



**GENERIC TORS FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF MDG-F
JOINT PROGRAMMES**

English - July 2012

GENERIC TORs FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF MDG-F JOINT PROGRAMMES

1. GENERAL CONTEXT: MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND (MDG-F)

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples' life in 50 countries by accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 130 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OEDC/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results.
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDGS, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one.
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Colombia, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

The following points should be provided by the joint programme team

- Describe the joint programme, programme name and goals; include when it started, what outputs and outcomes are sought, its contribution to the MDGs at the local and national levels, its duration and current stage of implementation.
- Summarize the joint programme's scale of complexity, including its components, targeted participants (direct and indirect), geographical scope (regions) and the socio-economic context in which it operates.
- It is also useful to describe the human and financial resources that the joint programme has at its disposal, the number of programme implementation partners (UN, national and local governments and other stakeholders in programme implementation).
- Changes noted in the programme since implementation began, and how the programme fits in with the priorities of the National Development Strategies as well as the MDG Fund.

The commissioner of the evaluation is seeking high-qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation, of this joint programme.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the "Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy" and the "Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund". These documents stipulate that **all joint programmes will commission and finance a final independent evaluation.**

Final evaluations are **summative** in nature and seek to:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results.
2. Generate substantive evidence based knowledge, on one or more of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in this terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period between four and six months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Measure the joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. Measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. **(MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).**
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level:

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.**
 - a) To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant (assess including link to MDGs, UNDAF and national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process)?
 - b) How much and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
 - c) To what extent was this programme designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (see MDG-F joint programme guidelines.)
 - d) To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - e) To what extent the implementing partners participating in the joint programme had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
 - f) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?

- g) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?
- h) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed? Did the JP follow the mid-term evaluation recommendations on the programme design?

Process level

- **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.**
 - a) To what extent did the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
 - b) To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
 - c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
 - d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
 - e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
 - f) What was the progress of the JP in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by agency? Where there are large discrepancies between agencies, these should be analyzed.
 - g) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
 - h) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the joint programme? Was it useful? Did the joint programme implement the improvement plan?
- **Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions**
 - a) To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?
 - b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?

Results level

- **Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.**
 - a) To what extent did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document? (detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs, 2) achievement of results).
 - b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute:
 1. To the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
 2. To the goals set in the thematic window?
 3. To the Paris Declaration, in particular the principle of national ownership? (consider JP's policy, budgets, design, and implementation)
 4. To the goals of delivering as one at country level?
 - c) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
 - d) To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted citizens?
 - e) Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
 - f) What type of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?
 - g) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
 - h) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?
 - i) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation recommendations contribute to the JP's achievement of development results?
- **Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**
 - a) To what extent the joint programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?
 - b) At local and national level:
 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
 2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
 3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
 4. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
 - c) To what extent will the joint programme be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?

- d) To what extent did the joint programme align itself with the National Development Strategies and/or the UNDAF?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TORs and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, mid-term evaluations and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. Consultants are also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool as a means to collect relevant data for the final evaluation. The evaluation team will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of targeted citizens/participants of the joint programme are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

- **Inception Report** (to be submitted within 15 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team).

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. **The report will follow the outline stated in Annex 1.**

- **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 20 days after the completion of the field visit, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft final report will be shared with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. **This report will contain the sections establish in Annex 2.**

7. EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY STANDARDS

The following UNEG standards should be taken into account when writing all evaluation reports¹:

1. The **final report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations** and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis (S-3.16).

NOTE: Using evidence implies making a statement based on valid and reliable facts, documents, surveys, triangulation of informants' views or any other appropriate means or techniques that contribute to create the internal validity of the evaluation. It is not enough to just state an informed opinion or reproduce an informant's take on a specific issue.

