



Terms of References for the Evaluation of the Project
“Building sustainable and inclusive peace, strengthening trust and social cohesion in Moldova”

Evaluation of the project	Building sustainable and inclusive peace, strengthening trust and social cohesion in Moldova <u>MPTF-O Gateway, Project 00133100</u>
Name of administrative unit/division	OHCHR Moldova, through UNDP Moldova
Project/programme duration	01 September 2022- 28 February 2025
Location(s)	Moldova: Both banks of the Nistru/Dniester River, as well as Center (Causeni, Anenii Noi, Stefan Voda), North (Balti), South (Comrat), and Security Zone
Donor(s)	UN Peacebuilding Fund
Implementing partner(s)	OHCHR (Convening Agency), UN Women, UNDP
Total overall project/programme budget	OHCHR: \$850,000 UNDP: \$802,500 UN Women: \$800,000 TOTAL: \$2,452,500
Type of evaluation	External
Timeframe for the evaluation	February - May 2025
Evaluation Team	3 evaluators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 International Consultant (Senior Evaluator) will be contracted through a separate competition • 2 National Consultants/ (Evaluators) will be contracted through this competition <p><i>Please select the position you would like to apply for (Position 1: National Evaluator or Position 2: National Evaluator – Data collection focus on the Left Bank).</i></p> <p><i>If you are applying for both positions, please note that only one assignment can be awarded for either of the two applications.</i></p>

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Moldova continues to face challenges in achieving long-term peace and stability due to the protracted conflict related to the Transnistrian region, situated along the left bank of the Nistru/Dniester River. Since the end of the active conflict in 1992, the Left Bank, with its main city

Tiraspol, has been effectively separated from the rest of the country, not controlled by the government in Chisinau and with a de facto leadership that is supported by the Russian Federation. Tensions in the region have escalated recently, particularly following the outbreak of the war in Ukraine in February 2022. These tensions have deepened existing divisions within Moldova, which are often linked to political affiliations (pro-Russia versus pro-West or pro-Ukraine views) and, to some extent, ethnic and linguistic differences. Furthermore, misinformation, alternative news sources, and hate speech are exacerbating these divisions and tensions.

2. Building sustainable and inclusive peace, strengthening trust and social cohesion in Moldova is an initiative funded by the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), involving three UN partners: OHCHR (Convening Agency), UN Women, and UNDP. The project seeks to facilitate an enabling environment for improved cross-river interconnection between CSOs, communities, the Peoples Advocate (Ombudsman) and the focal point for human rights on the left bank of the Nistru/Dniester River, reduce social tensions and support the continuation of the fragile Transnistrian conflict settlement process in the context described above of growing regional and domestic geopolitical tensions exacerbated by the war in Ukraine. The project works through the advancement of cross-river interaction on human rights, gender-responsive peacebuilding, and the promotion of equal access to services to all to prevent deepening divisions between the populations on either side of the conflict divide.
3. The programme aims to deliver three key outcomes as outlined below in Table 1

Table 1: Outcomes and outputs of the programme

Outcome 1	Strengthened cross-river engagement and productive interaction through the advancement of human rights, the Women, Peace and Security agenda and improved access to social services
<i>Output 1.1</i>	Improved capacities of the conflict settlement process actors to integrate human rights and gender equality perspectives at all levels of the negotiation agenda, including a focus on balanced and meaningful participation of women in the process at all levels
<i>Output 1.2</i>	Civil society organizations from both banks, People's Advocate and human rights focal point from the left bank, and local community actors from the Security Zone have increased capacities to JOINTLY engage in advancing human rights and the WPS Agenda and foster effective cross-river dialogue and partnerships.
<i>Output 1.3</i>	People from both banks, including women actors and community leaders, have increased knowledge and understanding of human rights, gender equality and the WPS agenda and are increasingly enabled to access available public services and in cross-river interaction
Outcome 2	Strengthened responses to divisive narratives and misinformation, thereby reducing inter-community tensions
<i>Output 2.1</i>	CSOs, judges, and law enforcement agents have strengthened capacities and duty bearers of the left bank have increased awareness to effectively implement international standards on tackling hate speech
<i>Output 2.2</i>	Moldovan new and traditional media ecosystems are empowered to produce evidence-based, human rights, gender- and conflict-sensitive media products conducive to promoting tolerance, non-discrimination, and pluralism
<i>Output 2.3</i>	Community-level prevention and response in addressing and countering hate speech and discrimination in areas with large refugee populations are strengthened

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

4. **Purpose:** The project is being evaluated in accordance with the funding agreement with the Peacebuilding Fund, with the evaluation report due by 31 May 2025. The primary purposes of the evaluation include:
- To identify areas of strength and areas of weakness in the planning and achievement of results - including in the areas of sustainable peace (conflict prevention and social cohesion), as well as gender and human rights integration, supported by evidence;
 - To produce useful lessons learned and good practices that illustrate successful and unsuccessful strategies in the achievement of results;
 - To produce clear and actionable recommendations identifying concrete actions and responsibilities for OHCHR, UN Women and UNDP to undertake towards these ends.

