



MINISTERUL SĂNĂTĂȚII,  
MUNCHI ȘI PROTECȚIEI SOCIALE  
AL REPUBLICII MOLDOVA



## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR NATIONAL EVALUATION CONSULTANT ON ACTIVE AGEING

### National Evaluation Consultant on Active Ageing to evaluate the Action Plan on Active Ageing 2018 – 2021 as part of the fourth review and appraisal cycle of the implementation of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing

Hiring Office:	UNFPA Moldova CO
Purpose of consultancy:	<p><b><u>Purpose</u></b></p> <p>UNFPA was requested by Moldovan Government to support the evaluation of the Action Plan on Active Ageing 2018 – 2021 and the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing (MIPAA), as part of the fourth review and appraisal cycle of MIPAA. In this regard, UNFPA in partnership with the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection requires the services of a National Evaluation Consultant on Active Ageing to perform the fourth review and appraisal cycle of the implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and –the Action Plan on Active Ageing 2018 – 2021.</p> <p>The consultancy will be conducted based on the bottom-up participatory approach: review and appraisal of the fourth cycle of the implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and its Regional Implementation Strategy (MIPAA/RIS) 2018 – 2022<sup>1</sup>. This also includes the Road Map on Ageing<sup>2</sup> and its Action Plan on mainstreaming ageing into sectorial policies 2018 – 2021 approved by the Government of the Republic of Moldova in 2017<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact, leadership and institutional management and human rights based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues in implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the above-mentioned policy documents, results achieved, factors that facilitated/hindered the achievements, will document good practices and lessons learned and provide recommendations for development of the new Action Plan on Ageing.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>In 2020, the UN General Assembly declared the 2021 – 2030 the Decade of Healthy Ageing. Governments and UN Agencies were called to promote active and healthy ageing as part of the Sustainable Development Goals. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development aims at eliminating all forms of poverty, combating inequalities and addressing environmental and climate change issues, ensuring that no one is left behind. In this context, the Voluntary National Review of the Republic of Moldova states the main principles of leaving no one behind, including elderly, emphasizing the importance of improvements required in human resources planning, recruitment, training and professional development, and employment retention. It states also the need for information and awareness campaign for society and employers on integration into labor market of the elderly.<sup>4</sup></p> <p>Population ageing is a global phenomenon and a continuous process. In 2019, there were 703 million persons aged 65 years or over in the global population. This number is projected to double to 1.5 billion in 2050. Globally, the share of the population aged 65 years or over increased from 6% in 1990 to 9% in 2019. That proportion is projected to rise further to 16% in 2050, when it is expected that one in six people worldwide will be aged 65 years or over<sup>5</sup>.</p>

<sup>1</sup> MIPAA: The Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing, The Regional Implementation Strategy for MIPAA for the UNECE Region, <http://www.unece.org/population/mipaa.html>

<sup>2</sup> Road Map on Ageing of the Republic of Moldova, <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=30030>

<sup>3</sup> Action Plan on mainstreaming ageing into sectorial policies <http://lex.justice.md/index.php?action=view&view=doc&lang=1&id=353338>

<sup>4</sup> [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/26346VNR\\_2020\\_Moldova\\_Report\\_English.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/26346VNR_2020_Moldova_Report_English.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> World Population Ageing 2019 (un.org)

Moldova is undergoing a significant demographic change – depopulation and accelerating ageing. It is a result of low fertility rate, low life expectancy (68.1 years for men and 75.6 years for women), a rapidly ageing population and high emigration. According to the data presented by the National Bureau of Statistics<sup>6</sup>, 574.9 thousand persons aged 60 years or over lived in the Republic of Moldova at the beginning of 2020, which represents 21.8% of the total number of the population with ordinary residence. Of the total number of elderly people, about 60% were women, every third person was between 60-64 years old, and 10.9% were people over 80 years old. The share of persons over 60 years old is continually increasing, registering at the beginning of 2020 an ageing coefficient of 21.8%, this figure corresponding to a high level of demographic ageing. The coordination and implementation of the Moldova’s activities in response to the ageing population were set in the Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan on mainstreaming ageing into sectorial policies 2018 – 2021.

Long-term sectorial development priorities of the Republic of Moldova have been reflected in the National Strategy “Moldova 2030”<sup>7</sup>, aiming to focus the public policies on the problems, interests and needs of the people, being in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and EU-Moldova Association Agreement.

As a key development partner, UN in the Republic of Moldova and the Government signed the Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development<sup>8</sup>, that focuses on: (i) Democracy, good governance, human rights and gender equality; (ii) Sustainable, inclusive and equitable economic growth; (iii) Environmental sustainability and resilience; and (iv) Inclusive and equitable social development.

With the purpose to support the Government of the Republic of Moldova in achieving Sustainable Development Goals and targets, UNFPA developed the Country Programme Document for Moldova 2018-2022<sup>9</sup>, being aligned with the National Development Strategy 2030 and the UNSDCF 2018-2022, meeting also the country’s international rights commitments and the reform agenda linked to the European Union accession process. In the process of assisting the national partners, UNFPA is planning to build on the achievements of the past Country Programme, which included, inter alia, a strengthened national statistical capacity and availability of demographic data.

### **Context**

The Republic of Moldova, as part of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe has adhered in 2002 to the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing (MIPAA) committing to take measures that will respond to the demographic ageing challenges and integration of ageing into national policies. In 2012, the Government of the Republic of Moldova, with the support of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) has elaborated the Road Map for Mainstreaming Ageing that provides a guide through which the country can uphold the commitments of the MIPAA and its Regional Implementation Strategy (RIS). This Road Map is intended to help identify concrete actions relevant to the economic, social, cultural and political specifics of the Republic of Moldova, to aid the country in fulfilling these internationally-agreed commitments within the framework of national situation<sup>10</sup>. Implementation of the Republic of Moldova’s commitments related to ageing were included in the Programme for integration of ageing issues into policies and its Action Plan on implementation of the Road Map for mainstreaming ageing in policies for 2018-2021, adopted by the Government of Moldova in December 2017.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council in its resolution 2020/8 “Modalities for the fourth review and appraisal of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing, 2002”<sup>11</sup> recalls that in the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing, 2002, adopted by the Second World Assembly on Ageing, held in Spain on 2002, the systematic review of its implementation by the Member States was requested as being essential for its success in improving the quality of life of older persons. The Economic and Social Council invites Member States to consider collecting and utilizing, in their national review and appraisal exercises, a combination of quantitative and participatory qualitative data gathering and analysis, disaggregated by age and also, when necessary, by other relevant factors, including sex and disability, and, where appropriate,

<sup>6</sup> Biroul Național de Statistică

<sup>7</sup> National Development Strategy Moldova 2030 <https://cancelaria.gov.md/en/content/national-development-strategy-moldova-2030-parliament>

<sup>8</sup> United Nations Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development 2018-2022 <https://moldova.un.org/en/sdgs>