2. **A reader of an evaluation report must be able to understand:** the purpose of the evaluation; exactly what was evaluated; how the evaluation was designed and conducted; what evidence was found; what conclusions were drawn; what recommendations were made; what lessons were distilled. (S-3.16)
3. In all cases, evaluators should strive to **present results as clearly and simply as possible** so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results.(S-3.16)
4. **The level of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation** should be described, including the rationale for selecting that particular level. (S-4.10)
5. **The Executive Summary should “stand alone”**, providing a synopsis of the substantive elements of the evaluation. The level of information should provide the uninitiated reader with a clear understanding of what was found and recommended and what was learned from the evaluation. (see Outline in Annex 2 for more details). (S-4.2)
6. **The joint programme being evaluated should be clearly described** (as short as possible while ensuring that all pertinent information is provided). It should include the purpose, logic model, expected results chain and intended impact, its implementation strategy and key assumptions. Additional important elements include: the importance, scope and scale of the joint programme; a description of the recipients/ intended beneficiaries and stakeholders; and budget figures. (S-4.3)
7. The **role and contributions of the UN organizations and other stakeholders** to the joint programme being evaluated should be clearly described (who is involved, roles and contributions, participation, leadership). (S-4.4)

¹ See UNEG Guidance Document “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, UNEG/FN/Standards(2005). http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

8. **In presenting the findings, inputs, outputs, and outcomes/ impacts should be measured to the extent possible (or an appropriate rationale given as to why not).** The report should make a logical distinction in the **findings, showing the progression from implementation to results with an appropriate measurement** (use benchmarks when available) and analysis of the results chain (and unintended effects), or a rationale as to why an analysis of results was not provided. Findings regarding inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from outputs, outcomes. (S-4.12)
9. Additionally, reports should **not segregate findings by data source.** (S-4.12)
10. **Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings** consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. (S-4.15)
11. **Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis,** be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. (S-4.16)
12. **Lessons, when presented, should be generalized beyond the immediate subject being evaluated** to indicate what wider relevance they might have. (S-4.17)

8. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluations:

1. The **Resident Coordinator Office** as **commissioner** of the final evaluation will have the following functions:
 - Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
 - Convene the evaluation reference group;
 - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
 - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team;
 - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat);
 - Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
 - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee;
 - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.
2. The **programme coordinator** as **evaluation manager** will have the following functions:
 - Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR;
 - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group;

- Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data;
- Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation;
- Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
- Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
- Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation.

3. The Programme Management Committee will function as the **evaluation reference group**.

This group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint programme and will:

- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards;
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation;
- Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference;
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
- Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products;
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation.

4. The MDG-F Secretariat will function as a **quality assurance member** of the evaluation, in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation, and will have the following functions:

- Review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.

5. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation study by:

- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed

9. EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	When (calendar days)
Design	Establish the evaluation reference group	CE*	6 months before the end of the programme
Design	General final evaluation TOR adapted	ERG**	
Implementation	Procurement and hiring the evaluation team	EM***	
Implementation	Provide the evaluation team with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme	EM, ERG	7 days
Implementation	Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group	ET****	15 days
Implementation	Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team. Agenda drafted and agreed with evaluation team	CE, EM, ERG	10 days
Implementation	In country mission	ET, EM, CE, ERG	20 days
Implementation	Delivery of the draft report	ET	20 days
Implementation	Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team. Fact-checking revision by MDG-FS, to be done at the same time as the ERG (5 business days)	EM, CE, ERG MDG-FS*****	15 days
Implementation	Delivery of the final report	EM, CE, ERG, MDG-FS, ^NSC	10 days
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation	EM, CE, ERG, NSC	10 days

* (CE) Commissioner of the evaluation ** (ERG) Evaluation Reference group *** (EM) Evaluation manager

**** (ET) Evaluation team ***** (MDG-FS) MDG-F Secretariat ^ (NSC) National Steering Committee

10. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure the extent to which development results have been attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and products should go far beyond what was said by programme stakeholders during the field visit or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc.) it's the ideal opportunity to set an agenda for the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also excellent platforms to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scaled-up at the country and international level.