5. The intended users of the evaluations:

Primary users	<i>Users directly involved in the programme implementation/ use: learning, decision-making, adjusting programme:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ OHCHR Moldova and reporting Lines at HQs (Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division/ Europe Section)▪ UN Women and UNDP offices in Moldova and their reporting lines▪ UN Peacebuilding Fund managing country/regional programme support▪ The Resident Coordinator Office (RCO) in Moldova
Secondary users	<i>Management oversight, feedback into programming and organisational learning:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ OHCHR Evaluation Function and Senior Executive Team▪ Evaluation Functions and governing bodies of UN Women and UNDP
Other users	<i>Other stakeholders:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Duty-bearers and rights-holders in Moldova▪ International community: Policy, field and desk officers in foreign services and donor agencies

6. **Objectives:** The evaluation will assess the programme's performance and progress and produce recommendations in terms of these seven evaluation criteria:
- **Relevance** - the extent to which the programme is relevant to the situation in the country/region, the mandates of implementing Agencies, Funds and Programmes, its comparative advantage, the Sustainable Development Goals and the needs of stakeholders (both duty-bearers and right-holders);
 - **Coherence** - the compatibility of the programme with other interventions in the country/region, sector or organization;
 - **Efficiency** - the extent to which the programme has economically converted resources into results in the course of its term;
 - **Effectiveness** - the degree to which planned results and targets have been achieved at outcome and output levels;
 - **Peacebuilding effect** - the extent the programme makes a contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable peacebuilding ;
 - **Sustainability** - the extent to which the net benefits of the programme continue or are likely to continue;

- **Gender, disability and human rights integration** - the degree to which a gender and human rights perspective has been integrated into the programme and the degree to which the results obtained have contributed to gender and human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality, with emphasis on women's rights and disability inclusion.
7. The evaluation will take both a summative and a formative approach. It will look at results achieved or not achieved so far (summative), identify lessons learned and best practices, and produce recommendations to inform future work (formative).
 8. Time scope: The evaluation will cover the entire implementation period of the project, i.e. 01 September 2022 - 28 February 2025
 9. Geographical scope: The evaluation will cover the entire country but will focus on the areas where the Project had engaged. These will include urban centres such as Chisinau, Tiraspol, Comrat, and Balti, as well as smaller towns and villages in the left Bank of Nistru/Dniester River, central and north Moldova, and the Security Zone.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

10. A set of evaluation questions framed along the OECD/DAC criteria (Relevance Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability) will guide the evaluation. Two other criteria, the peacebuilding effect and the integration of gender, human rights and disability, have been added to reflect the specific nature of the project. The preliminary questions below have been developed using the UNEG Guidelines for Evaluating Peacebuilding Initiatives and sample ToR. All evaluation questions should be answered in an evidence-based manner.
11. Preliminary questions are provided below. The evaluation criteria and questions will be reviewed by the evaluators during the inception phase and may, therefore, be modified to be approved by the Evaluation Management. The evaluation team will develop a more detailed analytical framework of questions and sub-questions as part of the inception report and in agreement with the Evaluation Manager.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?	<p>EQ1. To what degree has the project addressed the key peacebuilding and conflict prevention challenges in Moldova, within the scope of the UN's mandate in the country and given the changing context in and around Moldova, including in the context of the Left bank of Nistru/Dniester River?</p> <p>EQ2. Were the project ToC and project design relevant, and did they remain so throughout implementation (including the adaptability to changing circumstances and risks)?</p> <p>EQ3. To what extent has the project been aligned with national peacebuilding initiatives and national stakeholders' priorities (duty bearers, rights holders and especially of vulnerable groups)?</p>
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?	EQ4. To what extent did the project ensure coordination and synergies (i) within the different implementing entities within the project, (ii) with implementing UN agencies' programs and (iii) with other implementing organizations and donors?

Efficiency: How well are resources being used?	<p>EQ5. To what extent has the project been efficient in using the human, financial and intellectual resources at its disposal to achieve its targeted outcomes? These might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the organizational arrangements used in the project been adequate? • Has the monitoring data been systematically collected and analysed to feed into management decisions? • Was the conflict-sensitivity approach applied throughout the project? • Were the funds provided through grants to local partners/CSOs used in line with the project's objectives?
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	<p>EQ6: What outcomes have been achieved both intended/planned and non-intended, (including the progress against the project indicators?)</p> <p>EQ7: What enabling or constraining factors, both external and internal), have influenced the achievement and non-achievement of the programme outcomes?</p>
Peacebuilding effect:	EQ 8: To what extent has the project made a concrete contribution to reducing the risk of conflict in Moldova and/or to strengthening social cohesion in the country?
Sustainability: Will the benefits last?	EQ 9: Did the project include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity, etc.) to support positive changes in peacebuilding after the end of the project? What is the evidence for sustainability of main results? Has the project made any concerted efforts to expand the activities it piloted and obtain catalytic results beyond the direct inputs of the project?
Human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind: Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights-based?	<p>EQ10. To what extent has the project addressed the needs/priorities of women, persons with disabilities and other marginalised groups in line with the principle of Leave No One Behind (at all stages of the project cycle, including through the engagement of such groups in project governance, design, planning, implementation and monitoring).</p> <p>EQ11. What specific outcomes were addressing/promoting gender equality?</p> <p>EQ12. What specific outcomes tackled the rights/inclusion of marginalised groups?</p>
Lessons and good practices	EQ13. What lessons and good practices have been identified, with a focus on innovative approaches, which could be replicated in other initiatives?

