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| **Template: Terms of Reference for an Evaluation*** This template is a tool to support the drafting of the Terms of Reference for an evaluation. It is important to start every evaluation process by clearly defining what the priority issues to be evaluated are. The format provides a comprehensive checklist of elements that may be relevant in an evaluation. This is a menu from which the appropriate issues corresponding to priorities are selected.
 |

# Terms of Reference for an Evaluation

1. **Background to the evaluation**
	1. **Programme context (policy, country, regional, global, thematic context)**

Describe the broader context of the programme that will be evaluated. Set the bigger scene for the evaluation. Include an overview of the development objectives of the partner country, global development objectives and commitments that are relevant for the evaluation, Finland’s development policy, relevant sector, thematic and geographic priorities, including human rights issues and the cross-cutting objectives, and linkages to other relevant partners and interventions.

* 1. **Description of the programme to be evaluated**

Briefly describe the programme that will be evaluated. Summarise the programme beneficiaries and objectives, implementation strategies, resources for implementation (i.e. summarise the intervention logic), and the institutional framework and roles of key stakeholders. Include issues related to the promotion of human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities and promotion of climate sustainability. Describe the stakeholders and their roles, including both final beneficiaries and involved institutions.

* 1. **Results of previous evaluations**

Describe what is already known through previous evaluations. What value will this evaluation add?

1. **Rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation**

Define the rationale and purpose, including why is the evaluation undertaken, why at this particular point of time, and for whom. Explain the use of the results: Who will use the results of the evaluation? In what decision making situation and when will the results be used? How will the results be used for learning and/or accountability functions?

Set priority objectives of the evaluation by clarifying what issues, analysis and recommendations the evaluation will focus on. Describe **2-3 priority issues** for the evaluation.

1. **Scope of the evaluation**

Define what time span does the evaluation cover, what stakeholder groups will be involved, what geographical area the evaluation covers, what connections to other supporting sectors, themes and programmes the evaluation shall address.

It is also important to clearly define what issues are excluded from the evaluation (if any), and explain the reasons why.

1. **Issues to be addressed and evaluation questions**

For each evaluation criterion, priority evaluation questions shall be defined. **A maximum of15 evaluation questions may be included.**  If some criteria are left out, explain the reasons for this. Other criteria may also be added if relevant for the evaluation. While the evaluation questions indicate the priority issues under each criterion, the evaluation team should not limit the evaluation to these questions only. The standard evaluation criteria are presented below:

**Relevance** refers to the extent to which the objectives and approach of the programme are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country priorities, global priorities and partners' and Finland's policies. This includes an evaluation of how the promotion of human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities and promotion of climate sustainability as defined by international and regional conventions, national policies and strategies have been integrated into programme design and implementation.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Impact** describes how the programme has succeeded in contributing to its wider development impact, i.e. impact for its final beneficiaries, including promotion of human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities and promotion of climate sustainability. The evaluation of impact covers intended and unintended, short- and long-term, positive and negative impacts.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Effectiveness** describes the achievement towards the programme outcome and key outputs, or whether they are expected to be achieved in the future. Evaluation of promotion of human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities and promotion of climate sustainability is integrated in the analysis.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Efficiency** is defined by how well the various activities have transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Use of resources to promote human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities and promotion of climate sustainability is integrated in the analysis. Comparison should be made against what was planned. Furthermore, the management and administrative arrangements are analysed.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Aid effectiveness (Effectiveness of aid management and delivery)** refers to how the programme has implemented the commitments to promote ownership, alignment, harmonisation, management for development results and mutual accountability.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Sustainability** refers to the likely continuation of programme achievements when external support comes to an end. Typically, sustainability covers economic/financial, institutional, technical, socio-cultural and environmental dimensions. Sustainability also includes an analysis on the likely continuation of achievements in human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities, and climate sustainability. Evaluation of phasing out (exit) plans is part of the sustainability analysis.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Coherence** refers to issues beyond development cooperation focusing on contradictions or mutual reinforcement with other policies to achieve the programme impact and outcome.

* [formulate priority evaluation questions]

**Possible additional evaluation questions**

* [any other issue that should be covered in the evaluation]
1. **Methodology**

The detailed evaluation methodology will be left to the evaluators to propose, but general guidelines can be included in the ToR on data collection and analysis. Indicate that multiple methods are expected to be used to validate the findings, both quantitative and qualitative. The key materials to be analysed during the desk study phase shall be listed e.g. as an annex to the ToR. In case relevant, also some data collection tools may be defined, as well as guidelines for how data analysis will be conducted and recorded, ensuring that data is disaggregated by gender, age group and/or other relevant categories.

1. **The evaluation process and time schedule**

Describe the evaluation process outlining its phases, their sequencing and approximate schedules/durations, as well as locations of key meetings and presentations. Key milestones of the appraisal process (especially regarding deadlines of draft and final reports) should be described, but a detailed work plan will be left to the evaluators to propose.

Based on the management decisions on the evaluation’s recommendations, a follow-up work option may be included for the team leader to support the integration of the evaluation’s results in the programme’s future work planning.

1. **Reporting**

The reports and outputs produced in each phase of the evaluation are specified in this section. The evaluation team may be requested to submit the following deliverables:

* Inception report (draft and final inception reports)
* Presentation on the field findings (typically in the end of the field phase)
* Draft evaluation report
* Final report
* Presentation on the evaluation findings and recommendations

Each deliverable is subject to specific approval. The evaluation team is able to move to the next phase only after receiving a written statement of acceptance by the MFA. The reporting schedule shall be included in the contract.

1. **Quality assurance**

Include a request to the tenderer to propose and implement a quality assurance system for the appraisal. The proposal must specify the quality assurance process, methodology, tools and resources (QA personnel and resource allocations).

Include a request to the tenderer to propose and implement a quality assurance system for the evaluation. The proposal must specify the quality assurance process, methodology, tools and resources (QA personnel and resource allocations).

1. **Expertise required**

Instead of defining the experts or the team, the ToR should indicate the areas of expertise and leave flexibility for the tenderers to propose relevant teams.

Typically, an appraisal team should consist of international and national experts.. One expert shall be nominated as the Team Leader. The evaluation team shall ensure solid experience and knowledge in the following fields:

* Programme evaluations and planning in the relevant sector.
* Experience in project cycle management (PCM) and Results Based Management (RBM), and their application in programme design, monitoring and evaluation (M&E);
* Relevant sectoral experience, including experience from the region or country;
* Other experience and knowledge relevant to the evaluation.
* Experience in integrating cross cutting objectives in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation: Promotion of human rights and gender equality, reduction of inequalities, climate sustainability.
* Quality assurance in accordance to the quality assurance approach proposed in the tender.

In case relevant, include also a Junior Expert in the team.

1. **Budget**

Define the total available budget for the evaluation (excluding VAT).

1. **Mandate**

Add the following clarification on the appraisal team’s mandate:

The evaluation team is entitled and expected to discuss matters relevant to this evaluation with pertinent persons and organizations. However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on the behalf of the Government of Finland.

**Annexes:**

1. Link to the MFA evaluation manual
2. Outline of the Evaluation Report
3. Evaluation report quality checklist (OECD/DAC and EU standards)
4. List of key documentation