## STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT EVALUATIONS

*(Manual “Evaluation Management”, Step 3: Develop Terms of Reference)*



**Please note:**

The white text can be used as a blueprint for your own Terms of Reference (ToR).

The fields in light grey provide an explanation on the project specific information that has to be part of your ToR. They are to support the evaluation manager, who is responsible for drafting the ToR. Text provided in those fields should be deleted, replaced by your own text or updat- ed with the most recent data.



**Please note:**

The ToR are generally standard for both development projects and humanitarian assistance projects. Some specifications in the ToR are exclusively relevant for the evaluation of humanitarian assistance projects (HA in brackets) or development projects (DEV in brackets).

**Evaluation of *Project Name and Country***

**On behalf of Welthungerhilfe *and partner organisation, Date***

## INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | ... |
| **Project title:** | … |
| **Project no.:** | … |
| **Project holder:** | … |
| **Approved budget:** | … |
| **Committed funds:** | … |
| **Co-financer (line):** | … |
| **Project period:** | … |

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e. V. is one of the largest non-governmental organisations in Germany operating in the humanitarian assistance and development fields. It was established in 1962, as the German section of the “Freedom from Hunger Campaign”, one of the world’s first initiatives aimed at the eradication of hunger. Welthungerhilfe’s work is still dedicated to the following vision: All people have a right to a self-determined life in dignity and justice, free from hunger and poverty.

By **2019**, Welthungerhilfe and its partner organisations ran **499** international projects in 36 countries with an overall financing volume of EUR 221,6 million, comprised of private donations, public national and international funds.

In addition, Welthungerhilfe operates a marketing and fundraising department in Germany to engage and educate a wider public in development-related topics and to mobilise funds from currently more than **57,000 permanent private donors.**

Add brief specific background information (maximum 1–1.5 pages) on:

* Welthungerhilfe’s country programme portfolio
* The partner organisation and its programme portfolio
* The project with its main objectives (outcomes and outputs), the main stakeholder groups, the project region, implementing partners, mode of implementation and a brief problem background).

The information in the paragraph above can be used as a blueprint. However, it should be updated annually.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

* Explains why the evaluation is conducted (e.g. for learning and project steering, for taking decisions on a continuation of the project, for providing recommendations for a new project phase or for accounting for the project outcomes. If both learning and accountability is relevant, which has precedence?)
* Explains why the evaluation is conducted at this specific point in time (e.g. because implementation challenges require a revision of the strategy, guidance for the planning of a successor project is required).

1. **SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

This paragraph defines the boundaries of an evaluation. It determines what will and will not be covered by the evaluation. It may consider, e.g.:

* The type of the evaluation (mostly midterm evaluation or final evaluation; in some cases, ex post evaluations, self-evaluation, joint evaluation, real-time evaluation (HA))
* The subject of analysis, for example, a cluster of related projects, a single project, or a sub- component or process within a project, specific operations or processes, a specific phase of an emergency response (HA)? On which issues is the evaluation supposed to develop specific recommendations?
* The period under consideration (e.g. the project period, several subsequent phases of a project)
* The geographical coverage (e.g. selected countries of a multi-country **programme, specific** districts of a province).

1. **USERS OF THE EVALUATION**

* Who are the intended users of the evaluation results and how are they expected to use the evaluation results (e.g. project participants, Welthungerhilfe project staff, partners, Welt-hungerhilfe country office, Welthungerhilfe Head Office, the financing partner)?
* Who are the primary users expected to act upon evaluation results; and secondary users, which need to be informed about the evaluation and its results?

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AND CRITERIA)**

Evaluation questions (EQ) are specific questions developed to focus the evaluation. They should reflect the evaluation objectives and the information needs of the evaluation’s primary users.

The EQ **could** relate to and **could** be grouped under the following OECD/DAC1 criteria and/or the ALNAP2 criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Development Projects (DEV)** | **Humanitarian Assistance Projects (HA)** |
| **1.** Relevance | **1.** Relevance / Appropriateness |
| **2.** Coherence | **2.** Coherence |
| **3.** Efficiency | **3.** Efficiency |
| **4.** Effectiveness | **4.** Effectiveness |
| **5.** Stustainability | **5.** Connectedness |
| **6.** Impact | **6.** Impact |
|  | **7.** Coverage |

Please refer to the **[Evaluation Management Manual](https://www.welthungerhilfe.de/evaluation-manual/)** (page 26 onwards) for sample evaluation questions based on the OECD/DAC criteria. If any of the questions do not fit under the OECD/DAC criteria, they can be added separately.