IV. METHODOLOGY

12. The evaluation will follow:

- OECD/DAC Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully¹
- UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards² for Evaluation in the UN System,
- the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation³,
- the UNEG Guidance “Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations”⁴ and the UNEG Guidance on integrating disability inclusion in evaluations and reporting on the UNDIS accountability framework evaluation indicator,⁵
- As relevant, it will draw on the work of the UNEG Working Group on evaluating peacebuilding initiatives.

13. The evaluation’s overall methodological approach should be utilisation-focused, i.e. the evaluation should be planned and conducted in ways that enhance the likely utilization of both the findings by intended users. The evaluation should also, as far as possible, consider the specificities of the implementing AFP work.

14. Integration of Human Rights (HR), Gender Equality (GE), Disability Inclusion (DI) and Leaving No One Behind (LNOB). The evaluation should:

- Adequately answer Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Human Rights (GE, DI & HR) issues by detecting meaningful changes and the contribution of the intervention to them in terms of enjoyment of rights, empowerment of rights holders and capacity of duty bearers, with emphasis on women’s rights and disability inclusion;
- Be suitable for the populations and individuals that will be involved (in particular, if cultural and security issues are taken into account); and
- Be appropriate to involve all the key stakeholders without discriminating against some groups or individuals and guarantee the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, with a particular focus on women and persons with disabilities.

15. Further, in line with the UN commitment to Leaving No One Behind, the evaluation will apply an intersectional lens in the evaluation to capture if its interventions reach the most marginalised and vulnerable and if the interventions contribute to reducing their exclusion. Special attention will be paid to: (i) ensuring that the voices and opinions of both men, women and marginalised groups, such as people with disabilities, are heard (including gender-related and disaggregated data, (e.g. by age, sex, countries etc.); (ii) ensuring an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. The methodology section of the inception, draft and final reports should clearly explain how the evaluation was specifically designed to integrate GE, DI & HR issues, including data collection methods, data sources and processes, sampling frame, participatory tools, evaluation questions and validation processes.

16. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should describe the analysis and interpretation of data on GE, DI & HR, specific findings on GE, DI & HR-related criteria and questions, strengths and weaknesses of the intervention regarding GE, DI & HR, and specific recommendations addressing GE, DI & HR issues.

¹ https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2021/03/applying-evaluation-criteria-thoughtfully_45a54ea7.html

² <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

⁴ <https://unevaluation.org/document/download/4218>

⁵ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/3050>

V. METHODS

17. A mixed-methods approach is preferred - quantitative and qualitative, with rigorous triangulation of Information. It is expected that evaluators will be using the following methods (to be further defined by the evaluation team in the inception report):
- **Semi-structured or structured interviews** with staff, internal and external partners, UN agencies, donors, Member State representatives, CSOs, beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
 - **Focus group discussions** with staff and key stakeholders
 - **Web-based surveys** and/or questionnaires of targeted stakeholders.
 - **Analysis of monitoring and programme data**, including performance, financial and other data available. The evaluators will be further provided with access to data and documents relevant for the project implementation, including a full set of baseline and endline indicators, means of verification, lists of participants, and contact lists of key interlocutors.
 - **Document review** of strategies, policy documents, result frameworks, work processes, outputs, documents, job descriptions, partnerships agreements, reports, previous evaluation results, meeting minutes and work plans.
 - **Case studies of a specific group or situation**
 - **Benchmarking from within the same organization or from other organizations**
 - **Secondary data analyses of existing data sets**
 - **Direct observations** of selected field offices according to pre-determined criteria
18. **Field visits:** The evaluation will include missions to Tiraspol, Bender, Dubasari and Ribnitsa in the Left Bank, Chisinau, Balti, Cahul, Comrat in the Right Bank, as well as several villages/locations in the Security Zone, for direct observation and face-to-face interviews and/or focus groups with stakeholders. Locations are to be concretely specified at the inception phase.
19. The evaluators will be provided access to data and documents relevant for the project implementation, including a full set of baseline and endline indicators, means of verification, lists of participants, and contact lists of key interlocutors.
20. **Risks and limitations:** Not apparent at the time of writing the ToR, to be developed as needed in the inception phase

VI. STAKEHOLDER MAPPING

21. This preliminary list of stakeholders provides the basis for initial consultations during the evaluation design, and the evaluation team will develop it further during the inception phase.

UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OHCHR: Field presence in Moldova and relevant staff based in HQs in Geneva (FOTCD) ▪ UNDP Moldova and their reporting lines ▪ UN Women and their reporting lines
Duty bearers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State actors of Moldova responsible for human rights compliance, and especially the People's Advocate ▪ Other - Please see Annex III
Rights holders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grassroot organisations and civil society, including Project's grants recipients

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marginalised groups: civil society organisations representing marginalised groups, associations and grassroots representing women and young persons with disabilities, Roma communities
International community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RCO and the UN Country team in Moldova • Other international organisations and partners involved in relevant work

VII. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

22. The evaluation will be managed by the OHCHR Evaluation Function Evaluation Manager (PPMES) with the support of the the management group in consultations with the reference group. The Management Group is composed of the Project Coordinator (OHCHR) and the respective Project Officers/Managers from UNDP and UN Women, and will engage in day-to-day management of the Evaluation process.

