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HUOM: Tunnisteosiot alusta (pvm, laatija, kenelle laadittu jne) puuttuvat tästä versiosta.

TOR for Final Evaluation

[This format is a tool to support the drafting of the Terms of Reference for a final / ex-post evaluation. It is important start every evaluation process by clearly defining why the evaluation is needed, who needs the results and how the results will be used. Answers to these questions should guide what is included in the ToR. This format provides a comprehensive checklist of possible elements that may be relevant in an evaluation.

**1. Background to the final / ex-post evaluation**

[The purpose of this section is so provide information on the context and the content of what will be evaluated. You can briefly describe:

**1.1. Programme context (policy, country, regional, global, thematic context)**

[What is the broader context of the programme that will be evaluated? Set the bigger scene for the evaluation. Include

* development objectives of the partner country, incl. policies on cross-cutting objectives
* global development objectives and commitments that are relevant for the evaluation
* Finland’s development policy, relevant sector, thematic and geographic priorities, including the cross-cutting objectives
* linkages to other relevant partners and interventions]

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

[What will be evaluated?

Briefly describe the programme that will be evaluated. Include

* the programme objectives including, implementation strategies, resources for implementation ( i.e. summarise the intervention logic). When describing the programme the cross-cutting, i.e. human rights based equality and vulnerability reduction objectives must be included.
* the stakeholders and their roles, including both final beneficiaries and involved institutions]

**1.3. Results of previous evaluations**

[What do we already know through previous evaluations?

Summarise the information that is available based on previous evaluations. Include

* information of previously conducted relevant evaluations
* the main results of previous evaluations
* what do we know of the implementation of the previous evaluations’ recommendations?]

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

[This section clearly explains the

* **rationale and purpose**: Why is the evaluation undertaken? Why is the evaluation undertaken at this particular point of time? For whom is it undertaken? What learning and accountability functions will the evaluation serve?
* **use of the results**: Who will use the results of the evaluation? In what decision making situation will the results be used? How will the results be used for learning and/or accountability functions?

The **specific objectives** of the evaluation clarify what evidence, analysis and recommendations the evaluation will provide.

The objectives of a **final evaluation** may include

* “to provide evidence of the performance at the end of programme implementation (did the programme achieve its objectives, incl. the cross-cutting objectives?)”
* “to analyse likely sustainability of achievements”
* “to analyse the reasons explaining success and failure (understanding why?)”
* “to provide recommendations on possible follow-up actions”
* “to document generalised lessons learned”

The objectives of an **ex-post evaluation** may include

* “to provide evidence of the past performance, and sustainability of achievements (did the programme achieve its objectives, incl. the cross.cutting objectives, on a sustainable basis”
* “to analyse reasons explaining success and failure (understanding why?)”
* “to document generalised lessons learned based on experience in the programme”

**3. Scope of the final/ex-post evaluation**

[Based on the selected approach and the objectives of the evaluation, this section clearly defines what the evaluation will cover, the width and the depth, what are the connection boundaries to other sectors, and what will be left out. Define:

* What time span does the evaluation cover?
* What stakeholder groups will be involved?
* What geographical area does the evaluation cover?
* What bilateral - EU - multilateral dimensions does the evaluation address?
* What connections to other supporting sectors and themes does the evaluation address?
* Are there specific issues that should be excluded from the scope of the evaluation? Why?]

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

**4.1. Cross-cutting objectives and evaluation questions**

[In all evaluations the evaluators must examine the success of the programme in relation to all cross-cutting objectives including

* promotion of gender, social equality and climate sustainability,
* human rights and equal participation opportunities of easily marginalised groups (including children, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities).

All evaluations must analyse issues related to the governance context of the Programme and how the Programme can possibly compensate for the deficits in the governance context.

Should be a particular emphasis on some of the cross-cutting objectives? Why? Why not?

Define evaluation questions on the cross-cutting objectives. ]

**4.2. Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions**

[The evaluation questions are presented by criteria. Use the OECD/DAC and EU criteria as listed below. The emphasis given to each criteria will depend on the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. If some criteria are left out, explain the reasons for this. Other criteria may also be added if relevant for the evaluation.

For examples of detailed evaluation questions by criteria. It should be noted that the evaluation questions are the most important tool to focus the evaluation according to information needs.