**NOTE:** You do not need to cover all criteria, your EQ may focus on just one or two criteria. However, please justify the selection of EQ and criteria. You may even use another reference system to develop your EQ, i.e. a logframe, theory of change, sector orientation framework.

### 5.1 Relevance / appropriateness (DEV and HA)

Relevance / appropriateness questions explore the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner / institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.



**NOTE:** The relevance criterion is largely used in development evaluations, whereas the synonym of appropriateness relates to the humanitarian context.

### 5.2 Coherence (DEV and HA)

The coherence criterion explores to what extent to which the intervention’s compatibility with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.



**NOTE:** The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or under- mine the intervention, and vice versa. Includes **internal coherence** and external coherence: Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution / government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution / govern- ment adheres. **External coherence** considers the consistency of the interven- tion with other actors’ interventions in the same context. This includes comple- mentarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

### 5.3 Effectiveness (DEV and HA)

Assessing the effectiveness of a project explores the question: To what extent is the inter-vention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?



**NOTE:** Effectiveness questions mainly focus on the extent to which the intended results (outcomes, use of output and / or outputs) will be or are likely to be achieved, using the project planning documents (the logical framework / project planning matrix, project objectives and the respective indicators) as the main point of reference.

### 5.4 Efficiency (DEV and HA)

Assessing the efficiency of a project looks at the question: To what extent is the intervention delivering or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?



**NOTE:** “Economic” is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. “Timely” delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational effi- ciency (how well the intervention was managed).

### 5.5 Sustainability (DEV) / Connectedness (HA)



**NOTE:** The sustainability criterion is largely used in development cooperation evaluations, whereas the criterion of connectedness relates to the humanitarian context. The two terms cover different aspects:

Assessing the **sustainability** of a project explores the question: To what extent do the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue?



**NOTE:** Includes an examination of the financial, economic, social, environmental, and institutional capacities of the systems needed to sustain net benefits over time. Involves analyses of resilience, risks and potential trade-offs. Depending on the timing of the evaluation, this may involve analysing the actual flow of net benefits or estimating the likelihood of net benefits continuing over the medium and long-term.

The criterion of **connectedness** replaces the sustainability criterion used in development evaluations. It assesses the extent to which activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.

### Impact (DEV and HA)

The criteria explore the following question: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?



**NOTE:** While the effectiveness criterion looks at the achievement of intended outcomes as defined in the project planning matrix, impact addresses the ultimate signif-icance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify social, environmental and economic effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already captured under the effec- tiveness criterion. Beyond the immediate results, this criterion seeks to capture the indirect, secondary and potential consequences of the intervention. It does so by examining the holistic and enduring changes in systems or norms, and potential effects on people’s well-being, human rights, gender equality, and the environment. (This is not exactly the same thing as ‘Impact’ in the results chain.) There is often considerable overlap in the effectiveness and impact sections of evaluation reports. This can be minimised by putting precise and delineated EQ for both criteria.

### Coverage (HA)

The criterion of coverage assesses the extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering were reached by humanitarian action.

## EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Evaluation design and methodology must be adequate for answering the above-listed EQ. A (detailed) design and methodology for the evaluation will be proposed by the evaluator(s) in their offer/or inception report. Because it is the evaluator(s) proposing the design and methodo- logy, there is no need for the ToR to specify methods. However, if you have specific expecta- tions regarding the design and methodology, these should be stated in the ToR to allow the evaluator(s) to estimate the resources required for the respective methods.

A final agreement on the evaluation design and methodology will be discussed on the basis of the submitted offer **and/or** the inception report.

Generally,

* The evaluation methodology has to allow for sex-disaggregated data, showing how males and females benefit from the project
* The methods and data sources should be triangulated for enhancing the validity of eva- luation findings
* Existing data (e.g. baselines, endlines, secondary data, data stemming from the project feedback and complaints mechanism) must be included, where appropriate, for the eva- luation’s purpose and scope.

## MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS / ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

If applicable you should specify whether there will be an advisory, a steering, or a reference group for the evaluation and what its composition and roles will be. Furthermore, roles and responsibilities in managing the evaluation as well as supporting the evaluation, i.e. logistics, should be documented. Make sure it is clear who the evaluator(s) can contact on what issue.

1. **DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES**

The following deliverables are expected to be produced by the evaluator(s):

* Inception report (4–6 pages for the main text without front page, table of contents and annexes).

The inception report should set out the planned design and methodology to meet the above-mentioned objectives and to answer the evaluation questions.