OHCHR Evaluation Function Evaluation Manager (PPMES) is responsible for:

- Pre-drafting of the Terms of Reference;
- Serving as the primary port-of-call for evaluators, as well as for internal and external stakeholders regarding methodological issues;
- Circulation of the evaluation products to collect the feedback of the reference group (see below) and ensure that it is effectively integrated into the evaluation exercise;
- Monitoring the budget and the correct implementation of the evaluation work plan;
- Organising missions and other data collection activities with support from the Evaluation Management;
- Participating in missions, interviews and focus groups on an ad hoc basis for quality assurance purposes (see also point IX) and;
- Publication and dissemination of the final evaluation report.

Evaluation Management Group is composed of Project Coordinator of OHCHR in Moldova and Project Managers of UNDP and UN Women components. They are responsible for:

- Substantive review of the Terms of Reference the Evaluation Inception Paper, and the evaluation report (with a focus on the accuracy of the programme information presented);
- Supporting the selection and recruitment of the evaluators;
- Collecting documents for desk review and providing relevant programmatic information, documents, and data from other countries;
- Support the organization of data collection, including arrangements for field missions; identify interlocutors for interviews and FGDs; and schedule interview and FGDs meetings;
- Participate in regular evaluation meetings and briefings;
- Developing the management response;
- Perform other tasks to support the evaluation processes as needed.

23. **Reference Group** - A Reference Group will be constituted for this evaluation to serve in an advisory capacity to strengthen its substantive grounding and to maximise the utility of the evaluation: OHCHR PPMES shall chair the Reference Group that will include:

- Representatives of the three implementing AFPs (Heads of OHCHR, UNDP, UN Women)
- OHCHR HQ Desk Officer for Moldova
- OHCHR's DEXREL Donor and External Relations Officer(s) responsible for relations with the donors

- The three Agency representatives of the Management Group.
- PBSO Focal Point

The Reference Group will:

- Review the ToR and Inception Paper
- Attend and provide information and expertise during discussions on the evaluation findings and recommendations
- Comment on the draft and final versions of the evaluation report
- Support the dissemination of the evaluation findings

VIII. DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

24. The evaluation will produce the following major outputs, all of which will be grounded in UNEG Norms and Standards and good evaluation practice, to be disseminated to the appropriate audiences:
 - a. **Inception Report** (template will be provided as Annex)_informed by an initial desk review and inception interviews. This report will provide in a concise manner (max 10 pages without annexes) a concrete action plan for undertaking the evaluation. In particular, the report will present or reconstruct the ToC (if needed), review the evaluation questions and specify the evaluation methodology (in the form of the Evaluation design matrix). It will include stakeholder mapping, as well as information regarding any field visits or other logistical information. The inception report will also highlight any risks and limitations of the evaluation and will include a detailed workplan with a timeline. The Inception Report will be reviewed by the Evaluation Manager and the Reference Group for comments. The evaluation team will submit a revised final version following consideration of this feedback.
 - b. **Preliminary data presentation** - A meeting to present the preliminary findings at the end of the data collection and field mission phase to the field presence or unit responsible for the programme being evaluated and the evaluation management.
 - c. **Draft Report** - not exceeding 40 pages without annexes, which includes an Executive Summary of no more than 5 pages. This report will detail key findings, useful lessons learned and good practices, and clear and actionable recommendations for concrete action, underpinned by clear evidence. The report will be reviewed by the Evaluation Management and the Reference Group for factual comments
 - d. **Second Draft Report** that incorporates the first round of comments and feedback from the Evaluation Management and the Reference Group
 - e. **Evaluation findings presentation** - The evaluation team presents the evaluation results (conclusions and recommendations) for discussion with the evaluation reference group and other relevant internal stakeholders (in person or by video conference).
 - f. **Final Report** that incorporates final comments from the Evaluation Management and the Reference Group on the second draft report, including those received during the presentation of results.
 - g. **Evaluation briefer – to be produced by OHCHR Evaluation Function after completion of the evaluation**
25. The timeline proposed for the conduct of the evaluation is in Annex 1.

IX. QUALITY ASSURANCE

26. The evaluation manager is responsible for ensuring all evaluation processes and products meet all the UNEG and OECD/DAC norms, standards and principles and the provisions of OHCHR's, UNDP's and UN Women's Evaluation Policies. During the inception phase and the data collection phase,

the evaluation manager may join some of the interviews conducted by the evaluation team for quality control purposes.

27. Quality control checklists will be used by the evaluation manager for the finalisation of the ToRs and the revision of the evaluation reports.

X. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION.

28. The evaluation will be conducted by a **team of three consultants (one International – Senior Evaluator, and two National Evaluators)** with experience in evaluations, a good understanding of peacebuilding and human rights issues, familiarity with the integration of gender related matters and perspectives of marginalised groups, and knowledge of the country/region under the evaluation, responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish in accordance with the timelines agreed upon and in a high-quality manner.

29. Specific profiles and Terms of Reference for the position(s) of the **two national evaluators** are enclosed below.

XI. DISSEMINATION, USE AND FOLLOW-UP STRATEGY

30. The evaluation report will be made available to the donor and other major stakeholders and will be considered public documents unless decided otherwise due to information confidentiality and sensitivity. The final evaluation reports, together with their management responses, will be published on UN Agencies' intranet portals, public websites and the UNEG portal. All reporting shall comply with the Do Not Harm principle and should consider whether it may endanger stakeholders, particularly victims of human rights violations and/or human rights defenders.