**Relevance**

* evaluation questions

**Efficiency**

* evaluation questions

**Development effectiveness**

* evaluation questions

**Development impact**

* evaluation questions

**Sustainability**

* evaluation questions

**Programme management and administrative arrangements**

* evaluation questions

**Aid effectiveness (Effectiveness of aid management and delivery)**

* evaluation questions

**Coherence**

* evaluation questions

**Finnish value added**

* evaluation questions

**Possible additional evaluation questions**  
- Any other issue that should be covered in the final / ex-post evaluation]

**5. Methodology**

[This section gives guidance on methods to be used to gather information and to perform the evaluation analysis. The choice of methodology will be left to the tenderer to propose, but general guidelines can be included in the ToR. Indicate that it is expected that multiple methodologies are used, both quantitative and qualitative. Validation of results must be done through multiple sources. No single statements should be taken as a general outcome. The section on methodology may include indications on

* reports, documents, materials to be analysed during the desk study phase;
* the data/information collection tools that will be used, including any planned surveys, questionnaires, field observations, reference to administrative records and management reports, key interviews, etc;
* how data will be analysed and recorded, ensuring that all data is disaggregated by gender, age group and other relevant categories.

Indicate that during the inception phase the evaluators will continue to develop the methodology by producing an evaluation matrix including a detailed description of the methodology that they are going to employ.

This section should systematically consider and describe how the evaluation will promote

* a participatory and partnerships approach: How can the evaluation become an inclusive process involving different stakeholders including the final beneficiaries?;
* coordination and alignment: How can the evaluation build on national and local evaluation plans, activities and policies?
* capacity development: How will the evaluation be implemented to fully utilise the existing evaluation capacity of all partners, and to maximise positive effects of the process on evaluation capacity of all partners?
* complementarity: Can complementarity with other ongoing-or planned evaluations be achieved?
* joint evaluations: Can the evaluation or part of it be undertaken jointly or in parallel with others?.]

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

[This section describes the evaluation process outlining its phases, their sequencing and approximate duration, and where the work will be done e.g.

* kick-off meeting,
* inception and desk study phase,
* interviews and field missions, including presentation of results in the field,
* reporting and presentation of the evaluation results.

Key milestones in the process should be described, but a detailed work plan will be left to the tenderers to propose.]

**7. Reporting**

[The reports and outputs produced in each phase of the evaluation are specified in this section. Include information on the OECD/DAC and the EU evaluation quality standards and their usefulness in checking that the reports deal with the necessary dimensions of the topic. State that the report must be in clear and concise language.

The evaluation team must submit the following deliverables:

* **Inception report**

The desk study results are included in the inception report as a concise analysis of the policies, guidelines, and other documents studied for the evaluation. The desk study report must also contain a plan for the field study, i.e. what kind of questions need to be clarified by interviews, who will be interviewed in the Ministry, who will be interviewed in the partner institutions and in the field, outline of the questions to be asked in the interviews etc.

The Inception report must include detailed work methodologies, a work plan and detailed division of labour within the evaluation team, list of major meetings and interviews, detailed evaluation questions linked to the evaluation criteria in an evaluation matrix, reporting plans including proposals for tables of contents of the reports.

* **Presentation on the field findings**

Presentation on the field findings must be given in the partner country and in Helsinki.

* **Draft final report**

Draft final report amalgamates the desk study and the field findings. The evaluation report presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them and integrating the evaluation results on cross-cutting objectives.

The MFA and the relevant stakeholders will submit comments on the draft final report to the consultant. Indicate when the comments will be submitted (x weeks after receiving the draft report). The draft final report is commented only once. The commentary round is only to correct misunderstandings and possible mistakes, not to rewrite the report.

* **Final report**

The final report must be submitted x after receiving the comments. The final report must follow the report outlines agreed on during the inception phase.

* **Presentation on the evaluation findings**

The evaluation team is expected to give a PowerPoint supported presentation on the evaluation findings.

Each deliverable is subjected 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 is included in the contract.]

**8. Expertise required**

[The exact expertise requirements are described in the Instructions To Tenderers and any description in ITT will override description in this ToR.]

**9. Budget**

[The total available budget for this evaluation is xxxx euro, excluding VAT, which cannot be exceeded.]