<sup>9</sup> UNFPA Country programme document for Moldova, 2018-2022, <https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/portal-document/N1723916.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Road Map for Mainstreaming Ageing in Republic of Moldova, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, New York and Geneva, 2012, <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=30030>

<sup>11</sup> [https://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=E/RES/2020/8](https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/RES/2020/8)

	<p>sharing of best practices in such data collection.</p> <p>In the UNECE region, the first three cycles of review and appraisal of implementation of MIPAA and its Regional Implementation Strategy (RIS) were concluded with UNECE Ministerial Conferences in 2007 (León), in 2012 (Vienna) and in Lisbon (2017), hosted by Spain, Austria and Portugal, respectively. The 2017 UNECE Ministerial Conference on Ageing, hosted by Portugal in Lisbon in 2017, outlined three priority goals to be reached by 2022:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. recognizing the potential of older persons;</li> <li>2. encouraging longer working lives and ability to work;</li> <li>3. and ensuring ageing by dignity<sup>12</sup>.</li> </ol> <p>Republic of Moldova, as one of the signatory countries of MIPAA is requested by UNECE to present a report on national implementation of the fourth MIPAA cycle 2018 – 2022. In addition to that, the Government of the Republic of Moldova would develop a new Action Plan on ageing to reflect next steps in the upcoming 3-4 years of implementation of the Road Map on Ageing.</p>
<p>Scope of work:</p> <p><i>(Description of services, activities, or outputs)</i></p>	<p>The overall scope of the assignment is to perform the fourth review and appraisal cycle of the implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and its Regional Implementation Strategy (MIPAA/RIS) 2018 – 2022 and the Action Plan on Active Ageing 2018 - 2021.</p> <p>The consultancy will be conducted based on the bottom-up participatory approach. This also includes the Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan on mainstreaming ageing into sectorial policies 2018 – 2021 approved by the Government of the Republic of Moldova. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact, leadership and institutional management and human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues in implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the above-mentioned policy documents, results achieved, factors that facilitated/hindered the achievements, will document good practices and lessons learned and provide recommendations for development of the new Action Plan on Ageing.</p> <p>For the above-mentioned assignment, a National Consultant will be selected and will work under overall leadership of the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection and UNFPA, United Nations Population Fund.</p> <p>The selected National Consultant will be involved in carrying out MIPAA evaluation using a participatory methodology in alignment with recommendations and methodology proposed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council and UNECE. Main findings and proposals collected during this phase will be used for further development of a new Action Plan on Active Ageing.</p> <p>Evaluation Report of MIPAA will be presented to national stakeholders in a public event in September 2021.</p> <p><b><u>Objectives</u></b></p> <p>To achieve the envisaged scope, the following objectives were set:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluate the extent to which MIPAA / Road Map on Ageing and the 2017 Lisbon Ministerial Declaration objectives and results were achieved and report on the status of indicators during the last five years and highlight in a nutshell the most important achievement in the implementation of MIPAA/RIS during the last 20 years, in accordance with (Annex 1)</li> <li>▪ To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability leadership and institutional management and human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues in implementation by the Republic of Moldova of MIPAA/RIS 2018 – 2022 and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan.</li> <li>▪ Analyze and describe the extent to which the national ownership was ensured, including domestic financial allocations in implementation of the policy documents on ageing.</li> <li>▪ Describe good practices and provide factors that facilitated and/or hindered the achievements of the results and elaborate lessons learned;</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup> Proceedings of the 2017 UNECE Ministerial Conference on Ageing, 20-22 September 2017, Lisbon, Portugal  
[https://unece.org/DAM/pau/age/Ministerial\\_Conference\\_Lisbon/Documents/Conference\\_Proceedings\\_Lisbon\\_Ministerial\\_Conference.pdf](https://unece.org/DAM/pau/age/Ministerial_Conference_Lisbon/Documents/Conference_Proceedings_Lisbon_Ministerial_Conference.pdf)

- Present specific recommendations per each objective to be incorporated in the next Action Plan on Ageing.

The evaluation will consider core results achieved since 2018 and the **most important policy achievements during the last 20 years** in the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS, and will present, to the extent possible, implications of the results achieved towards elderly and general population. Evaluation should be grounded on human rights-based approach, ensure that results achieved are evidence-based, proposed recommendations are results-oriented and specific.

#### **Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions**

The evaluation should take into consideration the following criteria and evaluation questions:

**Relevance.** Evaluate to what extent the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS 2018 – 2022 and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan respond to the elderly needs:

- Are the implemented activities consistent with the objectives and expected results?

**Effectiveness.** Evaluate the extent to which planned results and indicators have been effectively achieved as result of MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan implementation:

- To what extent did the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan contributed to integration of older persons in society?
- How the above-mentioned policy documents contributed to the perceptions and images of ageing and older persons?
- Have the mechanisms for stakeholder’s participation, including elderly, been developed and consolidated?
- To what extent did the implementation of policy documents on ageing promoted equitable and sustainable economic growth in response to population ageing?
- To what extent businesses, non-profit organizations and public enterprises involve older persons as consumers in the planning and design of goods and services?
- To which extent social protection systems have been adjusted in response to demographic changes and their social and economic consequences?
- Have the labor market and migration been enabled to respond to the economic and social consequences of population ageing?
- Have age-friendly environments and housing been developed to ensure that older persons can attain and maintain their highest possible level of health and functional capacity?
- To what extent the lifelong learning was promoted and educational system adapted in order to meet the changing economic, social and demographic condition?
- To which extent policy documents on ageing strived for ensuring quality of life at all ages and maintaining independent living including health and well-being?
- To what extent were taken measures for building intergenerational solidarity?
- Has the necessary legislative framework been developed and amended to support the implementation of the policy documents on ageing?
- Assess effectiveness of monitoring and information system for the implementation?

**Efficiency.** Evaluate how economically or optimally financial, human and technical inputs have been used to produce results:

- How efficiently has result based management been applied in achieving the results of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan?
- What was the domestic financial support provided by the authorities nationally and locally in implementation of these policy documents and to which extent ageing were reflected in the medium-term budgetary framework?

**Impact.** Assess the extent to which the results achieved have made a real difference to the beneficiaries:

- Do the beneficiaries and other stakeholders affected by the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan perceived the effect of the interventions on themselves? What has been improved and what has not been improved? What are their recommendations for the future in this regard?

**Leadership, Management and Institutional Arrangements.** Asses to which extent the leadership and management of the interventions ensured the relevance, effectiveness, and the impact of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan implementation:

- To what extent did the intervention mechanisms (administrative regulatory framework and procedures) foster or hinder the achievement of the results?
- Did the management of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan implementation ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?
- Is there effective coordination among the government and civil society organization in the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan?

**Human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues.** Evaluate to what extent has human rights and gender equality considerations have been effectively mainstreamed throughout the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan in its development and implementation:

- Does the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan actively contribute to the promotion of elderly's rights?
- To what extent and how the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan ensured a non-discrimination and equity focus?

The National Consultant should consider contribution of all partners to the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan.

