understanding about the nature of GBV, as well as instilled a sense of urgency to address the issue. As a result, there was also an increase in the number of reported incidences of GBV/DV, as well as visits to One Stop Service Centers (OSSCs) and other shelters for survivors of violence. To achieve this success, UNFPA partnered with National Statistics Office (NSO) and the National Police Agency (NPA).
* **Policy Advocacy & Public Awareness:** The advocacy, communication, and education work, which was informed by the results of the National GBV Study, planted the seeds of awareness among both duty-bearers and rights-holders. This led to more concrete commitments, such as creating supportive policy frameworks which enabled better response to GBV with better financial and human resources. To achieve this outcome, UNFPA partnered with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection (MLSP), the National Committee on Gender Equality (NCGE), the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), and the Ministry for Education, Culture, Science and Sports (MECSS). The Project has also partnered with several nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and associations to implement various small projects, particularly on public awareness-raising.
* **Survivor Protection Mechanisms:** The survivor protection and multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms, as well as policy frameworks and other guidelines, were developed and put in place. Duty-bearers were capacitated and mobilized, and these frameworks guided their response to GBV to ensure that the services they provide to survivors and perpetrators alike are gender sensitive, compassionate and just. To achieve this success, UNFPA worked with the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA), the Ministry of Health (MOH), the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), and the National Center Against Violence (NCAV). However, at the local level, the Project also closely with provincial and district authorities in priority areas where OSSCs were established. This includes the Chairpersons of the Provincial Assemblies, Governors, the sub-national Coordinating Councils for Crime Prevention, among others.

The CGBV Project is slated to close on 31 May 2020. As such, there is a need to evaluate the Project’s output and outcome vis-à-vis the objectives set out in the Project document. The End-of-Project Evaluation results will be shared with the outgoing and incoming government administration to inform and guide future initiatives in addressing GBV.

1. **CONTEXT**
2. **Snapshot of Mongolia**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Capital:** Ulaanbaatar (population: 1.491.7375 Dec 2018) * **Land area:** 1,564,116 sq km (19th in the world). Landlocked. * **Population:** 3,238,479 (Dec 2018), growth rate 1.91% * **Ethnic groups:** Khalkh 81.9%, Kazak 3.8%, Dorvod 2.7%, Bayad 2.1%, Buryat 1.7%, other 7.8% (2010 est.) * **Literacy rate:** 98.4% (2018) * **MMR:** 27,1 per 100.000 LB (2018) * **Unmet need FP:** 22% (2018) * **TFR:** 2.9 (2018) * **Global Gender Gap Index**: 58rd/149 countries * **Language:** Mongolian * **Currency:** Mongolian tugrik (MNT) | * **Head of State:** President Khaltmaagiin Battulga (since June 2017) * **Head of Government:** Prime Minister Ukhnaagiin Khurelsukh (since Oct 2017) * **Form of Government***:* Parliamentary Republic * **Structure of the Parliament (State Great Hural):** Unicameral: 76 members, elected for a term of four years. * **National elections**: Parliamentary elections held in 2016, next elections are due in June 2020. * **Administrative Structure:** 21 aimags (provinces), 330 soums (rural districts) and 1,575 baghs (primary administrative unit); the capital city - Ulaanbaatar and its 9 districts and 135 khoroos (primary administrative unit in the capital city) * **GDP:** $13.1 billion (2018) * **GDP per capita:** $4,104 (2018) * **GDP growth rates:** 17.5% (2011), 1.37% (2016), 5.45% (2018) * **Inflation:** 7.65% (2018) * **HDI:** 0.741, 92nd (2017) * **Poverty rate:** 21.6% (2014), 29.6% (2016), 28.4%(2018) * **Unemployment:** 9.7% (2018) * **Industries:** Mining (coal, copper, molybdenum, fluorspar, tin, tungsten, and gold); construction and construction materials; oil; food and beverages; processing of animal products, cashmere and natural fibre manufacturing * **Main exports:** copper, apparel, livestock, animal products, cashmere, wool, hides, fluorspar, other nonferrous metals, coal, crude oil * **Main imports:** machinery and equipment, fuel, cars, food products, industrial consumer goods, chemicals, building materials, cigarettes, etc. |

Over the last 15 years, Mongolia has undergone a drastic transformation from a socialist economy to a market economy. It carried out a bold reform agenda aimed at stabilizing the economy, privatizing state firms, strengthening the private sector, establishing fundamental market institutions and improving the investment environment.

While Mongolia recorded the world’s highest GDP growth rate of 17.5% in 2011, GDP substantially dropped to 1.37% in 2016, due to severe economic difficulties largely resulting from the unfavourable global commodity market conditions, slow-down of the China’s economy, and reduced foreign direct investment. As such, Mongolia was downgraded in 2016 from High Middle-Income Country to Low Middle-Income Country status.

The poverty head count declined by more than 11 percentage points from 2010 to 2012. However, it increased to 29.6% in 2016, which then slightly dropped to 28.4% in 2018. The share of the poorest quintile in national consumption has been relatively constant since 2000 despite strong GDP growth and more than 76% increase in GNI per capita from 2009-2012. The Gini coefficient has remained at around 33 since 2009.

The Government has finalized the Sustainable Development vision 2030 (SDV) based on the Global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and has always been a strong supporter to advance the ICPD agenda at national, regional and international levels.