**10. 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. OECD/DAC and EU quality standards for evaluations  
2. Outline of Final / Ex-post Evaluation Report

**Ministry for Foreign Affairs** Annex 1

**Development Evaluation (EVA-11) 20.1.2011**

**OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and EU Quality Assessment of an Evaluation Report**

This document is a tool to support high quality evaluations (appraisals, mid-term evaluations, final evaluations and ex-post evaluations) of Finland’s development cooperation. It combines the DAC evaluation quality standards and the EU quality assessment of evaluation reports. The numbering is based on the DAC standards, and the EU criteria are included in *italics*.

The four parts of the table are relevant for different phases of the evaluation process.

1. “**Overarching considerations**” apply to all phases of the evaluation process.
2. “**Purpose, planning and design**” guides the preparation of an evaluation. It includes quality standards that are relevant in the identification of the evaluation need and subject, planning and design, including the preparation of the Terms of Reference.
3. “**Implementation and reporting**” guides the evaluation process, and gives detailed advice on how to ensure the high quality of the evaluation report.
4. “**Follow-up, use and learning**” is aimed to support full utilisation of evaluation results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **OVERARCHING COSIDERATIONS** | **COMMENTS** |
| * 1. **DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION**   Development evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed development intervention, its design, implementation and results. In the development context, evaluation refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of a development intervention. When carrying out a development evaluation the following overarching considerations are taken into account throughout the process. |  |
| * 1. **FREE AND OPEN EVALUATION PROCESS**   The evaluation process is transparent and independent from programme management and policy-making, to enhance credibility. |  |
| * 1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**   Evaluation abides by relevant professional and ethical guidelines and codes of conduct for individual evaluators. Evaluation is undertaken with integrity and honesty. Commissioners, evaluation managers and evaluators respect human rights and differences in culture, customs, religious beliefs and practices of all stakeholders.  Evaluators are mindful of gender roles, ethnicity, ability, age, sexual orientation, language and other differences when designing and carrying out the evaluation. |  |
| * 1. **PARTNERSHIP APPROACH**   In order to increase ownership of development and build mutual accountability for results, a partnership approach to development evaluation is systematically considered early in the process. The concept of partnership connotes an inclusive process, involving different stakeholders such as government, parliament, civil society, intended beneficiaries and international partners. |  |
| * 1. **CO-ORDINATION AND ALIGNMENT**   To help improve co-ordination of development evaluation and strengthen country systems, the evaluation process takes into account national and local evaluation plans, activities and policies. |  |
| * 1. **CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**   Positive effects of the evaluation process on the evaluation capacity of development partners are maximised. An evaluation may, for instance, support capacity development by improving evaluation knowledge and skills, strengthening evaluation management, stimulating demand for and use of evaluation findings, and supporting an environment of accountability and learning. |  |
| * 1. **QUALITY CONTROL**   Quality control is exercised throughout the evaluation process. Depending on the evaluation’s scope and complexity, quality control is carried out through an internal and/or external mechanism, for example peer review, advisory panel, or reference group. |  |
| 1. **PURPOSE, PLANNING AND DESIGN** | **COMMENTS** |
| **2.1 RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**  The rationale, purpose and intended use of the evaluation are stated clearly, addressing: why the evaluation is being undertaken at this particular point in time, why and for whom it is undertaken, and how the evaluation is to be used for learning and/or accountability functions.  For example the evaluation’s overall purpose may be to:   * contribute to improving a development policy, procedure or technique, * consider the continuation or discontinuation of a project or programme, * account for public expenditures and development results to stakeholders and tax-payers. |  |
| **2.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**  The specific objectives of the evaluation clarify what the evaluation aims to find out. For example:   * ascertain results (output, outcome, impact) and assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of a specific development intervention, * provide findings, conclusions and recommendations with respect to a specific development intervention in order to draw lessons for future design and implementation. |  |
| **2.3 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE**  The development intervention being evaluated (the evaluation object) is clearly defined, including a description of the intervention logic or theory. The evaluation scope defines the time period, funds spent, geographical area, target groups, organisational set-up, implementation arrangements, policy and institutional context and other dimensions to be covered by the evaluation. Discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the development intervention are identified. |  |
| **2.4 EVALUABILITY**  The feasibility of an evaluation is assessed. Specifically, it should be determined whether or not the development intervention is adequately defined and its results verifiable, and if evaluation is the best way to answer questions posed by policy makers or stakeholders. |  |
| **2.5 STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVMENT**  Relevant stakeholders are involved early on in the evaluation process and given the opportunity to contribute to evaluation design, including by identifying issues to be addressed and evaluation questions to be answered. |  |