XII. TIMELINE

The tentative timeline is below but might need to be adjusted based on the pace of the recruitment process and the availability of the selected consultants (among other factors).

PHASE	ACTIVITIES AND DELIVERABLES	TIMELINE
Inception phase	Start of Evaluation	15 February 2025
	Inception Meeting	Mid- February 2025
	Desk Review and Scoping interviews, development of Inception Report, including Data Collection Tools	Mid to end of February 2025
	Draft Inception Report	Early to Mid-March 2025
	Feedback from the Reference Group	Mid- March 2025
	Final inception report	Mid March March 2025
Data collection	Data collection and analysis	March-April 2025 (TBC)
	Field visit	March-April 2025
Evaluation report	Submission of the first draft report	Mid April April 2025
	Webinar to present findings	Week of Mid-April 2025
	Feedback from the Reference Group on the first report	By end of April 2025
	Submission of the second Draft Report	Early May 2025
	Feedback from the Reference Group	Mid May 2025
	Submission of the Final Report	Mid to end of May 2025

TERMS OF REFERENCE

National Evaluator

1. Introduction

OHCHR, on behalf of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women Moldova, is conducting an evaluation of its 'Building sustainable and inclusive peace, strengthening trust and social cohesion in Moldova'. This document contains supplemental TOR that will be used as the basis for contracting the Evaluator responsible for conducting the evaluation. It does not duplicate the information found in the TOR for the evaluation.

Time: 42 working days

Timeframe: February 2025 - 31 May 2025

2. Profile

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in combination with a qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.
- Minimum of 5 years of experience conducting assessments, reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the UN or international context.
- Experience in human rights or related field (humanitarian assistance, peace operations) is desirable
- Fluency in oral and written English and Romanian is required. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage.
- Experience working on similar matters in *Moldova is required*.
- Knowledge of integration of human rights and/or gender perspectives in evaluations.
- Knowledge of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women core areas is an advantage

3. Scope of work

The Evaluator will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish, particularly in the phases of data collection and review, and report writing. Key responsibilities include:

- Under the guidance of the Senior Evaluator, contribute to a desk review of relevant documents and scoping interviews with OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women staff as specified the ToR.
- Co-develop the evaluation design and methodology, and co-draft the Inception Report.
- Conduct data collection based on the approved Inception Report, in coordination with the Senior Evaluator. This includes undertaking field missions for interviews with stakeholders in prioritized zones in Moldova as listed above, under item 18.
- Organizing interviews and meetings with stakeholders
- Arranging own transport to locations in Moldova.
- Co-implement a workshop to present the preliminary findings at the end of the inception phase, in coordination with the Senior Evaluator.
- Contribute to the data analysis and preparation of drafts and final evaluation reports
- Co-conduct a presentation for the discussion of the evaluation results and recommendations, together with the Senior Evaluator.
- Ensure adherence to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates and the full evaluation terms of Reference (ToR) as well as the dedicated templates shared for this evaluation
- Ensure that all deliverables mentioned in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner and in line with the quality criteria checklist.

- Participate in the kick-off meeting, and provide any briefings throughout the evaluation process, as requested.

4. Supervision of the work

The Evaluator will report to the Evaluation Manager, who is responsible for approving the products of the consultancy.

5. Expected Deliverables

The Evaluator is responsible for the quality and timely submission of the specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English and have a clear, transparent and verifiable analysis process.

- Inception report in line with UNEG, OECD/DAC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines as well as the adapted templates for this evaluation. This includes a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation question matrix, stakeholder mapping, and risks and limitations to the evaluation (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings). Submission to the evaluation manager for review and comments from the reference group.
- A workshop to present the preliminary findings at the end of the data collection and field mission phase
- Draft report in line with UNEG, OECD/DAC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines as well as the specifically developed templates for this evaluation. This also includes an analysis of the performance of the project to adequately address gender equality, disability inclusion as well as human rights issues, with concrete findings, conclusions and recommendations. Submission to the evaluation manager for review by the reference group (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance);
- A **second Draft Report** that incorporates the first round of comments and feedback from the Evaluation Management and the Reference Group
- A **presentation** of the evaluation results (conclusions and recommendations) by the evaluation team, for discussion with the evaluation reference group and other relevant internal stakeholders (in person or by video conference).
- A **Final Report in line with UNEG, OECD/DAC standards and guidelines** that incorporates final comments from the Evaluation Management and the Reference Group on the second draft report, including those received during the presentation of results.

6. Details of deliverables and payments

This contract is an external collaboration contract for 42 working days. The following instalments will be made:

Deliverable	Output	To be accomplished by (dd/mm/yy)	Amount
1.	Inception Report (including desk review) (up to 14 w.d.) <i>This deliverable pertains to UNDP</i>	April 2025	33.3% of the fees upon receipt and approval of the inception report by the Evaluation Manager
2.	Data collection (including field missions), preliminary findings	April 2025	33.3 % of the fees upon receipt and approval of the first draft

	workshop, data analysis and draft evaluation report (up to 14 w.d.) <i>This deliverable pertains to OHCHR</i>		report by the Evaluation Manager
3.	Final Evaluation Report (including full proof reading) and presentations of final evaluation results (up to 14 w.d.) <i>This deliverable pertains to UN Women</i>	End of May 2025	33.3 % of the fees upon receipt and approval of the final report by the Evaluation Manager

7. Financial Arrangements

The financial proposal by interested individual consultants (IC) shall specify a total **lump sum** amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the ToR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including the daily fee, taxes, and number of anticipated working days, transport costs, etc.).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel within Moldova for the purpose of the evaluation. In general, travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket will not be accepted. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

The travel costs within Moldova, including expenses related to site visits, meetings with implementers, partners, and key stakeholders (local transportation), should be indicated separately in the financial proposal.

