Template version: 2020-04-27

[This template may be used by Swedish Partner Organisations as a guiding tool in designing a Terms of Reference (ToR) for evaluations of Sida funded interventions[1].

Template text in red font is help text and should be deleted. *Text in black font is* ***highly*** *recommended and should be included in the final document.*

For advice when assessing the relevance and quality of a ToR, please consult the Checklist for assessment of Terms of References in attachment to this template.

The ToR constitute the commissioner's main instrument in instructing evaluators how the assignment should be carried out.. The ToR should be brief and to the point (typically 6-7 pages), supplemented by necessary annexes. The format below is intended to help structure the ToR.

Before drafting the ToR, the commissioner may carry out a preliminary stakeholder analysis where she/he considers who the intended users of the evaluation are and how the evaluation is to be used. The evaluation process may be designed, conducted and reported **to meet the needs of the intended users**. Hence, they should normally be involved in defining purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation.

Important: For evaluations in fragile and conflict settings make sure to use the OECD/DAC guidelines "Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results" (2012).

Note regarding publication: Reports from evaluations commissioned by others, e.g. partners and other donors, are not published by Sida.]

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of [WRITE HERE]

[Try to make the title informative, searchable and interesting by including **name of country, sector and type of evaluation**. Avoid abbreviations.]

Date: [STATE THE DATE OF THE TOR HERE]

1. General information

1.1 Introduction

[Introduce – briefly – the context and background for the evaluation assignment. Include, for example:

- a description of the development problem in its context
- how you work in the area and what other actors do.
- Relevant national and/or local development plans
- Relevant strategy under which the intervention is to be evaluated.]

[1] "Intervention" encompasses all development and humanitarian efforts that may be evaluated under the framework agreement. This includes projects and programmes, policies, strategies, thematic areas, technical assistance, policy advice, approaches and instruments used.

1.2 Evaluation object: Intervention to be evaluated

[The evaluation object is the intervention that is to be evaluated. It should be described here. Include information that is important for the evaluators to know for a successful assignment. It is recommended to include the intervention proposal, or a later description if more applicable, as an annex to the ToR.]

The evaluation object is [STATE THE OBJECT HERE: Intervention X]

[DESCRIBE THE OBJECT HERE including for example:

- goals/objectives and theory of change
- target groups
- a description of challenges related to cross-cutting issues relevant for the object (e.g. gender equality, conflict, environment and climate change)
- implementation arrangements
- funds budgeted and spent
- geographical area
- how the intervention to be evaluated relates to other initiatives (donor or govment funded)
- specific issues/challenges that the evaluator should be aware of
- previous evaluations commissioned by partner or others]

For further information, the intervention proposal/document is attached as Annex B.

The intervention logic or theory of change of the intervention may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report, if deemed necessary.

1.3 Evaluation rationale

[Describe why the evaluation is to be carried out at this point in time.]

2. The assignment

2.1 Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

[Determining the purpose of the evaluation goes hand in hand with identifying its intended use and users. Asking **how the evaluation will be used and by whom** will help to clarify the purpose. Ideally, intended users should contribute to the evaluation design, for example by identifying issues to be addressed and evaluation questions to be answered. Commonly, primary intended users are your organisation and your partners.]

The purpose or intended use of the evaluation is to [STATE THE PURPOSE HERE]

[For example:

- help your organisation and your partner X to assess progress of on-going intervention Y to learn from what works well and less well. The evaluation will be used to inform decisions on how project implementation may be adjusted and improved; or
- provide your organisationa and your partners with an input to upcoming discussions concerning the preparation of a new phase of intervention Y; or
- serve as an input for your organisation to a decision on whether intervention Z shall receive continued funding or not; or

- help your organisationa to assess progress of its portfolio of projects/programmes to inform strategic decision making.]

The primary intended users of the evaluation are [STATE PRIMARY INTENDED USERS HERE]

[For example:

- the project management team of project/programme X
- your organisation

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate in the tender how this will be ensured during the evaluation process. Other stakeholders that should be kept informed about the evaluation include [STATE OTHER STAKEHOLDERS HERE]

[For example:

- The ministry and/or agency in sector x
- Donors x, y and z
- Local authorities in district/municipality x, y and z]

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation scope

[The evaluation scope defines what is to be covered by the evaluation. The evaluation does not have to cover the entire intervention. Be explicit about the delimitations of the evaluation, such as the time period, a specific target group, or particular aspect of the intervention. In complex programmes it is advisable to focus the evaluation to a limited number of components or aspects of the intervention.]