#### **Methodology and approach**

The evaluator is expected to submit a context specific evaluation methodology which will highlight the criteria and proposed evaluation questions listed above. The evaluation will be conducted in close coordination with the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection and UNFPA Moldova Country Office. The evaluator is expected to submit a context specific evaluation structure/outline as part of the inception report.

Proposed methodology should be based on the UNDESA *“Guidelines for review and appraisal of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing. Bottom-up participatory approach”*<sup>13</sup>. and UNECE *Guidelines for National Reports on MIPAA/RIS*

The collection of evaluation data will be carried out through a variety of techniques that will range from desk review, direct observation to informal and semi-structured interviews and focus/reference groups discussions.

#### *Data collection.*

The evaluation will use a multiple-method approach including documentary review and individual interviews. The evaluation will 1) review annual reports on the implementation of the Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan presented to the Government, reports and studies carried out by the development partners, other relevant policies and publication; 2) interview relevant national and local stakeholders. These stakeholders may include representatives from the government, civil-society organizations, the private-sector, UN organizations, trade unions, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and most importantly, the beneficiaries of the policies. All activities shall be carried out taking into account the development of the COVID-19 pandemic, undertaking all necessary protective measures.

#### *Stakeholders' participation.*

The evaluation will be conducted based on the bottom-up participatory approach, in alignment with UNDESA guidelines and UNECE *Guidelines for National Reports on MIPAA/RIS*.

<sup>13</sup> [https://unece.org/DAM/pau/\\_images/MIPAA\\_Review\\_guidelines\\_global.pdf](https://unece.org/DAM/pau/_images/MIPAA_Review_guidelines_global.pdf)

The evaluator will undertake triangulation and consolidation of the data obtained from the methodological processes outlined in the evaluation methodology framework. The evaluator will also align objectives or results of the Road Map on Ageing to the specific questions, performance indicators, data sources and data collection requirements to facilitate the evaluation proper. The evaluator should ensure compliance of the report with the Evaluation Quality Assessment Criteria of the UNFPA Department of Oversight. (Annex 2)

### **Evaluation process**

The evaluation process and development of a new Action Plan on Active Ageing will include the following key steps:

#### **i. Preparation**

- a. This involves briefing, orienting and clarifying relevant issues and approaches to the evaluator with the UNFPA and the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection.

#### **ii. Inception**

- a. The evaluator prepares a brief inception report which will include a clear, time and resource bound detailed work plan, methodology and clear evaluation of questions and tools. An inception report to be prepared by consultant and presented to UNFPA CO and the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection for discussion and agreement before the evaluator moves to the implementation phase.

#### **iii. Data collection**

- a. Desk review and analysis of the annual reports on the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan, reports of the national authorities responsible for the implementation of the strategy, reports and studies carried out by the development partners, other relevant policies and publication. The list of key documents will be agreed with the UNFPA and the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection.
- b. Carrying out individual or collective interviews with partners and stakeholders (national authorities, NGOs, development partners).
- c. The evaluator take into account the epidemiological context and will collect information related to COVID-19 pandemic to describe the measures that have been taken to protect older persons on the national level, activities carried out to strengthen social inclusion of older persons during physical distancing, etc., but also to mark out the challenges faced during this time.

#### **iv. Analysis**

- a. The evaluator will analyze collected data/information, seeks clarifications from different sources to enrich the findings. In the absence of midline and end line data, uses available data collection methods as much as practicable to collate feedback on the results of the MIPAA/RIS implementation from beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

#### **v. Reporting**

- a. The evaluator produces and submits a draft report according to the agreed format which consists of findings that details the current status of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan, the assessment of the results and recommendations for the next strategic document on active ageing. The draft Report will be presented not later than September 2021 during the meeting of the International Advisory Panel on Population and Development
- b. The evaluator produces a final report that incorporates the feedback received. The report will have two parts. A detailed report in alignment with the proposed methodology and a short version of that report, based on the UNECE reporting requirements (Annex 3).

#### **vi. Dissemination**

- a. Dissemination of the findings to the appropriate stakeholders and beneficiaries will be done as per agreed schedule. The report will be presented at the meeting of the National Commission on Population and Development, before it is sent in the final version to the UNECE Working Group on Ageing.

### **Expected outputs**

#### **A. Inception Report**

The Consultant shall submit an electronic copy of a draft inception report to UNFPA and Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection. The inception report provides an opportunity for the Consultant, UNFPA and the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection to ensure that their interpretations of the ToR are mutually consistent. The inception report shall:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Explain the evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why;</li> <li>▪ Review and strengthen the evaluation methodology (e.g. questions, methods, data-collection instruments);</li> <li>▪ Explain how the evaluation questions will be addressed with respect to all evaluative criteria indicated above by way of proposed methods, evaluation designs, proposed sources of data, and data-collection procedures;</li> <li>▪ For each of the evaluative criteria, describe the measurable performance indicators or standards of performance that will be used to assess progress towards the attainment of results;</li> <li>▪ Discuss (a) the limitations of the proposed methods and approaches and (b) what will be done to minimize the possible biases and effects of these limitations;</li> <li>▪ Explain the Consultant’s procedures for ensuring quality control for all deliverables;</li> <li>▪ Explain the Consultant’s procedures to ensure informed consent among all people to be interviewed or surveyed and confidentiality and privacy during and after discussion of sensitive issues with beneficiaries or members of the public;</li> <li>▪ Indicate familiarity with and agreement to adhere to the requirements of the UNFPA’s Evaluation Quality Assessment Criteria, which will be provided to the consultant;</li> <li>▪ Provide a proposed table of timely schedule of tasks, activities, meetings, field visits, consultations and deliverables consistent with this ToR;</li> <li>▪ Provide the content of the evaluation report and draft structure of the Action Plan;</li> </ul> <p>Note: Consultant is encouraged to suggest refinements to the TOR and to propose creative or cost- or time-saving approaches to the evaluation and explain an anticipated value. UNFPA reserves the right to modify the ToR in response to the inception report.</p> <p><b>B. Draft Evaluation Report</b></p> <p>The Consultant shall submit an electronic copy of a draft evaluation report. The draft report should be thoroughly copy edited to ensure that comments on content, presentation and structure can be reduced to a minimum.</p> <p>After review of the draft report, the UNFPA shall coordinate written comments on the draft report and shall submit these to the Consultant. Based on these comments, the consultant shall correct all factual errors and inaccuracies and make changes related to the report’s structure, consistency, analytical rigor, validity of evidence, and requirements in the TOR. The consultant will not be required to make changes to conclusions and recommendations unless they are regarded as qualitative improvements.</p> <p>After making the necessary changes, the Consultant will submit a revised draft evaluation report, which may lead to further comments from the International Advisory Panel on Population and Development. After the second round of review and, if necessary, further revision to the draft evaluation report, the Consultant can then submit the final report.</p> <p><b>C. Final Report</b></p> <p>The final report will address the comments from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection and UNFPA. The structure of the final report will be suggested by the consultant in the Inception Report. The final report will have two parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First part which will provide an in-depth evaluation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan in alignment with approved methodology</li> <li>• Second part will consist in a shorter version of the report, in alignment with UNECE requirements for reporting on MIPAA implementation (Annex 1), and will be examined and approved by the National Council for Human Rights, in accordance with the Government Decision 65/2019</li> </ul>
Duration and working schedule:	28 May – 30 September 2021, estimated volume of work – 30 working days