8. Documents to Be Included When Submitting the Proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/ information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Signed and filled-in Offeror's letter confirming interest and availability for the individual contractor (IC) assignment, incorporating a financial proposal, with the detailed breakdown of costs supporting the all inclusive financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per working day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, phone calls, transport costs etc.);
- Proposal (Motivation Letter): explaining why they are the most suitable for the work including previous experience in similar Projects (please provide brief information on each of the above qualifications, item by item, including information, links/copies of documents that prove participation in similar assignments);

- Curriculum Vitae (UN Personal History Form) including records on past experience in similar projects/assignments and concrete outputs obtained and at least 3 referees

Important notice: The applicants who have the statute of Government Official / Public Servant prior to appointment will be asked to submit the following documentation:

- a no-objection letter in respect of the applicant received from the Government, and;
- the applicant is certified in writing by the Government to be on official leave without pay for the entire duration of the Individual Contract.

A retired government official is not considered in this case a government official, and as such, may be contracted.

9. Evaluation of individual consultants

Initially, individual consultants will be **short-listed** based on the following minimum qualification criteria:

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in combination with a 4 years qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.
- Minimum of 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects, including baseline and endline data collection or analysis, or conducting final project assessments/reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the local, UN or international context.
- Experience working on similar matters in Moldova.

The short-listed individual consultants will be further evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/ compliant/ acceptable, and
- b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight – 60% (110 pts);

* Financial Criteria weight – 40% (200 pts).

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 210 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Points Obtainable
Technical		
Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in combination with a qualifying	<i>Master's (or equivalent) – 10 pts; PhD or second Master's –25 pts</i>	25

experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.		
Minimum of 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects, including baseline and endline data collection or analysis, or conducting final project assessments/reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the local, UN or international context.	<i>5 years – 20 pts, each additional year – 5 points up to max. 50 pts</i>	50
Experience in final evaluations of projects in the field of human rights or related field (humanitarian assistance, social cohesion, community development, peace operations) is desirable.	<i>No experience – 0 pts, up to 5 years experience – 5 pts, above 5 years experience – 10 pts.</i>	10
Knowledge of integration of human rights and/or gender perspectives in project monitoring and evaluations.	<i>No knowledge of such kind – 0 pts; Up to five M&E years – 5 pts, above 5 years M&E experiences – 10 pts.</i>	10
Experience working on similar matters in Moldova is required.	<i>Each assignment – 5 pts, up to max 15 pts</i>	15
Knowledge of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women core areas is an advantage.	<i>For each Agency – 5 pts, max 15 pts</i>	15
Total Technical Scoring		125
Interview (demonstrated technical knowledge and experience; communication/ interpersonal skills; initiative; creativity/ resourcefulness). Only up to the first 5 applicants that have accumulated the highest technical score shall be invited to an interview.		
Competencies and logic in carrying out complex project evaluations and assessments	<i>Limited competencies and logic – up to 5 pts, fair– up to 15 pts., good – up to 30 pts, very good – up to 40 pts</i>	175
Understanding and knowledge of regional/local peacebuilding contexts	<i>Limited understanding – up to 5 pts, fair – up to 20 pts., good – up to 40 pts, very good – up to 50 pts</i>	
Demonstrated ability to effectively utilize analytical and collaboration tools (e.g., MS Office 365, ZOOM, Google Workspace, evaluation-specific software) for complex data management, analysis, and reporting within an evaluation context	<i>Limited understanding and ability – up to 5 pts., satisfactory – up to 15 pts.; extensive – up to 20 pts</i>	
Ability to address challenges effectively, adapt to changing circumstances, and find practical solutions during evaluation activities.	<i>No ability – 0 pts., limited ability – up to 5 pts., demonstrated ability – up to 15 pts., extensive experience / strong skills – up to 20 pts</i>	
Strong communication and interpersonal skills	<i>No – 0 pts., to some extent – up to 5 pts., extensive experience / good skills – up to 10 pts</i>	
Command of the English language	<i>Working knowledge / intermediate – up to 15 pts, advanced – up to 20 pts</i>	
Command of the Romanian language	<i>Up to 5 pts for professional knowledge</i>	
Knowledge of Russian language is an asset	<i>Extra 5 pts for knowledge of Russian</i>	

Belonging to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment*	No – 0 pts., to one group – 2.5 pts., to two or more groups – 5 pts.	
Total Interview Scoring		175
Maximum Total Technical Scoring		300

Under-represented groups in UN Moldova are persons with disabilities, LGBTI, ethnic and linguistic minorities, especially ethnic Gagauzians, Bulgarians, Roma, Jews, people of African descent, people living with HIV, religious minorities, especially Muslim women, refugees, and other non-citizens. **Please specify in CV, in case you belong to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment.*

Financial	
<p>Evaluation of submitted financial offers will be done based on the following formula: $S = F_{min} / F * 200$ <i>S – score received on financial evaluation;</i> <i>F_{min} – the lowest financial offer out of all the submitted offers qualified over the technical evaluation round;</i> <i>F – financial offer under consideration</i></p>	200

Winning candidate

The winning candidate will be the candidate, who has accumulated the highest aggregated score (technical scoring + financial scoring).