The population of Mongolia is growing at 1.9% annually alongside a national pronatalist stance embedded in policies and programmes. The total fertility rate increased steadily from 2.5 children per woman in 2003 to 3.2 in 2008 and has remained at the current level of 2.9 since then. The country has been successful in reducing mortality, and the life expectancy at birth is 65 years for men and 74 years for women. The maternal mortality ratio has decreased from 199 per 100,000 live births in 1992 to 27.1 in 2018. Mongolia’s population aged 15-34 comprises 36.2% of the total population, and the median age of the population at 27.5 years.

Overall, the population is becoming more urbanized, in 2000, 57% of the population were living in urban areas whereas this has increased to 67.8% in 2018. The population has increasingly concentrated in the capital city Ulaanbaatar, which now accounts for 46% of the population. Dispersed across the rest of the country, more than a third of the population relies on semi-nomadic livestock herding as their primary source of livelihood. About 45.2% of total households live in gers (traditional dwellings 2010 census).

Mongolia achieved all health-related Millennium Development Goal (MDGs) targets except for Tuberculosis. However, disparities still exist particularly affecting young people. The adolescent birth rate is high, 44.4 as per 2018 Social Indicator Sample Survey (SISS). The unmet need for family planning increased from 4.6% in 2003 to 22.0% in 2018, which is particularly high among adolescent women aged 15-19 and women living in urban areas. Of particular concern is the abortion ratio, which was reported at 189 per 1,000 live births in 2013, an increase from 169 in 2008 (229 in urban areas and 118 in rural areas). Also notable are syphilis incidence rates of 60.4 per 10,000 persons among young people aged 15-24 as compared to 32 per 10,000 persons among those aged 25-49. While the HIV prevalence rate has been low below 0.03% among general population, the percentage of youth with comprehensive knowledge of HIV and AIDS is only 20.7% among men and 22.8% among women.

Mongolia has a GII value of 0.301, ranking at 65 out of 160 countries in the 2017 index. In Mongolia, 17.1 percent of parliamentary seats are held by women, and 91.2 percent of adult women have reached at least a secondary level of education compared to 86.3 percent of their male counterparts. Female participation in the labour market is 52.7 percent compared to 66.2 for men. Although women are active in most areas of Mongolia’s economy and society, gender inequalities persist in access to economic opportunities and political decision-making. Further, gender based violence is a serious problem.

Domestic violence is one of the major human rights violations in the country. Furthermore, in 2017, the National Statistics Office and UNFPA Mongolia conducted the very first nation-wide survey on GBV, the report of which was released in June 2018. It is estimated that 57.8% of Mongolia’s ever-partnered women go through one or other forms of violence in their life time; 31.2% on physical and/or sexual violence; and one in 10 women experienced non-partner sexual violence.

1. **Combating Gender-Based Violence (CGBV) in Mongolia Project**

The CGBV Project runs from 1 June 2016 to 31 May 2020 with a budget of USD 2,700,000 from SDC added to UNFPA’s Country Programme 6 budget allocation for targeting violence against women and girls. It aimed at achieving the following results.

**Impact (Overall Goal):** The overall goal of the project is to strengthen national capacity to combat gender-based violence, particularly domestic violence, in Mongolia.

**Project Outcome 1:** Evidence on GBV/DV is generated and sustained for improved policy

**Output 1.1.:** Nationwide survey on GBV, particularly DV, prevalence, root causes, and contributing factors, is conducted and disseminated

**Output 1.2.:** An administrative database on GBV, particularly DV, is strengthened and integrated among relevant agencies

**Project Outcome 2:** Rights-holders and duty-bearers have a better understanding and higher readiness to address GBV.

**Output 2.1.:** Public awareness on GBV, particularly DV, and its consequences is improved

**Output 2.2.:** Duty-bearers’ support for legal frameworks to combat GBV is increased

**Project Outcome 3:** Multidisciplinary response to GBV/DV in pilot provinces and districts is strengthened

**Output 3.1.:** Supportive policy environment for survivor protection and rehabilitation services is improved

**Output 3.2.:** Multidisciplinary response to GBV, particularly DV, is established with effective functioning

1. **OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

The overall objectives of the End-of-Project Evaluation are to (i) enhance the accountability of UNFPA for its performance in implementing the CGBV project, and (ii) broaden the evidence base for the design of succeeding initiatives to prevent and respond to GBV.

The specific objectives of this evaluation are as follows:

* Provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNFPA and its implementing partners in achieving the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the CGBV Project document.
* Draw key lessons from the implementation of the CGBV Project and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations in light of SDG 2030 agenda for the any succeeding initiatives on GBV.

To achieve these, the consultants will fulfill the following purposes:

* Collect quantitative and qualitative data from diverse stakeholders in line with the approved project Results and Resources Framework (RRF) as well as the project M&E framework;
* Analyze the progress of the CGBV Project in fulfilling the output and outcomes listed in the Project document;
* Document the facilitating and constraining factors for the CGBV Project, as well as lessons learned; and
* Produce the End-of-Project report, including recommendations for any future activities and adjustments to current initiatives

The evaluation will cover all interventions under the CGBV Project from July 2016 to February 2020 to analyze the achievement of the Project against expected results at the output and outcome levels, as well as the alignment with UNFPA’s 6th Country Program (2017 to 2021).

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS.**

The evaluation shall systematically use the four OECD-Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. This will be combined with specific assessment questions on the implementation process and crosscutting aspects.

The criterion of relevance brings into focus the correspondence and alignment between the objectives and the strategies of the CGBV Project on the one hand, and the needs, government priorities, and UNFPA’s country programme on the other.