Place where services are to be delivered:	Chisinau, Republic of Moldova																																											
Delivery dates and how work will be delivered (e.g. electronic, hard copy etc.):	<p><b>Work Plan and timeframe</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Tasks</th> <th>Timeline</th> <th>No. of working days</th> <th>Responsible</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Preparation and submission of the inception report (English)</td> <td>30 May</td> <td>2 days</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Desk review</td> <td>30 June</td> <td>5 days</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carrying out individual interviews</td> <td>30 June</td> <td>4 days</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft report prepared and submitted</td> <td>15 July</td> <td>10 days</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft report reviewed by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection and UNFPA</td> <td>1 August</td> <td></td> <td>MoHLSP and UNFPA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final shorter version of the report, in alignment with UNECE requirements for reporting on MIPAA implementation (Annex 1) submitted</td> <td>5 August</td> <td>3 days</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>First report which will provide an in-depth evaluation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan in alignment with approved methodology</td> <td>15 September</td> <td>5 days</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dissemination of final findings of the Report</td> <td>30 September</td> <td>1 day</td> <td>Evaluation Consultant &amp; MoHLSP</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Total working days per consultant:</b></td> <td><b>30</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Note:</i> The duration of the work plan may be adjusted upon request of the consultant. However, the number of working days for which the consultant will receive the payment is 30 working days.</p>				Tasks	Timeline	No. of working days	Responsible	Preparation and submission of the inception report (English)	30 May	2 days	Evaluation Consultant	Desk review	30 June	5 days	Evaluation Consultant	Carrying out individual interviews	30 June	4 days	Evaluation Consultant	Draft report prepared and submitted	15 July	10 days	Evaluation Consultant	Draft report reviewed by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection and UNFPA	1 August		MoHLSP and UNFPA	Final shorter version of the report, in alignment with UNECE requirements for reporting on MIPAA implementation (Annex 1) submitted	5 August	3 days		First report which will provide an in-depth evaluation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan in alignment with approved methodology	15 September	5 days	Evaluation Consultant	Dissemination of final findings of the Report	30 September	1 day	Evaluation Consultant & MoHLSP	<b>Total working days per consultant:</b>		<b>30</b>	
Tasks	Timeline	No. of working days	Responsible																																									
Preparation and submission of the inception report (English)	30 May	2 days	Evaluation Consultant																																									
Desk review	30 June	5 days	Evaluation Consultant																																									
Carrying out individual interviews	30 June	4 days	Evaluation Consultant																																									
Draft report prepared and submitted	15 July	10 days	Evaluation Consultant																																									
Draft report reviewed by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection and UNFPA	1 August		MoHLSP and UNFPA																																									
Final shorter version of the report, in alignment with UNECE requirements for reporting on MIPAA implementation (Annex 1) submitted	5 August	3 days																																										
First report which will provide an in-depth evaluation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan in alignment with approved methodology	15 September	5 days	Evaluation Consultant																																									
Dissemination of final findings of the Report	30 September	1 day	Evaluation Consultant & MoHLSP																																									
<b>Total working days per consultant:</b>		<b>30</b>																																										
Monitoring and progress control, including reporting requirements, periodicity format and deadline:	The monitoring will be ensured by means of regular information exchange on progress via e-mail and phone calls. Regular online meetings with the UNFPA and MoHLSP on the updates will be organized. Any challenges that may impede the process of achievement of deliverables will be communicated to UNFPA, as well as the measures for their mitigation.																																											
Supervisory arrangements:	The contracted National Consultant will work under the overall guidance and will report to: UNFPA Programme Analyst on Population and Development																																											
Expected travel:	N/A																																											
Required expertise, qualifications and competencies, including language requirements:	<p><u>Academic Qualifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Professional degree (Master level degree or higher) in Social Policies, Public Policies, Economics, public administration, international development and/or other related science.</li> <li>▪ Other formal education relevant for the assignment (such as training in Human Rights Based Approach, Results Based Management or Monitoring and Evaluation) is an asset.</li> </ul> <p><u>Years of Experience:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least 5 years of relevant <b>professional experience</b> in ageing policies, social development, gender or demography <i>OR</i> at least 5 years of relevant experience in monitoring and evaluation, public policy and impact assessments.</li> <li>▪ Previous experience of <b>collaboration with Government of Moldova in developing sectorial policies</b>, in particular State Chancellery, National Commission on Population and Development</li> </ul>																																											

and Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection.

- Experience of **work with development partners**, in particular UN/UNFPA and EU (successful experience in working with UN agencies is an asset).
- Experience in organization, moderation and/or facilitation of **participatory** team-works, joint researches, national/local level consultations, trainings.

Languages:

- Fluency in Romanian and English is required.

Working knowledge of one or more additional languages relevant for Moldova, including Russian, Bulgarian, Gagauzian, Romani, Ukrainian or sign language would be an asset.

**Selection of Consultant**

Selection process will be conducted based on the qualifications and competencies required for this assignment, as mentioned above. The following score will be provided per each qualification criteria:

<b>Qualification criteria</b>	<b>Scoring</b>	<b>Total possible score</b>
University degree in Social Policies, Public Policies, Economics, public administration, international development and/or other related science.	BA – 10 pts, MA – 15 pts, PhD – 20 pts	20 pts
Other formal education relevant for the assignment (such as training in Human Rights Based Approach, Results Based Management or Monitoring and Evaluation) is an asset.	5 pts – one training, 7 pts for two trainings and 10 pts for all three trainings in RBM, M&E or HRBA	10 pts
At least 5 years of relevant <b>professional experience</b> in ageing policies, social development, gender or demography <i>OR</i> at least 5 years of relevant experience in monitoring and evaluation, public policy and impact assessments.	5 pts – 20 pts, each year over 5 years – 5 pts, up to a maximum 40 pts).	40 pts
Previous experience of <b>collaboration with Government of Moldova in developing sectorial policies</b> , in particular State Chancellery, National Commission on Population and Development and Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection.	No experience – 0 pts, experience with Governmental institutions – 3 pts; experience with State Chancellery / MoHLSP, NCPD - 5 pts	5 pts
Experience of <b>work with development partners</b> , in particular UN and EU (successful experience in working with UN agencies is an asset).	Previous experience with UN / EU – 3 pts, experience with UNFPA – 5 pts.	5 pts
Experience in organization, moderation and/or facilitation of <b>participatory</b> team-works, joint researches, national/local level consultations, trainings.	No experience – 0 pts, some experience at local or national level (3-4 events) – 5 pts, extensive experience – 10 pts	10 pts
Fluency in Romanian and English is required.	5 pts	5 pts
Working knowledge of one or more additional languages relevant for Moldova, including Russian, Bulgarian, Gagauzian, Romani, Ukrainian or sign language would be an asset.	5 pts	5 pts
<b>Total score:</b>		<b>100 pts</b>

Please note that before starting its assignment the selected consultant would be asked to submit a series of documents (health statement, certification of health insurance; passport, vendor form, security certificates etc.), as well as to follow two mandatory online courses: i) Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and ii) Fraud and Corruption Awareness.