Annexes to the Terms of Reference:

Annex 1: LogFrame

Annex 2: Inception report Template

Annex 3: Evaluation report Template

Please select the position you would like to apply for (Position 1: National Evaluator or Position 2: National Evaluator – Data collection focus on the Left Bank).

If you are applying for both positions, please note that only one assignment can be awarded for either of the two applications.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

National Evaluator – Data collection focus on the Left Bank

1. Introduction

OHCHR, on behalf of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women Moldova, is conducting an evaluation of its 'Building sustainable and inclusive peace, strengthening trust and social cohesion in Moldova'. This document contains supplemental TOR that will be used as the basis for contracting the Evaluator responsible for conducting the evaluation. It does not duplicate the information found in the TOR for the evaluation.

Time: 21 working days

Timeframe: February 2025 - 31 May 2025

2. Profile

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in combination with a qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.
- Minimum of 5 years of experience conducting assessments, reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the UN or international context.
- Experience in human rights or related fields (humanitarian assistance, peace operations) is desirable.
- Fluency in oral and written English and Russian, is required. Knowledge of Romanian is an advantage.
- Experience working on similar matters in *Moldova is required*.
- Knowledge of integration of human rights and/or gender perspectives in evaluations.
- Knowledge of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women core areas is an advantage.

3. Scope of work

The Evaluator will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish, particularly in the phases of data collection and review, and report writing. Key responsibilities include:

- Conduct data collection based on the approved Inception Report. This includes undertaking field missions for interviews with stakeholders in prioritized zones in Moldova, as listed above under item 18.
Draft detailed interviews/ focus group discussion transcripts and notes.
- Organizing interviews and meetings with stakeholders.
- Arranging own transport to locations in Moldova.
- Conduct data analysis and contribute to the drafts and final evaluation reports.
- Contribute to a presentation for the discussion of at the end of the data collection phase and final evaluation results and recommendations Ensure adherence to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates and the full evaluation terms of Reference (ToR) as well as the dedicated templates shared for this evaluation
- Ensure that all deliverables mentioned in these terms of reference are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner.

4. Supervision of the work

The Evaluator will report to the Evaluation Manager, who is responsible for approving the products of the consultancy.

5. Expected Deliverables

The Evaluator is responsible for the quality and timely submission of the specific deliverables, as specified below. All products should be well written in English and have a clear, transparent and verifiable analysis process.

- **Contributions to the inception report** where the lead drafters are the other evaluators, with a detailed workplan and list of interviewees and focus group discussion to be conducted with a focus on the Left bank (template will be provided) Data collected with detailed notes and/or transcripts of interviews and focus groups conducted.
- **Brief presentation** during a workshop to present the preliminary findings at the end of the data collection and field mission phase.
- **Analysis of collected data** conducted providing an input for the draft and final evaluation reports in line with UNEG, OECD/DAC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines as well as the specifically developed templates for this evaluation. The analysis should adequately address gender equality, disability inclusion as well as human rights issues, with concrete findings, conclusions and recommendations. Submission to the evaluation manager for review by the reference group (may entail various rounds of comments and revision in accordance);
- A **presentation** of the evaluation results (conclusions and recommendations) by the evaluation team, for discussion with the evaluation reference group and other relevant internal stakeholders (in person or by video conference).

6. Details of deliverables and payments

This contract is an external collaboration contract for 21 working days. The following instalments will be made:

Deliverable	Output	To be accomplished by (dd/mm/yy)	Amount
1.	Contribution to the Inception Report with a detailed workplan and list of interviewees and focus group discussions (focus on Left bank) delivered. <i>(up to 7 w.d.)</i> <i>This deliverable pertains to UN Women</i>	April 2025	33.3 % of the fees upon receipt and approval of the inception report by the Evaluation Manager
2.	Data collection conducted with detailed notes and/or transcripts with the presentation of the preliminary findings delivered. <i>(up to 7 w.d.)</i> <i>This deliverable pertains to OHCHR</i>	April 2025	33.3 % of the fees upon receipt and approval of the inception report by the Evaluation Manager
2.	Data analysis provided as input for the draft and final evaluation reports. Presentation of the final findings. <i>(up to 7 w.d.)</i> <i>This deliverable pertains to UNDP</i>	Mid-May 2025	33.3 % of the fees upon receipt and approval of the analysis and final presentation

7. Financial Arrangements

The financial proposal by interested individual consultants (IC) shall specify a total **lump sum** amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the ToR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including the daily fee, taxes, and number of anticipated working days, transport costs, etc.).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel within Moldova for the purpose of the evaluation. In general, travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket will not be accepted. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

The travel costs within Moldova, including expenses related to site visits, meetings with implementers, partners, and key stakeholders (local transportation), should be indicated separately in the financial proposal.