The evaluation scope is limited to [DESCRIBE THE SCOPE HERE]

[For example:

- time frame to be covered by the evaluation
- geographical coverage of the evaluation
- target groups to be included in the evaluation]

If needed, the scope of the evaluation may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

2.3 Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

[Formulating the objective means to translate the purpose of the evaluation (section 2.1) into evaluation questions, to clarify <u>what the evaluation aims to find out</u>. For development interventions, frame the questions in relation to the widely used and agreed OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance - **relevance**, **coherence**, **effectiveness**, **efficiency**, **impact**, and **sustainability.** For evaluation of humanitarian assistance, there are additional OECD/DAC criteria – **connectedness**, **coverage**, **coherence** and **coordination** to consider. Standard questions based on the definitions of the various criteria are found below, or please consult the OECD/DAC document Better Criteria for Better Evaluation[2] for a more indepth description.

It is not required that all evaluation criteria are covered in one single evaluation. Rather, it is advisable to focus on a few, to ensure the evaluation's analytical depth of each choosen criteria. How many depends on the status of implementation of the intervention as well as the available time frame and budget. For a mid-term evaluation for example, it may be less useful to include sustainability.]

The objective/objectives of this evaluation is/are to [STATE THE OBJECTIVE HERE]

[For example:

- evaluate the *(state one or more evaluation criteria)* of internvetion x and formulate recommendations on how its management team can improve and adjust implementation.
- evaluate the *(state one or more evaluation criteria)* of intervention x and formulate recommendations as an input to upcoming discussions concerning the preparation of a new phase of the intervention.
- evaluate *(state one or more evaluation criteria)* of intervention x as an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.
- evaluate the *(state one or more evaluation criteria)* of support to organisation x in country y to provide Sida with background information for developing an operationalisation plan for the new cooperation strategy.

Formulate one or several evaluation questions under each chosen criterion to further clarify what the evaluation aims to find out. Questions should be precise and researchable/possible to answer. Please limit the number of questions so that they can be addressed with sufficient depth given the timeframe and budget for the evaluation (a maximum of 10 questions is recommended).

For development interventions, it is highly recommended to only use the predefined standard questions provided under each criterion below, and to require that the consultant refines them in the tender and during the inception phase.]

The evaluation questions are: [LIST THE CHOSEN CRITERION AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS HERE]

[Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?

- To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries', global, country, and parter/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?
- To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?

Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?

- How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organisation where it is being implemented?

Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

[2] OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.*

- To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?
- Have the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?

Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

- To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?

Impact: What difference does the intervention make?

- To what extent has the project or programme generated, or is expected to generate, significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, high-level effects?

Sustainability: Will the benefits last?

- To what extent will the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue?

For humanitarian assistance, the following additional criteria could also be considered. We recommend that you use one or a few (but rarely all) of the four questions below.

Connectedness (this criterion replaces the sustainability criterion above)

- To which extent has the humanitarian assistance taken longer-term and interconnected problems into account?

Coverage

- To what extent were major population groups reached by the humanitarian assistance?

Coherence

- To what extent have policies of different actors been mutually consistent?
- Were human rights consistently respected?

Coordination

- To what extent have the interventions of different actors been harmonised?

Furthermore, based on the description of cross-cutting challenges one may consider including evaluation questions that address the perspective of the poor and the rights perspective in the project/programme as well as to what extent conflict sensitivity, gender equality and environmental considerations have been mainstreamed in the project or programme. For example, one may include one or two questions such as:

- Has the intervention contributed to poverty reduction? How?
- Has the intervention been implemented in accordance with the rights perspective (a Human Rights Based Approach): i.e. Have target groups been participating in project planning, implementations and follow up? Has anyone been discriminated by the intervention through its implementation? Has the intervention been implemented in a transparent fashion? Are there accountability mechanisms in the project?
- Has the intervention been designed and implemented in a conflict sensitive manner?