<p>Inputs / services to be provided by UNFPA or implementing partner (e.g support services, office space, equipment), if applicable:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Other relevant information or special conditions, if any:</p>	<p><b><u>Management and evaluation</u></b></p> <p><b>Please note that for this assignment are not eligible those candidates that were engaged in development or implementation of the Action Plan on Ageing 2018 – 2021.</b></p> <p>One national consultant will be hired through a selection process. The consultant will be responsible to carry out the evaluation and to provide deliverables upon the deadline. With the purpose to avoid any conflict of interests, the selected consultant was not supposed to take part in the development of the Action Plan on active ageing 2018-2021.</p> <p>Evaluation Report will be validated at a public event with relevant national stakeholders, that will take place in September 2021.</p> <p>The Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection shall request information on the implementation of MIPAA from the central public authorities, according to the UNECE’s Guidelines for National Reports. <i>Coordination Team</i> composed by the representatives of the Ministry of Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection and UNFPA will offer the required support to the National Consultant (logistics, meetings with stakeholders, dissemination etc.). The Coordination Team will meet with the Evaluator at agreed schedules, discuss progress and address any challenges faced. In particular, it will be responsible for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Select and secure appropriate endorsement of consultant;</li> <li>b. Review and endorse the terms of reference of the evaluation;</li> <li>c. Provide overall technical guidance and quality assurance on every step of the evaluation process;</li> <li>d. Coordinate and set up meeting scheduled with beneficiaries and stakeholders;</li> <li>e. Facilitate the evaluation consultant’s access to all background documents;</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Ethics</u></b></p> <p>The evaluation of the MIPAA/RIS and Road Map on Ageing and its Action Plan will be conducted along highest ethical and legal standards and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, especially members of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups and in accordance with the UNEG’s Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Due consideration will also be given to beneficiaries and other stakeholders on confidentiality of information and privacy during consultations and personal interviews.</p> <p><b><u>Evaluation audience</u></b></p> <p>The results of the evaluation will be publicly available for any interested parties. The primary users of the evaluation results are the decision makers within the Government of the Republic of Moldova, especially the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection. The recommendations of the evaluation will be used for the development of the new Action Plan on Active Ageing.</p> <p>The short version of the report (<i>Annex 1</i>) will be presented to the UNECE Working Group on Ageing and will be included into the regional fourth review and appraisal cycle of the implementation of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and its Regional Implementation Strategy (MIPAA/RIS) 2018 – 2022.</p> <p><b><u>Financial arrangements:</u></b></p> <p>The payment will be conducted in two instalments as an output-based lump sum, upon submission and</p>

<p>approval of the stipulated in the Terms of Reference deliverables and certification by the UNFPA Moldova Country Office appointed staff of the successful performance as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1st instalment – 50% - upon submission by the National Consultant of draft report reviewed by the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Protection and UNFPA;</li> <li>- 2nd instalment – 50% - upon dissemination by the National Consultant of final findings of the report.</li> </ul> <p>The lump sum will be established based on the requirements included in Terms of Reference and expertise of the selected National Consultant, in alignment with UNFPA Policy and Procedures for Contracting Individual Consultants.</p>	
<p>Signature of Head of Requesting Officer in Hiring Office:</p> <p>DocuSigned by: <i>Eduard Mihalas</i></p> <hr/> <p><b>Eduard Mihalas</b> Programme Analyst on Population and Development Date: 20-Apr-2021</p>	<p>Signature of Approving Officer:</p> <p>DocuSigned by: <i>Natalia Plugaru</i></p> <hr/> <p><b>Natalia Plugaru</b> UNFPA Assistant Representative Date: 20-Apr-2021</p>

## Annex 1.

### Outline of the report on the follow-up to the Regional Implementation Strategy of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing in the Republic of Moldova

#### Part I

##### Executive summary

*Approximately 500 to 700 words (1-1.5 A4 pages, single-spaced).*

Please provide an executive summary according to the structure below:

- Methods used for this report; in particular, details of the bottom-up participatory approach used, if any.
- Brief review of national progress in fulfilling (or lagging behind) the commitments of MIPAA/RIS. Include **three to five major achievements** since 2017 and **three to five important aspects to be improved in the future**
- Conclusion.

##### General information

This section should contain general information about the member State and the entities submitting the report, in particular:

1. Country name
2. Name and contact details of the author(s) of the report
3. Name and contact details of official national focal point on ageing
4. Name, reference, and date of adoption or status of preparation of national strategy, action plan or similar policy document on ageing (please attach relevant documents in the annex).

#### 1. National ageing situation

*Approximately 500 words (1 A4 page, single-spaced, excluding annexes).*

This section should include a brief **overview of the national ageing situation with respect to demographic, social, economic and political developments**, and, in particular major challenges related to population ageing in the country.

One of the key objectives of the national reports is to allow member States to share good practices and novel approaches to similar challenges and opportunities related to the ageing of their societies, taking into account the different contexts in which population ageing evolves.

Therefore, this section may consist of the following:

1. **Presentation of demographic indicators** and their projections that could help better understand the country's development regarding the issues discussed. Which demographic change occurred during the last twenty years?
2. **Presentation of key quantitative social and economic indicators** and characteristics that may help to bring into focus the issues treated and to permit quantitative analysis. What was the impact of the demographic change for society in your country?<sup>14</sup>
3. **Brief description of the social, economic and political situation**, which may help to understand the context in which ageing-related issues are dealt with in your country.
4. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly affected the social and economic situation across the countries. Brief description of important measures to revise/adjust social and economic policies due to the confinement and economic shut-down, if any.

**Suggestion: you may provide more detailed analytical tables and charts in the annex.**

<sup>14</sup> See for instance the European Commission's report on the impact of demographic change <https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/new-push-european-democracy/impactdemographic-change-europe>

## 2. Method

Up to 500 words (1 A4 page, single-spaced, excluding annexes).

This section should deal with the methods used for an evaluation of policy actions taken towards the implementation of MIPAA/RIS within the framework of the ten commitments of RIS since 2002 and especially under the three main goals of the 2017 Lisbon Ministerial Declaration.