Assessing the effectiveness, the extent to which CGBV Project outputs have been achieved, and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the achievement of the CGBV Project outcomes, will require a comparison of the intended goals, outcomes and outputs with the actual achievement of terms of results.

The efficiency criterion-the extent to which CGBV Project outputs and outcomes have been achieved with the appropriate amount of resources-captures how resources such as funds, expertise, time, among others, have been used by the Project team and converted into the results along the results chain.

Finally, the sustainability of the Project is related to the likelihood that benefits from the CGBV Project will continue after UNFPA funding is terminated and the corresponding interventions are closed.

The following are the preliminary evaluation questions specific to the above criteria:

1. **Overall Impacts**
2. What has happened as a result of the project, and what changes have occurred in the community and the country that are attributable to the project?
3. What are the intended and unintended results of the project since 2016?
4. What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary short, mid, and long-term effects produced by the project?
5. **Relevance**
6. Was the project relevant and appropriate to a country context?
7. Did the project take into account the current situation and needs of the population of Mongolia, especially the GBV/DV victims/survivors?
8. Does the project respond to national priorities?
9. Do the project stakeholders and target groups find the project useful and important for their needs and the needs of the country?
10. Is there synergy between the project interventions and interventions by other development partners? Or, does the project interventions complement projects by other development partners?
11. **Efficiency**
12. Are the interventions conducted and objectives achieved in a cost-efficient manner by the project?
13. Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
14. What was the timeliness of inputs (technical assistance, capacity building activities including training, equipment, etc.)?
15. Did the project activities overlap and duplicate with similar interventions?
16. **Effectiveness**
17. How did the inputs and activities lead to the outputs and outcomes?
18. To what extent have the expected results and planned outcomes have been achieved?
19. What are the key factors influencing and/ or not influencing the achievement (s)?
20. What was the intervention coverage – were the planned geographical area and target group successfully reached?
21. What were the achievements in terms of promoting gender equality and equity?
22. **Sustainability**
23. Is the project likely to have lasting results after project termination?
24. Are the positive effects sustainable?
25. How is the sustainability or the continuity of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
26. To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like economic, social and cultural aspects?
27. Are stakeholders ready to continue supporting or carrying out project activities?
28. How sustainable are the innovative initiatives piloted?
29. Did the project design include strategies to ensure sustainability? Were the strategies used from the beginning of project implementation? Was there an adequate strategy for capacity building?
30. **Implementation Process**
31. Were roles and responsibilities amongst stakeholders clearly identified?
32. What kinds of implementation problems have emerged and how are they being addressed?
33. How has technical assistance been provided and what was the quality of the technical assistance?
34. What are the project’s strengths and weaknesses?
35. **Crosscutting Aspects**
36. To what extent did the project employ the human rights-based approach in the design and implementation of the interventions?
37. Did the project have strategies aiming at the participation of all targeted groups, and particularly those who are marginalized (disabled, socio-ethnic minority groups, sexual minority, people living in rural areas, etc.)? How effectively were the strategies targeting the above mentioned groups have been implemented and were they relevant and successful?
38. Have the measures for empowering the less autonomous groups been taken, what was the outcome?
39. How did the project take into account the specific needs and strategic interests of men and women? To what degree was the participation of men/women instigated?
40. Has the Project monitoring system-integrated sex disaggregated data?
41. **METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH**

*Evaluation Approach*

The Evaluation will utilize a mixed method approach, using qualitative and quantitative methods, as necessary. The theory of change used to design the CGBV Project, its Operational Plans, Project documents and existing Mid-Term Review will be reviewed as necessary, based on stakeholder consultations to provide the basis for this evaluation.

The evaluation will pay special attention to ensure equity, gender and human rights-based and survivor-centric approaches are embedded into the data collection and analysis. The evaluation will be transparent, inclusive and participatory as well as gender and human rights responsive. It will seek and utilize data disaggregated by age, gender, vulnerable groups, etc. to ensure findings are gender reflective and targeted.

*Sampling Strategy*

The consultants will identify suitable sampling strategy to select, interventions to scrutinize, field visits to conduct, as well as stakeholders to interview. Sampled sites and stakeholders should reflect the full range of interventions under the CGBV Project in terms of themes and across priority geographic areas of work as well as target groups.

*Data Collection*

Primary data will be collected at the national and sub-national levels through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and direct observation during field visits, as appropriate.

Secondary data will be collected through desk review of existing literature (evaluations, research and assessments conducted by CO and other partners in the country), annual reviews/progress reports, and other monitored data.

*Validation mechanisms*

The consultants will use a variety of methods to ensure the validity of the data collected, including systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection. Further, the consultants will validate findings with key stakeholders and ensure that there are no factual or interpretive errors or missing evidence that could materially change findings.

*Stakeholder participation*

An inclusive approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders, will be taken. Communication with stakeholders with respect to its purpose, the criteria applied, and the intended use of the findings will be ensured at all stages of the evaluation. The evaluation team will perform a stakeholder 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 include representatives from the government, civil-society organizations, the private-sector, other UN organizations, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and most importantly, the beneficiaries of the programme. Every effort will be made to include key stakeholders as part of the evaluation process either as sources of data (primary/secondary) or through their representation in the ERG.

*Evaluation audience*

Findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the End-of-Project Evaluation shall be used to assess the achievements of the CGBV Project and to inform the development of the second phase of the Project and other initiatives targeting GBV. For transparency and accountability purposes, the End-of-Project evaluation report shall be communicated to all stakeholders including UNFPA staff and the Executive Board, national partners, government, civil society organizations and donors.