| **2.6 SYSTEMATIC CONSIDERATION OF JOINT EVALUATION**  To contribute to harmonisation, alignment and an efficient division of labour, donor agencies and partner counties systematically consider the option of a joint evaluation, conducted collaboratively by more than one agency and/or partner country.  Joint evaluations address both questions of common interest to all partners and specific questions of interest to individual partners. |  |
| **2.7 EVALUATION QUESTIONS**  The evaluation objectives are translated into relevant and specific evaluation questions. Evaluation questions are decided early on in the process and inform the development of the methodology. The evaluation questions also address cross-cutting issues, such as gender, environment and human rights. |  |
| **2.8 SELECTION AND APPLICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA**  The evaluation applies the agreed DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The application of these and any additional criteria depends on the evaluation questions and the objectives of the evaluation. if a particular criterion is not applied and/or any additional criteria added, this is explained in the evaluation report. All criteria applied are defined in unambiguous terms. |  |
| **2.9 SELECTION OF APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**  The purpose, scope and evaluation questions determine the most appropriate approach and methodology for each evaluation. An inception report can be used to inform the selection of an evaluation approach.  The methodology is developed in line with the evaluation approach chosen. The methodology includes specification and justification of the design of the evaluation and the techniques for data collection and analysis. The selected methodology answers the evaluation questions using credible evidence. A clear distinction is made between the different result levels (intervention logic containing an objectives-means hierarchy stating input, output, outcome, impact).  Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART(Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely). Disaggregated data should be presented to clarity any differences between sexes and between different groups of poor people, including excluded groups. |  |
| **2.10 RESOURCES**  The resources provided for the evaluation are adequate, in terms of funds, staff and skills, to ensure that the objectives of the evaluation can be fulfilled effectively. |  |
| **2.11 GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES**  The governance and management structures are designed to fit the evaluation‘s context, purpose, scope and objectives.  The evaluation governance structure safeguards credibility, inclusiveness, and transparency. Management organises the evaluation process and is responsible for day-to-day administration. Depending on the size and complexity of the evaluation, these functions may be combined or separate. |  |
| **2.12 DOCUMENT DEFINING PURPOSE AND EXPECTATIONS**  The planning and design phase culminates in the drafting of a clear and complete written document, usually called “Terms of Reference” (TOR), presenting the propose, scope, and objectives of the evaluation; the methodology to be used; the resources and time allocated; reporting requirements; and any other expectation regarding the evaluation process and products. The document is agreed to by the evaluation manager(s) and those carrying out the evaluation. This document can alternatively be called “scope of work” or “evaluation mandate”. |  |
| 1. **IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING** | **COMMENTS** |
| **3.1. EVALUATION TEAM**  A transparent and open procurement procedure is used for selecting the evaluation team.  The member of the evaluation team possess a mix of evaluative skills and thematic knowledge. Gender balance is considered and the team includes professionals from partner countries or regions concerned. |  |
| **3.2 INDEPENDENCE OF EVALUATORS VIS-A-VIS STAKEHOLDERS**  Evaluators are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries. Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly. The evaluation team is able to work freely and without inter­ference. It is assured of co-operation and access to all relevant information. |  |
| **3.3 CONSULTATION AND PROTECTION OF STAKEHOLDERS**  The full range of stakeholders, including both partners and donors, are consulted during the evaluation process and given the opportunity to contribute. The criteria for indentifying and selecting stakeholders are specified.  The rights and welfare of participants in the evaluation are protected. Anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants is protected when requested or as needed. |  |
| **3.4. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATUION WITHIN ALLOTTED TIME AND BUDGET**  The evaluation is conducted and results are made available to commissioners in a timely manner to achieve the objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation is carried out efficiently and within budget. Changes in conditions and circumstances are reported and un-envisaged changes to timeframe and budget are explained, discussed and agreed between the relevant parties. |  |
| **3.5. EVALUATION REPORT**  The evaluation report can readily be understood by intended audience(s) and the form of the report is appropriate given the purpose(s) of the evaluation.  *Specialised concepts are clearly defined and not used more than necessary. There is a list of acronyms. The length of various chapters and annexes is well balanced.*  The report covers the following elements and issues: |  |
| **3.6. CLARITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SUMMARY**  A written evaluation report contains an executive summary. The summary provides an overview of the report, highlighting the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and any overall lessons. |  |