- How has gender equality been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the intervention? To what extent has the intervention contributed to the improvement of gender equality? Has the project had any positive or negative effects on gender equality? Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?
- Has the intervention been designed and implemented in accordance with the perspective on environment and climate change, and if so how and with what results, i.e. have risks for the environment been considered and managed?

Bear in mind that adding questions of this type will increase the scope of the assignmet and additional time/budget will be be necessary.]

Questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further refined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

2.4 Evaluation approach and methods

[It is advisable to let the evaluator propose an appropriate methodology and methods to answer the evaluation questions in the tender and to further develop it during an inception phase. If it is known that data access can be constrained, add a paragraph with brief information on this.]

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception report.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods.

A *gender responsive* approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used.

The approach to the evaluation should be *utilization-focused*, which means the evaluator should facilitate the *entire evaluation process* with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluators should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

2.5 Organisation of evaluation management

[This section describes the organisation and management structure of the evaluation at your side, focusing on the roles of intended users in the evaluation process. The evaluation shall be organised in a way that contributes to the purpose of the evaluation. <u>Choose one</u> of the two following alternatives of standard text in black font. Adjust to context if necessary.]

[Alternative 1: for evaluations where the organisation and your cooperation partner are the intended users] This evaluation is commissioned by [STATE organisation here]. The intended user(s) is/are [STATE INTENDED USERS HERE]. The intended users of the evaluation form a steering group, which has contributed to and agreed on the ToR for this evaluation. The steering group is a decision-making body. It will approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation [ADD "and to evaluate the tenders" IF DESIRABLE]. The steering group will participate in the start-up meeting of the evaluation, as well as in the debriefing/validation workshop where preliminary findings and conclusions are discussed.

[Alternative 2: for evaluations where your organisation is the only intended user] This evaluation is commissioned by [STATE organisation HERE]. The intended user is/are [STATE INTENDED USERS HERE]. As the evaluation will serve as an input to the decision on whether [STATE NAME OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME HERE] shall receive continued funding or not, the intended user is the commissioner. [STATE PARTNER ORGANISATION HERE] has contributed to the ToR and will be provided with an opportunity to comment on the inception report as well as the final report, but will not be involved in the management of the evaluation. Hence the commissioner will evaluate tenders, approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation. The start-up meeting and the debriefing/validation workshop will be held with the commissioner only.

2.6 Evaluation quality

[Choose one of the three following alternatives of standard text in black font.]

[Alternative 1: for development evaluations] All evaluations of organisation X shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation[3]. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation[4] and the OECD/DAC Better Criteria for Better Evaluation[5]. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

[Alternative 2: for evaluations regarding humanitarian assistance] The evaluation shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation[6] and use the OECD Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies[7]. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation[8] and the OECD/DAC Better Criteria for Better Evaluation[9]. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

[Alternative 3: for evaluations regarding peace and conflict] The evaluation shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation[10] and use the OEDC/DAC Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results[11]. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation[12] and the OECD/DAC

[3] OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

[4] Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.*

[5] OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

[6] OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

[7] OECD (1999) *Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies*.

[8] Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*.

[9] OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

[10] OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

[11] OECD (2012) *Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results*.

[12] Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*.

Better Criteria for Better Evaluation[13]. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

2.7 Time schedule and deliverables

[Specify key deliverables and milestones for the inception, data collection and analysis as well as the reporting phases. Allow sufficient calendar time for the inception phase, the evaluator's preparatory work, travel and data collection, as well as for participation, discussions, debriefings and turn-around time for drafts to be read, commented on and revised. **This is especially important in evaluations of humanitarian work and in conflict and post-conflict settings.**

The start-up meeting and the inception report are important as they provide opportunities for you and the evaluator to ensure that you have a mutual understanding of the ToR and the assignment.

Note: The final reporting can be in traditional written form, or in any other form that suits the particular evaluation (e.g. workshops, presentations, film, etc.) provided that recommendations are documented.]

[To do:

- Use the standard text in black font and adjust, specify and/or add deliverables in the table that will serve the purpose of your evaluation. **If you decide to use another format for reporting than a final report, adjust items 7-9 to reflect that.** Item 10 is a common dissemination output but can be replaced by other activities that better serve the purpose of the evaluation.
- Add specific expectations regarding communication during the evaluation process (frequency, with whom etc.) and/or upcoming strategic issues that require consultation, if any.
- Allow sufficient time for the evaluator to find the right evaluation team for the job and to prepare the tender and inception report documents.
- Note: The time between deliverables 5, 6 and 7 is when the main data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance (2-3 days) takes place. **Do allow enough time for this.**]
- When preparing the list, please confirm availability of key colleagues and cooperation partners during the assignment.
- For evaluations of humanitarian work and in conflict and post-conflict settings it is important to build in flexibility in the list.]