1. **EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will unfold in five phases that are outlined below:

1. **Preparation phase**

This phase will include:

* Drafting the evaluation Terms of Reference;
* Approval of the ToR;
* Recruitment of consultants;
* Introduction of international and national consultants;
* Compilation of initial documentation list;
* Stakeholders mapping and compilation of list of projects and its key interventions.

1. **Design phase** 
   * Conduct desk review of all relevant documents regarding the CGBV Project
   * Develop a stakeholder map of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation and their corresponding strength of relationship to the Project. The mapping exercise will include state and civil society actors as well as other development actors.
   * Reconstruct and revisit the Project’s Theory of Change (TOC) that links planned activities to the intended results of the Project
   * Develop the evaluation matrix by finalizing the evaluation questions, identifying related assumptions and indicators to be addressed, and identifying data sources
   * Develop a data collection and analysis strategy, as well as a concrete work plan with timelines for the field phase
   * Specify the limitations and challenges expected to be faced when conducting the evaluation, as well as any mitigation efforts to be taken to overcome these
   * Share with the Project team for review, discussion, and finalization of the report addressing all comments received
   * Clearance of the design report by UNFPA’s Gender Programme team and senior management

At this stage, the consultants gain an in-depth understanding of both the CGBV Project and the country context. Evaluation questions are selected and adapted and the most appropriate method of data collection and analysis are proposed. From a sampling framework of comprehensive stakeholder’s map, the evaluators select a sample of stakeholders to interview during the field phase. The methodological approach to sampling will also be described.

At the end of the design phase, the consultants will produce a *design report*that will outline the detailed evaluation methodology, criteria, timeframes and the structure of the final report. The design report must include the evaluation matrix, stakeholders map, final evaluation questions and indicators, 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. The design report should also present the reconstructed project intervention cause-and-effect logic linking actual needs, inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes of the programme. The design report needs to be reviewed and approved by UNFPA Mongolia’s Gender Programme team and management before the evaluation field phase commences. The consultants will perform these tasks in close cooperation with the UNFPA CO personnel, particularly with a view to: (i) refine the evaluation questions; (ii) consolidate the stakeholders mapping; and (iii) identify additional documentation.

1. **Field Phase**

After the design phase, the consultants will undertake the collection and analysis of the data required in order to answer the evaluation questions final list consolidated at the design phase. The consultants will collect data through individual interviews, group discussions and focus groups, and by way of consulting additional documentation. Towards the end of the field phase, the consultants will analyze the collected data and produce a set of preliminary findings, complimented by tentative conclusions and emerging, preliminary recommendations. These provisional evaluation results are presented to the Gender Programme team during a debriefing meetings to be scheduled at the end of the field phase.

1. **Reporting Phase**

During this phase, the consultants will continue the analytical work initiated during the field phase, taking into account comments made by the CO staff, partners and other involved stakeholders.

The consultants submit a draft final evaluation report to the Gender Programme team, who then reviews and quality assures draft report. Upon Gender Programme team’s consideration of the draft evaluation report being of adequate quality, the report is shared with implementing partners for comments while respecting the independence of the evaluation team in expressing its judgement. Based on the comments, the consultants proceed with the production of the final evaluation report. This will be done through a validation workshop facilitated by the consultants.

1. **Facilitation of Use and Dissemination Phase**

During this phase, the consultants together with the Gender Programme team will ensure the final report and other evaluation knowledge products are shared with relevant stakeholders and rights-holders through relevant channels and communication and knowledge management platforms. The Gender Programme team will also share the final report with relevant units of UNFPA and invite them submit a management response. The Gender Programme team consolidates all responses in a final management response document and the Gender Programme team is responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of the recommendations. The final report of the evaluation will then be posted on the CO website.

1. **EXPECTED OUTPUT AND DELIVERABLES**
2. **Overall Deliverables**

One international consultant and one national consultant will be hired for the End-of-Project Evaluation. The consultants are expected to produce the following deliverables:

1. An approved design report including (as a minimum):
   * Stakeholder Map
   * Evaluation Matrix, including the final list of evaluation questions and the corresponding judgment criteria and indicators
   * Overall evaluation design and methodology, with a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase
2. A debriefing presentation document (Power Point) synthesizing the main preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation to be presented and discussed with the Gender Programme team during the debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase
3. A draft final evaluation report, possibly followed by a second draft that takes into account any comments from UNFPA
4. A Power Point presentation of the results of the evaluation for the in-country stakeholder validation workshop
5. An approved final evaluation report (with annexes) based on comments expressed during the in-country stakeholder validation workshop
6. An evaluation brief, i.e., a 2-3-page summary of the key evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

All deliverables will be in English and Mongolian.

1. **Deliverables of the International Consultant**

To fulfill the abovementioned deliverables, the international consultant is expected to lead the End-of-Project Evaluation process, methodology development, data analysis, and report development. The specific responsibilities of the international consultant are as follows:

* Lead the overall evaluation process in cooperation with the national consultant
* Lead the development of the Design Report, including the tools for data collection. The international consultant is also expected to spearhead the process of validating the proposed design with key stakeholders with the final approval of UNFPA
* Lead the data collection process (both primary and secondary), and the analysis of the data
* Lead the process of developing the draft and final evaluation reports
* Present the key findings to UNFPA Mongolia and relevant stakeholders during an in-country stakeholder validation workshop, and incorporate feedback received into the final report

The overall supervision and strategic guidance of the consultants will be provided by the UNFPA Head of Office and Assistant Representative. However, they will be under the direct supervision and day-to-day guidance of the NPO on Gender and will work closely with the Gender Programme team and other relevant staff in the country office. The consultants will be stationed at UNFPA Country Office in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. However, in addition to traveling within the city, it is expected that the consultant/s will travel to some provinces to meet with the key stakeholders, such as government officials, ministries and civil society organizations. UNFPA will facilitate logistical support for the consultants.