The commissioner of the evaluation, the reference group, the evaluation manager and any other stakeholder relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete plan of dissemination of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, replicability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

11. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

12. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT/TEAM OF CONSULTANTS

- **Academic:**
- **Experience:**

This section will be drafted by the commissioner/or manager of the evaluation based on the needs identified and budget available for the evaluation and taking into account the following guidelines²:

- The evaluation should be conducted by a well-qualified evaluator/s. (UNEG standard 3.13)
- The consultant/s should be selected on the basis of competence, and by means of a transparent process. (UNEG S3.13)
- The evaluator should have at least 5 years of recognized expertise in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- In the case of hiring more than one evaluator, one consultant should be experienced in the sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation, or have a sound knowledge of the subject to be evaluated. The other should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation. (UNEG S3.13)

13. DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

This section will be drafted by the commissioner/or manager of the evaluation, based on the intended uses identified for the evaluation.

² See UNEG Guidance Document “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, UNEG/FN/Standards (2005). http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

14. ANNEXES

ANNEX I: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

- 1.** Introduction
- 2.** Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
- 3.** Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
- 4.** Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme
- 5.** Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information
- 6.** Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”

ANNEX II: DRAFT & FINAL REPORT OUTLINE

- **Cover Page**
Including JP title, thematic window, report date, name of the evaluator/s.
 - **Table of contents**
Including page references for all chapters & annexes.
 - **Acronyms page**
 - **Executive Summary**
No more than 2 pages. Summarize substantive elements of the report, including a brief description of the joint programme, purpose and objectives of the evaluation, evaluation methodological approach, key findings and conclusions, main recommendations.
- 1. Introduction**
Explain why the evaluation is being conducted, including the following content:
- **Background**
MDG-F, thematic window, joint programme.
 - **Purpose, Goals and Methodology of Evaluation:**
Purpose and goal of the evaluation, methodologies used (including evaluation criteria, scope), constraints and limitations on the study conducted.
 - **Description of the development intervention**
Provide sufficient detail on the joint programme so that the readers of the report can easily understand the analysis done in the next chapter.
 - **Context**
Social, political, economic, institutional factors that affect the JP.)
 - **JP description**
Title, timeframe, intervention logic, objectives, intended outcomes/outputs, scale of the intervention, total resources, geographic location, etc.)
- 2. Levels of Analysis**
This section should be evidence based, guided by the evaluation criteria and questions.
- **Design | Relevance**
Include a description of the initial concept and subsequent revisions, and all pertinent information for the reader to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Assess the design relevance and address all evaluation questions (including link to MDGs, UNDAF and national priorities, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process, M&E framework and communications strategy and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).
 - **Process | Efficiency, Ownership**
Include a description of the JP's governance structure, coordination mechanisms, administrative procedures, implementation modalities, UN coordination, national ownership in the process and all pertinent information to clearly understand the analysis done in this section. Address all evaluation questions (including JP's level of financial progress and implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations).
 - **Results | Effectiveness, Sustainability**
Assess the level of attainment of the development results compared to what was initially expected. Show progression of implementation with an appropriate measure and analysis of

the results chain (organized by outcome, and distinguishing findings on completion of activities and outputs from outcomes). If some of this analysis is not included, explain why it is not. Also, include an analysis of the effect of the mid-term evaluation on the JP's results achievement. For sustainability, please mention availability of financial resources and examples of or evidence for replicability and scale up of JP. Address all evaluation questions.

3. Conclusions

4. Lessons Learned

Define the scope of each lesson (joint programme, national policy, local intervention, etc.)

5. Recommendations

Prioritized, structured and clear. The scope and relevant stakeholder should be clearly defined for each recommendation.

6. Annexes

ANNEX III: DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

This section must be completed and specified by the other users of the evaluation but mainly by the management team of the joint programme and by the Programme Management Committee. A minimum of documents that must be reviewed before the field trip shall be established; the Secretariat estimates that these shall include, as a minimum:

MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)

Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One