It is suggested that both a quantitative and a qualitative approach be used for assessing the impact of policy actions:

- **Quantitative information** can be taken from ongoing and new studies on ageing, both cross-sectional (assessing the impact of policies across several sectors) and longitudinal (observing a specific policy impact over a period of time). For the comparative picture at the regional level, data on available indicators composing the Active Ageing Index and those from the comparable/harmonized surveys could be recommended.
- **Qualitative information** can be obtained through a **bottom-up participatory approach or other available qualitative data from recent research** (preferably undertaken since 2017). If member States wish to conduct new qualitative research for the purpose of this report, the participatory approach may be a suitable tool, as it calls for the involvement of older persons in assessing the impact of policy actions on the quality of their lives. This approach is flexible, and can be adapted to country-specific challenges and opportunities.<sup>15</sup>

In general this section should refer to **interactions with the different stakeholders** – such as ministries, regional and local authorities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, social partners, academia and organizations representing the interests of older persons and of young persons - especially in the context of intergenerational relations – and on how these interactions contributed to the report. A short paragraph and/or figure of the network view that captures the overall process and stakeholders' roles could be included in this section.

This section should also describe the review and appraisal coordinating mechanism: the ECOSOC resolution 2020/8 on **“Modalities for the fourth review and appraisal of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing, 2002”** in its paragraph 4 *“encourages* Member States to establish or strengthen a national coordinating body or mechanism, as appropriate, in order to, inter alia, facilitate the implementation of the Madrid Plan of Action, including its review and appraisal.” When applicable, **the links between the review and appraisal of MIPAA/RIS and other established monitoring mechanisms** in your country, for instance on implementation of SDGs, should be discussed here.

## Part II: 20 Years of MIPAA/RIS

### Main actions and progress in implementation of MIPAA/RIS and the 2017 Lisbon Ministerial Declaration goals

The **Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing** was adopted by the Second World Assembly on Ageing, held in Madrid in 2002<sup>16</sup> and its **UNECE Regional Implementation Strategy**<sup>17</sup> highlighting ten commitments was endorsed the same year at the UNECE Ministerial Conference on Ageing, held in Berlin.

In 2017, the UNECE Ministerial Conference concluded the 3<sup>rd</sup> review and appraisal of the MIPAA/RIS implementation in the region under the theme *“A Sustainable Society for All Ages: Realizing the potential of living longer”*. The Conference adopted the **2017 Lisbon Ministerial Declaration**<sup>18</sup> comprising three main goals:

- I. Recognizing the potential of older persons
- II. Encouraging longer working life and ability to work
- III. Ensuring ageing with dignity.

<sup>15</sup> For a detailed description of the bottom-up participatory approach see: UNDESA (2006), ‘Guidelines for Review and Appraisal of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing: Bottom-up Participatory Approach’ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/ageing/publications/2015/08/guidelines-for-reviewand-appraisal-of-the-mipaa-bottom-up-participatory-approach/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/mica2002/documents/Madrid2002Report.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/mica2002/documents/ECE\\_AC23\\_2002\\_2\\_Rev6\\_e.pdf](https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/mica2002/documents/ECE_AC23_2002_2_Rev6_e.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.unece.org/index.php?id=45245>

In this section, **please provide a short analysis of the implementation of the 2017 Lisbon Ministerial Declaration goals and measures during the last five years** including what has been achieved/lagging (successes and setbacks, as well as reasoning behind both), good practices and lessons learned. Pay particular attention to the crosscutting impact of RIS commitments 8 (mainstreaming gender) and 10 (regional cooperation) in every question. Finally, **highlight in a nutshell the most important achievement** in the implementation of MIPAA/RIS **during the last 20 years** and give **recommendations for future actions** (what is planned/needs to be done).

## 1. Recognizing the potential of older persons

1.1. What has been done to **empower individuals to realize their potential** for physical, mental and social well-being throughout their lives and to participate in and contribute to society according to their capacities, needs, and desires along the **RIS commitments 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10** and the goals of the **Lisbon Ministerial Declaration**?

- ❖ developing and implementing socially responsible and future-oriented economic and financial strategies
- ❖ fostering effective consultations with, and involvement of, older persons and their representatives at the national, regional and local levels in designing policies
- ❖ promoting a positive image of older persons, acknowledging their contributions to society
- ❖ fostering work and volunteering of younger and older persons in intergenerational settings
- ❖ encouraging businesses, non-profit organizations and public enterprises to involve older persons as consumers in the planning and design of goods and services
- ❖ ensuring that older persons can attain and maintain their highest possible level of health and functional capacity by supporting the development of age-friendly environments and housing.

1.2. Please also reflect on **your country's participation in the relevant global/UN-wide campaigns**:

1.2.1. Does your country take part in a **Global Campaign to Combat Ageism** led by the World Health Organization (WHO)<sup>19</sup>? Do the activities in your country contribute to the endeavors of this WHO-led campaign? Which ones? Did your participation in the campaign contribute to the implementation of the MIPAA/RIS in your country? **Which measures have been set in this context?**

1.2.2. Does your country take part in the United Nations **Open-ended Working Group on Ageing (OEWG-A)** for the purpose of strengthening the protection of the human rights of older persons? Do the activities in your country contribute to the endeavors of the OEWG-A? Which ones? Do national policies ensure protection of the human rights of older people in your country? **Do you see any legal gaps?**

1.3. Highlight in a nutshell the **most important policy achievement during the last 20 years** to contribute to empowering individuals to realize their potential for physical, mental and social well-being throughout their lives and to participate in and contribute to society.

**Give some examples how thinking, feeling and dealing with ageing has changed during the last 20 years** and give some recommendations for future action (what is planned/needs to be done) to avoid ageism.

**Suggestion: this could be a good question for dialogue with older persons and civil society**

## 2. Encouraging longer working life and ability to work

2.1. Which measures have been implemented to **recognizing the potential embedded in the employment of older workers and developing labor market strategies** to promote maximum participation opportunities for workers of all ages along the **RIS commitments 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10** and the goals of the **Lisbon Declaration**?

- ❖ promoting lifelong learning opportunities
- ❖ fight unemployment at all ages, reducing financial inequalities and poverty, taking up measures to reduce the gender pay gap
- ❖ encouraging employers to value the experience of, and to retain and hire, older workers
- ❖ providing incentives for longer working life opportunities and more flexible retirement choices
- ❖ planning and implementing pension reforms, that take into account the increasing longevity and the extension of working lives

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.who.int/ageing/ageism/campaign/en/>

- ❖ facilitating the reconciliation of employment and care work.

**2.2.** Which **special measures** did your country set to **close the gender pay and pension gap** as well to take into account the **special situation of older women**?

**2.3.** Highlight in a nutshell **the most important achievement during the last 20 years** in recognizing the potential embedded in the **employment of older workers and developing labor market strategies** to promote maximum participation opportunities for workers of all ages? Give some recommendations for future action (what is planned/needs to be done).

### **3. Ensuring ageing with dignity**

**3.1.** Which measures have been contributing to **protecting older persons' enjoyment of all human rights and dignity, promoting their autonomy, self-determination and participation in society**, and making sure that no law, policy or programme leaves room for discrimination of any kind along **RIS commitments 7, 8, 9 and 10** and the goals of the **Lisbon Declaration**?