8. Documents to Be Included When Submitting the Proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/ information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Signed and filled-in Offeror's letter confirming interest and availability for the individual contractor (IC) assignment, incorporating a financial proposal, with the detailed breakdown of costs supporting the all inclusive financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per working day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, phone calls, transport costs etc.);
- Proposal (Motivation Letter): explaining why they are the most suitable for the work including previous experience in similar Projects (please provide brief information on each of the above qualifications, item by item, including information, links/copies of documents that prove participation in similar assignments);
- Curriculum Vitae (UN Personal History Form) including records on past experience in similar projects/assignments and concrete outputs obtained and at least 3 referees.

Important notice: The applicants who have the statute of Government Official / Public Servant prior to appointment will be asked to submit the following documentation:

- a no-objection letter in respect of the applicant received from the Government, and;
- the applicant is certified in writing by the Government to be on official leave without pay for the entire duration of the Individual Contract.

A retired government official is not considered in this case a government official, and as such, may be contracted.

9. Evaluation of individual consultants

Initially, individual consultants will be **short-listed** based on the following minimum qualification criteria:

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in

combination with 4 years qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.

- Minimum of 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects, including baseline and endline data collection or analysis, or conducting final project assessments/reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the local, UN or international context.
- Experience working on similar matters in the Moldovan context.

The short-listed individual consultants will be further evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/ compliant/ acceptable, and
- b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight – 60% (300 pts);

* Financial Criteria weight – 40% (200 pts).

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 210 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Points Obtainable
<u>Technical</u>		
Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in law, political science, international relations, economics, or related field. A first level university degree in combination with a qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced degree.	<i>Master's (or equivalent) – 10 pts; PhD or second Master's – 25 pts</i>	25
Minimum of 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects, including baseline and endline data collection or analysis, or conducting final project assessments/reviews or evaluations of projects, programs or policies in the local, UN or international context.	<i>5 years – 20 pts, each additional year – 5 pts up to max. 50 pts</i>	50
Experience in final evaluations of projects in the field of human rights or related field (humanitarian assistance, social cohesion, community development, peace operations) is desirable.	<i>No experience – 0 pts, up to 5 years experience – 5 pts, above 5 years experience – 10 pts</i>	10
Knowledge of integration of human rights and/orgender perspectives in project monitoring and evaluations.	<i>No knowledge of such kind – 0 pts; Up to five M&E years – 5 pts, above 5 M&E experiences – 10 pts.</i>	10

Experience working on similar matters in <i>Moldova is required.</i>	<i>Each assignment – 5 pts, up to max 15 pts</i>	15
Knowledge of OHCHR, UNDP and UN Women core areas is an advantage.	<i>For each Agency – 5 pts, max 15 pts</i>	15
Total Technical Scoring		125
Interview (demonstrated technical knowledge and experience; communication/ interpersonal skills; initiative; creativity/ resourcefulness). Only up to the first 5 applicants that have accumulated the highest technical score shall be invited to an interview.		
Competencies and logic in carrying out complex project evaluations and assessments	<i>Limited competencies and logic – up to 5 pts, fair– up to 15 pts., good – up to 30 pts, very good – up to 40 pts</i>	175
Understanding and knowledge of regional/local peacebuilding contexts	<i>Limited understanding – up to 5 pts, fair – up to 20 pts., good – up to 40 pts, very good – up to 50 pts</i>	
Demonstrated ability to effectively utilize analytical and collaboration tools (e.g., MS Office 365, ZOOM, Google Workspace, evaluation-specific software) for complex data management, analysis, and reporting within an evaluation context	<i>Limited understanding and ability – up to 5 pts., satisfactory – up to 15 pts.; extensive – up to 20 pts</i>	
Ability to address challenges effectively, adapt to changing circumstances, and find practical solutions during evaluation activities.	<i>No ability – 0 pts., limited ability – up to 5 pts., demonstrated ability – up to 15 pts., extensive experience / strong skills – up to 20 pts</i>	
Strong communication and interpersonal skills	<i>No – 0 pts., to some extent – up to 5 pts., extensive experience / good skills – up to 10 pts</i>	
Command of the English language	<i>Working knowledge / intermediate – up to 15 pts, advanced – up to 20 pts</i>	
Command of the Russian language	<i>Up to 5 pts for professional knowledge</i>	
Knowledge of Romanian language is an asset	<i>Extra 5 points for knowledge of Romanian</i>	
Belonging to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment*	<i>(No – 0 pts., to one group – 2.5 pts., to two or more groups – 5 pts.)</i>	
Total Interview Scoring		175
Maximum Total Technical Scoring		300

**Under-represented groups in UN Moldova are persons with disabilities, LGBTI, ethnic and linguistic minorities, especially ethnic Gagauzians, Bulgarians, Roma, Jews, people of African descent, people living with HIV, religious minorities, especially Muslim women, refugees, and other non-citizens. Please specify in CV, in case you belong to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment.*

Financial	
<i>Evaluation of submitted financial offers will be done based on the following formula:</i> $S = F_{min} / F * 200$ <i>S – score received on financial evaluation;</i> <i>Fmin – the lowest financial offer out of all the submitted offers qualified over the technical evaluation round;</i> <i>F – financial offer under consideration</i>	200

Annexes to the Terms of Reference:

Annex 1: LogFrame

Annex 2: Inception report Template

Annex 3: Evaluation report Template

Please select the position you would like to apply for (Position 1: National Evaluator or Position 2: National Evaluator – Data collection focus on the Left Bank).

If you are applying for both positions, please note that only one assignment can be awarded for either of the two applications.