1. **WORK PLAN AND INDICATIVE TIMELINE OF DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PHASE** | **DELIVERABLES** | **DATES** |
| **Preparatory Phase** | Approval of the TOR | 9 January 2019 |
| Recruitment of the Consultants | 9 February 2020 |
| **Design Phase** | Draft Design Report | 21 February 2020 |
|  | Final Design Report | 28 February 2020 |
| **Field Phase** | Data Collection | March 2020 |
| **Reporting Phase** | Final Report Draft #1 | By 27 March 2020 |
| Final Report Draft #1 | By 3 April 2020 |
| In-Country Stakeholder Validation Workshop | By 10 April 2020 |
| Final Report, Evaluation Brief | 30 April 2020 |
| **Dissemination Phase** | Dissemination of Report within the CO | 1 May 2020 |
| Finalization of Management Response | 20 May 2020 |
| Dissemination of Report to all Stakeholders | 22 May 2020 |

1. **MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT**
2. **Minimum Qualifications for the International Consultant**

* Advanced degree from a recognized academic institution in development studies, social science, public health, gender equality and/ or GBV related field
* At least 8-10 years’ experience in conducting project/programme evaluations, including practical field experience
* Experience of data analysis, both quantitative and qualitative especially familiarly with quantitative data analysis methods, and, and proven track record of producing high quality reports
* Extensive experience in working in countries of the Asia-Pacific region, and past experience with Mongolia is highly desirable
* Experience in working on human rights and gender equality particularly in GBV field is desirable
* Experience in working with United Nations and engaging with government and ministries, as well as CSOs is desirable
* Advanced and demonstrable analytical and writing skills
* Fluency in English (both oral and written) is required

1. **Required Competencies for All Consultants**

* Demonstrates commitment to human development principles and values
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Shares knowledge and experience
* Demonstrates excellent communication skills
* Provides helpful feedback and advice
* Knowledgeable about issues of human rights, gender, population, and statistics and policy research in general

1. **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Below is an initial list of documents for review by the consultants:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** |
| 1 | Combating Gender-Based Violence (CGBV) Project Document |
| 2 | CGBV Project Log Frame |
| 3 | CGBV Project Annual and Quarterly Reports |
| 4 | CGBV Project Mid-Term Report |
| 5 | CGBV Project Communication Strategy & Key Messages document |
| 6 | CGBV Project press releases and other publicity materials |
| 7 | National GBV Study 2018 |
| 8 | Mongolian Government’s Sustainable Development Vision 2020 |
| 9 | United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2017-2021 |
| 10 | Country Programme Document (2017-2021) |
| 11 | Law Combating Domestic Violence |

**ANNEXES**

1. **ANNEX 1: UNEG/UNFPA Ethical Code of Conduct for 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

**Evaluation Team /Evaluators:**

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/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest 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. 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 evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. 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. They 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/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21>

1. **ANNEX 2: Outline of the Structure of the Design & Final Evaluation Reports**

**ANNEX 2.1.: Design Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **CONTENTS** |
| 1 | Cover Page |
| 2 | Second Page   * Country Map (half-page) * Table (half-page)   Evaluation Team  Titles / Position in Team Names |
| 3 | Third Page   * Table of Contents |
| 4 | Fourth Page onwards   * Report Contents  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Section** | **Title** | **Suggested Length** | | Chapter 1 | Introduction | 1 – 2 pages | | 1.1. | Purpose and objectives of the CGBV Project evaluation |  | | 1.2. | Scope of the evaluation |  | | 1.3. | Purpose of the design report |  | | Chapter 2 | Country Context | 4 – 6 pages | | 2.1. | GBV in Mongolia |  | | 2.2. | Relevant national strategies and policy frameworks |  | | Chapter 3 | CGBV Project | 5 – 7 pages | | Chapter 4 | Methodological Approach | 7 – 10 pages | | 4.1. | Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions |  | | 4.2. | Methods for data collection and analysis |  | | 4.3. | Selection of the sample of stakeholders |  | | 4.4. | Evaluability assessment, limitations and risks |  | | Chapter 5 | Work Plan | 3 – 5 pages | | 5.1. | Process overview |  | | 5.2. | Team composition and distribution of tasks |  | | 5.3. | Resource requirements and logistics support |  | | 5.4. | Work plan |  | |
| 5 | Annexes   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Annexes |  |  | | 1 | Terms of Reference |  | | 2 | Evaluation Matrix |  | | 3 | Templates or outlines of data-collection methods (e.g. interview protocols/ guides, logbooks or equivalent, survey questionnaires) |  | | 4 | Stakeholders map and list of persons consulted |  | | 5 | Bibliography/documents consulted |  | |
| 6 | Abbreviations and Acronyms |
| 7 | List of Tables |
| 8 | List of Figures |
| 9 | Key Facts table |