- ❖ protecting older persons' enjoyment of all human rights and dignity, promoting their autonomy, self-determination and participation in society,
- ❖ supporting the necessary infrastructure and assistance to prevent all types of abuse and violence against older persons,
- ❖ fostering the development of innovative methods and services as well as user and age-friendly technology and products,
- ❖ raising quality standards for integrated social and long-term care and health services and continuously adapting the status, training and working conditions of professional care workers,
- ❖ supporting research on individual and population ageing processes to better address emerging needs in ageing societies,
- ❖ promoting the participation of both persons with dementia and/or mental and behavioral disorders and their informal carriers in social and community life,
- ❖ respecting the self-determination, independence and dignity of older persons, especially, but not limited to, towards the end of life.

**3.2.** Highlight in a nutshell the **most important achievement during the last 20 years to protecting older persons' enjoyment of all human rights** and to **raising quality standards for integrated social and long-term care** and health services as well as adapting the status, training and working conditions of professional care workers. Give some recommendations for future action (what is planned/needs to be done).

## ***Part III: Healthy and Active Ageing in a Sustainable World***

### **1. Contribution of ageing-related policies to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals**

The **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future. At its heart are the **17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**<sup>20</sup>, which are an urgent call for action by all countries - developed and developing - in a global partnership. They recognize that **ending poverty** and other deprivations must go hand-in-hand **with strategies that improve health and education, reduce inequality, and spur economic growth** – all while tackling climate change and working to preserve our oceans and forests.

**At the heart of the SDGs is the promise “to leave no one behind”.** This entails ensuring that every individual, including every older person, is included in development efforts. In his Report on the Modalities for the fourth review and appraisal of the implementation of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing 2002, the Secretary-General states in paragraph 12:

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

“[...] Efforts to implement the Madrid Plan of Action will therefore contribute to accelerating progress towards the realization of the 2030 Agenda.”<sup>21</sup>

- 1.1. Has your country already submitted voluntary national report(s) (VNR) to the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) on the implementation of the SDGs? Please briefly report on whether and how the **population ageing and older persons’ issues were addressed** in your country’s VNR(s).**
  - 1.2. Within the national political planning are there any established links between ageing issues and the 2030 Agenda** (a mapping of the connections between MIPAA/ RIS and the SDGs that shows areas for policy integration is available on the UNECE website<sup>22</sup>)?
  - 1.3. Given the information reported about MIPAA/RIS implementation, what are the most relevant SDGs which could be nourished by current policy measures** (specify which measures)? Were they or will they be included in your country’s VNR(s)? Describe 1–3 good practice examples.
- 2. Lessons learnt from managing the consequences and impacts for older people in emergency situations: the COVID-19 pandemic**

In May 2020, the United Nations Secretary-General launched a Policy Brief: ‘The impact of COVID-19 on older persons’ with four key priorities for Member States’ action:<sup>23</sup>

- ❖ Ensure that difficult health-care decisions affecting older people are guided by a commitment to dignity and the right to health.
- ❖ Strengthen social inclusion and solidarity during physical distancing.
- ❖ Fully integrate a focus on older persons into the socio-economic and humanitarian response to COVID-19.
- ❖ Expand participation by older persons, share good practices and harness knowledge and data.

Please describe briefly the main measures that have been set **in your country to protect older persons** and to address the four focus areas as outlined above. Please also indicate if and how policy approaches have changed, in light of the lessons learned since the start of the pandemic.

- 2.1. How were older people affected by Covid-19 in your country?** Was there a higher share of hospitalization and rate of deaths among older people in 2020 than for population in general and in relation to previous long-term observations?
- 2.2. What has been done to ensure that difficult health-care decisions affecting older people are guided by a commitment to dignity and the right to health?** Please reflect on the recommendations of the Secretary-General’s Policy Brief, when applicable, and briefly describe the main challenges and 3 - 5 good practices.
- 2.3. What has been done to strengthen social inclusion and solidarity during physical distancing?** Please reflect on the recommendations of the Secretary General’s Policy Brief, when applicable, and briefly describe the main challenges and 3 - 5 good practices.
- 2.4. What has been done to fully integrate a focus on older persons into the socioeconomic and humanitarian response to COVID-19?** Please reflect on the recommendations of the Secretary-General’s Policy Brief, when applicable, and briefly describe the main challenges and 3 - 5 good practices.
- 2.5. What has been done to expand participation by older persons, share good practices and harness knowledge and data?** Please reflect on the recommendations of the Secretary-General’s Policy Brief, when applicable, and briefly describe the main challenges and 3 - 5 good practices.

### **3. Activities in preparation and implementation of the WHO Decade of Healthy Ageing 2020 – 2030**

In August 2020, the 73rd World Health Assembly have endorsed the proposal for a **Decade of Healthy Ageing (2020-2030)**.<sup>24</sup> The World Health Assembly asked the WHO Director General to transmit this decision to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for consideration of the proposal for the Decade by the United Nations General Assembly.

<sup>21</sup> <https://undocs.org/E/CN.5/2020/4>

<sup>22</sup> [http://www.unecce.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/PS2018/00\\_MIPAA\\_RIS\\_2030\\_Agenda\\_Areas\\_for\\_Policy\\_Integration.pdf](http://www.unecce.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/PS2018/00_MIPAA_RIS_2030_Agenda_Areas_for_Policy_Integration.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.un.org/development/desa/ageing/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2020/05/COVIDOlder-persons.pdf>.

- 3.1.** Is your country preparing (or already has) a **National Action Plan** (or similar) **for the implementation of the WHO Decade of Healthy Ageing 2020 – 2030**? If yes, please briefly describe main actions foreseen.
- 3.2.** Would your country agree to report on the implementation of the WHO Decade of Healthy Ageing 2020 – 2030 in the framework of the next national reviews and appraisals of MIPAA/RIS?

#### Conclusions and priorities for the future

*Up to 1,000 words (no more than two A4 pages).*

This final part should contain an overall summary of the findings, future challenges and opportunities related to ageing; recommendations for future actions to be taken; and policy adjustments needed. It should cover both progress towards the Lisbon Ministerial Declaration goals and, in a nutshell, major achievements over the twenty years of MIPAA/RIS. Please identify also priorities for further policy research and indicate your country's requests, needs and wishes with regard to the work of international organizations in the field of ageing.

#### Annexes

This section may contain any important and essential information/documents or statistical data that otherwise could not be included in the report itself.