| **3.7. CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION**  The evaluation report describes the context of the development intervention, including:   * policy context, development agency and partner policies, objectives and strategies; * development context, including socio-economic, political and cultural factors; * institutional context and stakeholders involvement.   The evaluation identifies and assesses the influence of the context on the performance of the development intervention. |  |
| **3.8. INTERVENTION LOGIC**  The evaluation report describes and assesses the intervention logic *(e.g. in the form of a logical framework)* or theory, including underlying assumptions and factors affecting the success of the intervention.  *The evolution of the project/programme has been taken into account in the evaluation process.* |  |
| **3.9. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INFORMATION SOURCES**  The evaluation report describes the sources of information used (documents, respondents, administrative data, literature, etc.) in sufficient detail so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed. The evaluation report explains the selection of case studies or any samples. Limitations regarding the representativeness of the samples are identified.  The evaluation cross-validates the information sources and critically assesses the validity and reliability of the data.  Complete lists of interviewees and other information sources consulted are included in the report, to the extent that does not conflict with the privacy and confidentiality of participants.  *The inputs form most important stakeholders are used in a balanced way.* |  |
| **3.10. EXPLANATION OF THE METHODOLOGY USED**  The evaluation report describes and explains the evaluation methodology and its application. In assessing outcomes and impacts, attribution and/or contribution to results are explained. The report acknowledges any constraints encountered and how these have affected the evaluation, including the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. It details the techniques used for data collection and analysis. The choices are justified and limitations and shortcomings are explained.  *Data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) are applied in accordance with standards. There are well-designed indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project /programme and its context. The report points out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method.* |  |
| **3.11. CLARITY OF ANALYSIS**  The evaluation report presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them.  Finding flow logically from the analysis of the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions are substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and any lessons follow logically from the conclusions. Any assumptions underlying the analysis are made explicit.  *The analysis focuses well on the most relevant cause / effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic. If there are any limitations of the analysis, they are identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge*.  *The generalisability of findings is discussed. The interpretations and extrapolations are justified and supported by sound arguments. The report draws conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria. The conclusions are free of personal or partisan considerations.* |  |
| **3.12. EVALUATION QUESTIONS ANSWERED , *MEETING NEEDS***  The evaluation report answers all the questions detailed in the TOR for the evaluation. Where this is not possible, explanations are provided. The original questions, as well as any revisions to these questions, are documented in the report for readers to be able to assess whether the evaluation team has sufficiently addresses the questions, including those related to cross-cutting issues, and met the evaluation objectives.  *The report clearly covers the requested period of time, and the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme. The evaluation deals with and responds to all ToR requests. If not, justifications are given.* |  |
| **3.13. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CHANGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION**  The evaluation report explains any limitations in process, methodology or data, and discusses validity and reliability. It indicates any obstruction of a free and open evaluation process which may have influenced the findings. Any discrepancies between the planed and actual implementation and products of the evaluation are explained. |  |
| **3.14. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DISAGREEMENTS WITHIN THE EVALUATION TEAM**  Evaluation team members have the opportunity to dissociate themselves from particular judgements and recommendations on which they disagree. Any unresolved differences of option within the team are acknowledged in the report. |  |
| **3.15. INCORPORATION OF STAKEHOLDERS’ COMMENTS**  Relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can verified, the evaluators investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders’ comments are reproduced verbatim, in an annex or footnote, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants. |  |
| 1. **FOLLOW-UP, USE AND LEARNING** | **COMMENTS** |
| **4.1. TIMELINESS, RELEVANCE AND USE OF THE EVALUATION**  The evaluation is designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons are clear, relevant, targeted and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended learning and accountability objectives. The evaluation is delivered in time to ensure optimal use of the results.  Systematic dissemination, storage and management of the evaluation report is ensured to provide easy access to all development partners, to reach target audiences, and to maximise the learning benefits of the evaluation. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4.2. SYSTEMATIC RESPONSE TO AND FOLLOW-UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS**  Recommendations are systematically responded to and action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation |  |
| **4.3. DISSEMINATION**  The evaluation results are presented in an accessible format and are systematically distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency. In light of lessons emerging from the evaluation, additional interested parties in the wider development community are identified and targeted to maximise the use of relevant findings. |  |