**ANNEX 2.2.: Final Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **CONTENTS** |
| 1 | Cover Page |
| 2 | Second Page   * Country Map (half-page) * Table (half-page)   Evaluation Team  Titles / Position in Team Names |
| 3 | Third Page   * Acknowledgements |
| 4 | Fourth Page   * Table of Contents |
| 5 | Fifth Page   * Abbreviations & Acronyms * List of Tables * List of Figures |
| 6 | Sixth Page   * Key Facts Table |
| 7 | Seventh Page onwards   * Report Contents  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Section** | **Title** | **Suggested Length** | |  | Executive Summary | 2 – 5 pages | | Chapter 1 | Introduction | 5 - 7 pages | | 1.1. | Purpose and objectives of the CGBV Project evaluation |  | | 1.2. | Scope of the evaluation |  | | 1.3. | Methodology & Process |  | | Chapter 2 | Country Context | 4 – 6 pages | | 2.1. | GBV in Mongolia |  | | 2.2. | Relevant national strategies and policy frameworks |  | | Chapter 3 | CGBV Project | 5 – 7 pages | | 3.1. | Project Outcomes and Output |  | | 3.2. | Overview of the Project’s Results |  | | Chapter 4 | Findings & Answers to the Evaluation Questions | 20 – 25 pages | | Chapter 5 | Conclusion | 3 – 5 pages | | 5.1. | Strategic Level |  | | 5.2. | Programmatic Level |  | | Chapter 6 | Recommendations | 3 – 5 pages | | **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES** | | 42 – 55 pages | |
| 8 | Annexes   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Annexes |  |  | | 1 | Terms of Reference |  | | 2 | List of Persons/Institutions Met |  | | 3 | List of Documents Consulted |  | | 4 | Evaluation Matrix |  | | 5 | Questionnaires used for FGDs, Interviews, etc. |  | |

1. **ANNEX 3: Template for the Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assumptions to be assessed** | **Indicators** | **Sources of information** | **Methods and tools for the data collection** |
| **Evaluation question 1** | | | |
| **Assumption 1:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 2:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 3:** |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **Evaluation question 2** | | | |
| **Assumption 1:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 2:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 3:** |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **Evaluation question 3** | | | |
| **Assumption 1:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 2:** |  |  |  |
| **Assumption 3:** |  |  |  |
|  | | | |

1. **ANNEX 4: Evaluation Quality Assessment Template & Exploratory Note**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **Organizational Unit:** | | | | | **Year of Report** | | | |
| **Title of Evaluation Report:** | | | | | | | | |
| **Overall Quality of Report:** | | |  | | **Date of Assessment:** | | | |
| **Overall Comments:** | | | | |  | | | |
|  | | | | |  | | | |
| **Assessment Levels:** | | | | | | | | |
| **Very Good** | strong, above average, best practice | **Good** | | satisfactory, respectable | **Fair** | with some weaknesses, still acceptable | **Unsatisfactory** | weak, does not meet minimal quality standards |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality Assessment Criteria** | *Insert assessment level followed by main comments*  *(use ‘shading’ function to give cells corresponding color)* | |
| * + - 1. **Structure & Clarity of Reporting** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly*   * Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible non-technical language appropriate for the intended audience)? * Is the report focused and to the point (e.g. not too lengthy)? * Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)? * Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography, a list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix and methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?   *Executive summary*   * Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation? * Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)? * Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5-10 pages)? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Design & Methodology** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context*   * Does the evaluation describe whether the evaluation is for accountability and/or learning purposes? * Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation? * Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described? * Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change? * Does the evaluation explain any constraints and/or general limitations?   *To ensure a rigorous design and methodology*   * Is the evaluation approach and framework clearly described? Does it establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection? * Were the methods chosen appropriate for addressing the evaluation questions? Are the tools for data collection described and justified? * Are the methods for analysis clearly described? * Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their impact on the evaluation described? (Does it discuss how any bias has been overcome?) * Is the sampling strategy described? Does the design include validation techniques? * Is there evidence of involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation design? (Is there a comprehensive/credible stakeholder map?) * Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data? * Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Reliability of Data** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes*   * Did the evaluation triangulate all data collected? * Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of qualitative and quantitative data sources? * Did the evaluation make explicit any possible issues (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues? I.e. did the evaluation make explicit possible limitations of the data collected? * Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations? * Is there adequate gender disaggregation of data? And if this has not been possible, is it explained? * Does the evaluation make explicit the level of involvement of different stakeholders in the different phases of the evaluation process? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Analysis & Findings** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To ensure sound analysis*   * Is information analysed and interpreted systematically and logically? * Are the interpretations based on carefully described assumptions? * Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions? * Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data? * Are possible cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained? * Where possible, is the analysis disaggregated to show different outcomes between different target groups? * Are unintended results identified? * Is the analysis presented against contextual factors? * Does the analysis include reflection of the views of different stakeholders (reflecting diverse interests)? E.g. how were possible divergent opinions treated in the analysis? * Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?   *To ensure credible findings*   * Can evidence be traced through the analysis into findings? E.g. are the findings substantiated by evidence? * Do findings follow logically from the analysis? * Is the analysis of cross-cutting issues integrated in the findings? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Conclusions** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To assess the validity of conclusions*   * Are conclusions credible and clearly related to the findings? * Are the conclusions demonstrating an appropriate level of analytical abstraction? * Are conclusions conveying the evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Recommendations** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations*   * Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions? * Are the recommendations sufficiently clear, targeted at the intended users and operationally-feasible? * Do recommendations reflect stakeholders’ consultations whilst remaining balanced and impartial? * Is the number of recommendations manageable? * Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation? | **Comments:** | |
| * + - 1. **Gender** | **Assessment Level:** |  |
| *To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW)[[1]](#footnote-1)*   * Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected? * Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved? * Were gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected? * Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis? | **Comments:** | |

**Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Level:** |  | | | |
| **Comments:** |  | **Good** | **Fair** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Assessment Level:** | | | | |
| **Comments:** |  |  |  | **7** |
| **Assessment Level:** |  |  | **13** |  |
| **Comments:** |  |  | **11** |  |
| **Assessment Level:** |  |  | **40** |  |
| **Comments:** |  | **11** |  |  |
| **Assessment Level:** |  | **11** |  |  |
| **Comments:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Assessment Level:** |  | **22** | **63** | **7** |
| **Comments:** |  |  | **Fair** |  |
| **Assessment Level:** |  | **Good** 🡆 confident to use | **Fair** 🡆 use with caution | **Unsatisfactory** 🡆 not confident to use |

**(\*) (a)** Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if ‘finding and analysis’ has been assessed as ‘good’, enter 40 into ‘Good’ column. **(b)** Assessment level with highest ‘total scoring points’ determines ‘Overall assessment level of evaluation report’. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. ‘Fair’). **(c)** Use ‘shading’ function to give cells corresponding colour.

**If the overall assessment is “Fair”, please explain[[2]](#footnote-2):**

* How can it be used?
* What are the aspects to be cautious about?

**Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment “Very Good”, “Good”, or “Unsatisfactory”[[3]](#footnote-3):**

**Consideration of significant constraints[[4]](#footnote-4):**

The Quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

⬜ Yes ⬜ No

If yes, please explain:

1. **ANNEX 5: Management Response Template**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UNFPA**  **Management Response** | **Combating Gender-Based Violence in Mongolia Project** |

*Note: The following management response lists the recommendations as they appear in the evaluation report. Please refer to the report for more details on each recommendation. Recommendations may be organized by clusters, e.g.: strategic recommendations, recommendations associated with the country programme, recommendations associated with cross-cutting issues. Within each cluster, recommendations should be ranked by priority levels (from 1 to 3).*

Instructions for completing the management response:

1. Boxes in white to be completed upon receiving the present request

2. Boxes in grey to be completed one year later

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 1: Strategic recommendations** | | | | | | |
| **Recommendation #** | **To ………. *(e.g Executive Director’s Office*)** | | | | **Priority Level ….*(from 1 to 3)*** | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Management response-** *Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation*: ……………………………………………………………………………………... …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | | **Deadline** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Annual implementation status updates** | | |
| **Status (ongoing or completed)** | | **Comments** |
|  | |  |  |  | |  |
|  | |  |  |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation #** | **To ……….(*e.g. Country office*)** | | | **Priority level …..** | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Management response-** *Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation*: ……………………………………………………………………………………... …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Deadline** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Annual implementation status updates** | | |
| **Status (ongoing or completed)** | | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 2: Recommendations associated with the programme** | | | | | |
| **Recommendation #** | **To ………..** | | | **Priority level …..** | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Management response-** *Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation*: ……………………………………………………………………………………... …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Deadline** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Annual implementation status updates** | | |
| **Status (ongoing or completed)** | | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clusters 3: Recommendations associated with cross-cutting issues** | | | | | |
| **Recommendation #** | **To …………** | | | **Priority level …..** | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Management response-** *Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation*: ……………………………………………………………………………………... …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Deadline** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Annual implementation status updates** | | |
| **Status (ongoing or completed)** | | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |

1. **ANNEX 7: United Nations-approved editing guidelines**

**Instructions for the preparation of documents**

**Length of reports**

Reports originating in the Secretariat must not exceed 8,500 words in length (10,700 words for documents not originating in the Secretariat), including any footnotes, headings or hidden text. A waiver must be requested for reports that exceed the limit.

**Format**

Manuscripts should be transmitted for processing in electronic form. For technical specifications on format and media to be used in preparing documents at Headquarters, see the latest version of the DGACM guide to document submission.

For documents prepared at offices away from Headquarters, click on the links below:

United Nations Office at Geneva

United Nations Office at Nairobi

United Nations Office at Vienna

Main headings and subheadings should be in bold print. Initial capitals are used only for the first word and words normally capitalized. For more detailed instructions, see Format/Headings and subheadings and Mastheads and cover pages.

Italics and bold print are not used for emphasis, except where the General Assembly has requested the use of bold print for recommendations (see also Italics and bold print).

**Revised texts**

If a text is a revised version of a previously issued document (such as a draft resolution), or is the final version of a report already submitted in draft form for advance editing/translation, all changes, including deletions, must be clearly indicated by means of Microsoft Word track changes.

**References and quotations**

Manuscripts should not include lengthy quotations from texts previously circulated as United Nations documents, such as General Assembly resolutions and earlier reports of the Secretary-General, nor should such texts or excerpts therefrom be attached as annexes.

Internal cross-references should be carefully checked in the final draft, as the paragraph numbers may have changed from those in earlier drafts.

Necessary quotations and references should be carefully checked for accuracy. In the case of United Nations documents, paragraph numbers, not pages, should be cited.

For more detailed instructions, see Editorial guidelines/Style/Quotations.

**Abbreviations and acronyms**

Abbreviations and acronyms should always be explained. The full name should be spelled out the first time it occurs in the text, or a complete list should be provided.

Abbreviations and acronyms are not used for the names of Member States, most commissions, committees or other subsidiary bodies, major United Nations offices, Secretariat departments, or in document titles or internal headings.

Names of subsidiary bodies, major United Nations offices and Secretariat departments should be given in full the first time they occur in a text. Short titles (e.g. "the Council", "the "Commission", "the Department") are used thereafter.

For a list of abbreviations and acronyms used in United Nations documents, see Editorial guidelines/Style/Abbreviations and acronyms.