Member States are also invited to provide an annex with statistical data for the indicators included in the Active Ageing Index (or their proxy measures). For the indicator description check general AAI methodology and Guidelines for Active Ageing Index (AAI) in non-EU countries and at subnational level, both available on **AAI Wiki**.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> The Decade proposal document is available on <https://www.who.int/ageing/decade-of-healthy-ageing>

<sup>25</sup> <https://statswiki.unece.org/display/AAI/Active+Ageing+Index+Home>



## Annex 2. Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid of the UNFPA Department of Oversight

<b>Organizational Unit:</b>				<b>Year of report:</b>				
<b>Title of evaluation:</b>								
<b>Overall quality of report</b>	<b>Very good</b>					<b>Date of assessment:</b>		
<b>Overall</b>								
<b>Assessment levels</b>	<b>Very good</b>	strong, above average, best	<b>Good</b>	satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b>	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
<b>Quality Assessment criteria</b>				<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding color)</i>				
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>				Yes No Partial	Assessment level:		<b>Very good</b>	
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>								
1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?				Yes				
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations) <i>Note: YES - the report is within the indicated maximum page length. PARTIAL - the report exceeds the maximum page limit by 1- 5 pages. NO - the report exceeds the maximum page limit beyond 5 pages.</i>				Yes				

<p>3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?</p> <p><i>Note: YES - the report contains all the annexes indicated. PARTIAL - if the report is missing the ToRs or the bibliography in the annexes. NO - if the report is missing any of the following annexes: a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys).</i></p>	yes	
<i>Executive summary</i>		
<p>4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the</p> <p>i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?</p>	Yes	
<p>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</p> <p><i>Note: YES - the executive summary is within the indicated maximum page limit. PARTIAL - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by 1 to 2 pages. NO - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit beyond 2 pages.</i></p>	Yes	
<p><b>2. Design and Methodology</b></p>	Yes No Partial	<p>Assessment level: <b>Very good</b></p>
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		
<p>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</p>	Yes	
<p>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</p>	Yes	
<p>3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?</p>	Yes	
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p> <p><i>Remember: Please address both aspects of this sub-criteria in the comment: 1) are data collection tools described (i.e. documentary review, interviews, focus group</i></p>	Yes	

<i>discussions etc.) and 2) is the rationale for their selection detailed</i>		
<p>5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?</p> <p><i>Remember: Please address all three aspects of this sub-criteria in the comment: 1) is a comprehensive stakeholder map included (in either the report itself or the annexes) 2) Is the overall stakeholder consultation process described and 3) within the consultation process were key stakeholders consulted on the recommendations specifically? 4) does the evaluation stakeholder mapping and data collection methods involve vulnerable and marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities and their representative organizations?</i></p>	Yes	
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p> <p><i>Remember: This sub-criteria is asking about the data analysis methods used and whether they are clearly described - was contribution analysis used, or qualitative comparative analysis, for example, or descriptive statistics? Triangulation is not a method of analysis; it is a validation technique.</i></p>	Yes	
<p>7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?</p>	Yes	
<p>8. Is the sampling strategy described?</p> <p><i>This criteria is asking whether the methodological approach to determining the sample of stakeholders consulted and the sample of site visits is described. Reviewers should examine whether the evaluation report includes information on how the universe was determined; the sampling approach used (i.e. purposive); the indicators used to develop the sample to be consulted (or visited); the resulting sample; and importantly limitations to the approach (including any potential resulting bias).</i></p>	Yes	
<p>9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?</p> <p><i>Remember: The default should be to disaggregate by sex. Whenever possible, this sub-criterion is also asking systematic disaggregation of data related to population groups (e.g. persons with disability) where there are implications related to UNFPA's portfolio/interventions for these population groups.</i></p>	Yes	
<p>10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?</p> <p><i>Remember: This sub-criteria is asking about the evaluation methodology itself – specifically does the evaluation's design / methodology ensure that the evaluation is able to assess the extent to which the country programme integrates cross-cutting issues across its portfolio of work? Therefore, we're looking to see whether, for example, evaluation questions or indicators assess/capture the extent to which a</i></p>	Yes	

<p><i>human rights based approach to the development and implementation of the country programme was used (i.e. whether the evaluation queries/assesses whether beneficiaries/partners were consulted and through design process of the country programme); or whether the evaluation's data collection methods capture the voices/perspectives of a range of stakeholders include beneficiaries/vulnerable/marginalized groups.</i></p>		
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment level: <b>Very good</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p>		
<p>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources? <i>Remember: Please address both parts of this sub-criteria, namely do the evaluators identify the sources of the qualitative and quantitative data they used and do they discuss the reliability (or lack thereof) of both?</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations? <i>Remember: Ensure that reviewers are assessing the evaluation report (not the country programme); the sub-criteria is concerned with whether there is evidence in the report that evaluators' approach to data collection was sensitive to ethical considerations (i.e. consent, confidentiality, etc.) and were not discriminatory against particular groups' participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders, including persons with disability). We are also interested if evaluators noted limitations in this regard. Note that mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to evidence that the data was actually collected with a sensitivity to ethics and discrimination; the reviewer should assess whether there is evidence in the report of the UNEG standards actually being implemented. If the UNEG documents/standards are referenced in the text, but the evaluators do not explain how/show evidence of the data being collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination, etc., this should be a "partial".</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes		
4. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted? <i>Remember: Please address both parts of the sub-criteria in the comment, namely: are the cause/effect links (between UNFPA contribution and outputs/contribution to results/outcomes) explained as well as the results and 2) are unintended outcomes discussed. On the latter, please note in the comment whether evaluators considered/looked for unintended outcomes and noted whether there were (or were not) any; or whether the report does not mention unintended outcomes.</i>	Yes		
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes		
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes		
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes		
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			

1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	
<b>6. Recommendations</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	
<b>7. Gender</b>		
	1 2 3 (**)	Assessment level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?  <i>This question is asking whether the evaluation itself integrates GEEW – in its scope</i>	3	a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in

<p><i>of analysis (i.e. in the objectives for example) or the indicators the evaluation selects against which data will be collected so that the evaluation is able to assess whether the country programme is gender responsive.</i></p>		<p><i>the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results ?(Score: 0-3)</i></p>
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques? <i>Remember: Ensure that the reviewer does not confuse the content of the country programme with the approach to the evaluation. This sub-criteria is asking whether the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions (i.e. the evaluation itself) are gender responsive; in other words, are the criteria interpreted/operationalized and evaluations questions developed in a way that is able to capture whether (or not) gender equality/human rights/the empowerment of women has been integrated into the Action (in the design/planning, implementation and results)?</i></p>	3	<p><i>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</i></p>
<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	3	<p><i>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</i></p> <p><i>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3)</i></p>
<p>(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory). (**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p>		
<b>Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment</b>		
		Assessment Levels (*)

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)	7			
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			
5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)	11			
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>100</b>			
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Very good</b>			
	Very good very confident to use	Good confident to use	Fair use with caution	Unsatisfactory not confident to use
(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column. (b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair'). (c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.				
<b>OVERALL COMMENTS: Please explain the overall assessment.</b>				
<i>Some considerations for this section may include highlighting the following:</i> 1. <i>Exceptional: Evaluations that go above and beyond what's required for and overall EQA rating of "Very Good".</i> 2. <i>Good practices: Evaluations that demonstrate good practices in methodology, or in the integration of cross-cutting issues such as disability inclusion, gender equality or human rights.</i> 3. <i>Innovation: Evaluations that have employed any innovative practices or approaches (e.g. in the methodology it included leveraging social media in an innovative way to collect data).</i> 4. <i>COVID-19: Evaluations that have adapted their exercises to respond to the new challenges and evolving environment of COVID-19 pandemic.</i>				
<b>Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)</b>				
<b>The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
<b>If yes, please explain:</b>				