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out [STATE START AND END DATE]. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews need to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meeting/s [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE PARTICIPANTS]	[STATE DATE/TIME PERIOD]

[13] OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

		[Please note that it is important to allow enough time from the start of the procurement process to the start of the assignment, i.e. the time *before* this start-up meeting.
2. Draft inception report		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow a minimum of 3 weeks from start-up of evaluation. It is highly recommended to allow more than 3 weeks for the inception phase]
3. Inception meeting [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE PARTICIPANTS]	Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]
4. Comments from intended users to evaluators (alternatively these may be sent to evaluators ahead of the inception meeting)		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for commenting]
5. Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance	Evaluators	[Allow a minimum of 4 weeks for data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance including time for planning of field missions. For evaluations in fragile contexts, more time is required to allow for security arrangements and ongoing assessment of the security situation]
6. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting)	[STATE PARTICIPANTS]	[STATE TENTATIVE DATES]
7. Draft evaluation report		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow at least 3 weeks for analysis, report writing and quality assurance between the debriefing/validation meeting and submission of the draft report]
8. Comments from intended users to evaluators		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]

		[Allow at least 2 weeks for commenting and plan for quality assurance of revised versions]
9. Final evaluation report		[STATE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for revisions]
10. Seminar [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE TARGET GROUPS]	Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by X (your organisation) before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in [STATE LANGUANGE] and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology (including how a utilization-focused and gender responsive approach will be ensured), a stakeholder mapping, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

[**Note:** If a final report is required the two paragraphs below should be used. If another format will be used, delete the paragraphs and specify the format and that recommendations need to be documented.]

The final report shall be written in [STATE LANGUAGE] [if not English, request an Executive Summary translated into English] and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure). The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages. The evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect a gender analysis/an analysis of identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, directed to relevant stakeholders and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term. The report should be no more than [STATE NUMBER OF PAGES] [a maximum of 35 pages is recommended, but the number of pages must relate to the complexity of the evaluation object] excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report). The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation[14].

2.8 Evaluation team qualification

[14] Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014

The evaluation team leader shall have documented skills and experience from conducting evaluations and leading evaluation teams, including communication and facilitation skills. The team leader should have english language skills.

The evaluation team shall include the following competencies:

[LIST MANDATORY EVALUATION TEAM COMPETENCIES HERE]

A CV for each team member shall be included in the call-off response. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team if appropriate.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

2.9 Financial and human resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is [STATE THE BUDGET CEILING HERE].

[It is important to set a maximum budget fit for purpose. Avoid specifying the number of working days etc. to allow evaluators to suggest a work plan suitable to the proposed evaluation methodology. **Important:** Evaluations in fragile and conflict settings will most probably require additional budget for necessary security arrangements.]

The contact person at X (Your organisation) is [STATE THE FUNCTION, UNIT AND DEPARTMENT HERE]. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant documentation will be provided by [STATE THE FUNCTION, UNIT AND DEPARTMENT HERE]. [Relevant documentation such as assessment memos, annual reports, audit reports etc must always be prepared well in advance and shared with the evaluators at the start-up meeting.]

Contact details to intended users (your organisation, cooperation partners, other donors etc.) will be provided by [STATE THE FUNCTION AND ORGANISATION HERE].

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics [STATE FOR EXAMPLE BOOKING INTERVIEWS, PREPARING VISITS ETC. HERE] including any necessary security arrangements.

3. Annexes

[The compulsory attachments to the ToR are Annex A “List of key documentation”, Annex B “Project/Programme document”.]

Annex A: List of key documentation

[List the key resources that are available either publicly on the internet or will be distributed with the ToR (e.g. internal documents) in order to provide evaluators with insight and guidance when preparing the tender (e.g. relevant strategy documents, programme documents and reports).]

[PLEASE LIST KEY DOCUMENTS HERE]

Annex B : Intervention document