**Names**

For geographical names, including countries, see UNTERM. If the location does not appear therein, the GeoNames database of the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency is a useful guide.

For individuals, corporations etc., verify correct names or most commonly used spellings or transliterations, and use consistently throughout.

When general terms such as president, representative and so on are used, it would be helpful to the translators to indicate the gender of the person.

When animal or plant species are mentioned, the scientific (Latin) designation should be included in addition to the common or vernacular name, as the latter may not provide sufficient information to allow an accurate translation.

**Use of the first person**

The first person may be used in reports of the Secretary-General.

**Additional guidelines**

For further guidelines on drafting and format, see Editorial guidelines/Basic documents and Format.

**Country names and currencies**

Country names and currencies are listed in the United Nations Multilingual Terminology Database (http://untermportal.un.org). To start your search, enter the name of the country in the “search” field. Under "subjects" on the left pane, click on "country names", then click on "view" beside the entry. Both the short and formal country names are given. The short form is used for most purposes in the United Nations. The formal name is generally used in legal texts, such as treaties.

The country name is normally given after the name of a city, unless the city is the capital.

Except in communications from Member States, country names should not be used in the possessive form: the population of the Sudan, not the Sudan's population

In communications from Member States issued as United Nations documents, the country designations used by the author of the communication are retained in the edited text, even if they are not consistent with established United Nations terminology. For further information, see "Communications from Member States" in Editorial guidelines/Policy questions.

In reports containing information from Member States that is reproduced as received, the designations used by the Member States are not changed and the following disclaimer is inserted as a footnote on the cover page of the report:

Note: The information provided by Member States has been reproduced as received. The designations employed do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations Secretariat concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area, or of its authorities.

**Footnotes and other references**

**Contents**

I. Introduction

II. General instructions on footnotes and text notes

A. When to use footnotes and text notes

B. Placement of footnotes

C. Excessive referencing

D. Electronic sources

E. Points of style

III. United Nations sources

A. Masthead documents

B. Reports issued as supplements to the Official Records

C. Sales publications

D. Reports of conferences

E. Resolutions and decisions

F. Statements and oral reports made before a United Nations body

G. Instruments in the Treaty Series

H. Advisory opinions, judgments and orders of the International Court of Justice

I. Conference room papers

J. Restricted documents

K. Material on the website of an office or department

IV. Outside sources

A. Documents of other organizations

B. Books and publications

C. Publishing data: special issues

D. Government publications

E. Legal references

F. Working papers and research reports in a published series

G. Articles and chapters in a book or publication

H. Articles in a periodical

I. Articles in a newspaper

J. Articles on a website

K. Unpublished papers and dissertations

L. Databases

M. Public statements

N. Interviews

O. Personal communications

P. Multimedia sources

V. Repeated references

A. Repeated footnote indicators

B. Use of ibid.

C. Shortened references

D. Repeated footnotes in tables and figures

VI. Permission footnotes

VII. Explanatory footnotes

A. Content

B. Notes to explanatory footnotes

C. Supplementary sources of information

VIII. Cross references

IX. Footnote indicators

A. Types of indicators

B. Placement of indicators in the text

C. Numbered footnotes

D. Footnotes indicated by lower-case letters

E. Footnotes indicated by asterisks and other symbols

X. Reference lists and bibliographies

A. Author-date system

B. Keyed references

C. General bibliographies and lists of sources

**Policy questions**

Links on this page will connect you to policy documents that may be of interest to authors and editors, including editorial directives and documents in the series “Regulations for the control and limitation of documentation”.

**Covers and title pages of publications (Editorial Manual, article H 1, pp. 467-472)**

**Attribution of authorship**

**Copyright principles, practice and procedure**

1987

1992

**Criteria for the selection of material to be issued as United Nations publications**

**Mention of names of commercial firms (Editorial Manual, article H 8, p. 502)**

**Newsletters and other information materials in printed or electronic format**

**Use of the United Nations emblem on documents and publications (Editorial Manual, article H 3, pp. 478-485)**

**Papers and reports of seminars and similar meetings (Editorial Manual, article H 9, pp. 503-511)**

**ISBN and ISSN for United Nations publications**

**Categories of distribution of documents and meeting records (Editorial Manual, article H 4, pp. 487-88)**

**Guidelines for publication of maps**

**References and acknowledgements**

**Guidelines for electronic publishing**

**Guidelines for publishing in an electronic format**

**United Nations Internet publishing**

**Terminology: “Persian Gulf” and “Gulf”**

**Nomenclature: Falkland Islands (Malvinas)**

**Guidelines for gender-inclusive language**

**Proofreading marks**

Use standard proofreading marks (see model) to help speed up the editing process and make it possible for colleagues to understand the changes made to a document.

1. This assessment criterion is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool, see Annex 7. Each sub-criterion shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory). One question is if this criterion should be included in the overall evaluation quality assessment grid, or form a separate column and be assessed on its own. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The purpose here is to clarify in what way the report can be used. This in order to assist the elaboration of a relevant Management Response and the wider use of the evaluation findings back into programming. When a report has been assessed as Fair, it is obligatory to fill this text box in. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The purpose is, where relevant, to clarify for example severe unbalances in the report (for example, the report is good overall but recommendations very weak). Is optional to fill in. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This should only be used in case of significant events that has severely hampering the evaluation process like natural disasters, evaluators falling sick, unexpected significant travel restrictions, etc. More ‘normal’ limitations should be mentioned under relevant section above. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)