(It may also be the task of the evaluator(s) to unpack the overarching EQ and specify them further in the inception report)

It should also reflect the limits of the suggested design and methodology and could explore the feasibility for answering the EQ and reflect on the ToR, describe the overall approach of the evaluation and how data will be collected by providing an evaluation matrix, drafts of suggest- ed data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines as well as a tentative evaluation schedule.

It may also state how the evaluator(s) intends to design the evaluation as a learning-oriented process (if applicable).

The inception report follows a standard outline which will be provided to the evaluator(s) after contracting and needs the approval of the contracting party.

Deadline: fill in a date, usually 10 days after contracting or after the briefing meeting

* Debriefing notes outlining the most important preliminary findings and recommendations   
  (2–4 pages).

Deadline: Presented at the end of the field mission

* Evaluation report as draft and final (define language , 25–35 pages main text, including the executive summary but excluding the front page, table of contents and annexes). The evaluation report has to contain an executive summary of a maximum 5 pages and several mandatory annexes. A outline for the evaluation report will be provided to the evaluator(s).

Deadline draft report: fill in a date, usually at the latest 4 weeks after the field mission.

Deadline final report: fill in a date, usually at the latest 3 weeks after the submission of the draft report.

The final report needs the approval of the contracting party. In case of dissent there should be documentation of the matter.

* Dissemination and communication strategy (if required), stating which stakeholders receive which information in which format (see: evaluation products) and when.

Deadline dissemination and communication strategy: fill in a date, same as for final report.

* Other evaluation products (if required), e.g. one-pager for field staff or a compilation of good practice examples.

Deadline other evaluation products: fill in a date, same as for final report.

* Photos: The evaluator(s) should provide a digital file with up to three photos of the eva- luation, including photos related to the evaluation process (e.g. of group discussions, in- terviews, final workshop). The photos should be submitted in a JPEG or GIF format. The informed consent of the person presented is a prerequisite.

Deadline: fill in a date, same as for final report.



**NOTE:** It might be worth considering phased payments against specific deliverables.

## RESOURCES AND AVAILABLE DATA

The financial resources available for the evaluation will certainly influence the scope, depth and also the methodological demands on the evaluation and are thus an important piece of information for the evaluator(s) when drafting both the technical offer and the inception report. You may indicate the financial resources in the form of funds available for the evaluation or state the maximum number of working days you envisage for the whole evaluation exercise. Furthermore, the quantity and quality of available data (e.g. outcome monitoring data) is also relevant for drafting an offer. The possibility of providing the evaluator(s) with support when it comes to data collection/analysis (i.e. in the form of enumerators or data entry clerks) is also of relevance when drafting the technical offer or inception report.

1. **TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE**

You can either provide a rough time frame or a detailed schedule for the evaluation. Some ToR state an estimate of the work volume (number of working days), others leave it to the evalua- tor(s) to estimate how long they will require for the task.

1. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

All documents and data acquired from documents as well as during interviews and meetings are confidential and to be used solely for the purpose of the evaluation.

The deliverables as well as all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluator(s) or the organisation itself) is confidential and remains at all times the property of the contracting party.

## EXPERTISE OF THE EVALUATORS

This section specifies which expertise (qualifications, previous experience, methodological skill, language skills, etc.) you expect from the evaluator(s). It is also helpful for potential evaluator(s) to know whether you are looking for a team of evaluator(s), e.g. matching an international and a national expert or male and female evaluator(s). It might be worth considering having a team of evaluator(s) depending on the scope and purpose of the evaluation and budget at hand. As minimum expertise, Welthungerhilfe expects the evaluator(s) to have previous (participative) evaluation expertise, technical knowledge on the major evaluation topics, experiences with gender-responsive / transformative planning, monitoring and evaluation, other relevant cross-cutting topics (i.e. Core Humanitarian Standard) and good language skills (written and oral).

## TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Applicants have to provide:

* A technical and financial offer
* The technical part of the offer should include reference to the perceived feasibility of the ToR. (If required, including suggestions for specific evaluation questions.)  
  It should also include a brief description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation and a workplan/adaptations to the workplan at hand (maximum 4 pages).
* The financial part includes a proposed budget for the complete evaluation. It should state the fees per working day (plus the respective VAT, if applicable), the number of working days proposed and other costs (e.g. visa costs). Proof of professional registration and taxation is also required (e.g. by providing the evaluator(s) tax number).
* CV with references.



**NOTE:** It might help in the selection process to ask the evaluator(s) to provide proof – examples of previous assignments or references.

Another standard text block for instructing the evaluator(s) on the financial offer is:

* The financial part does not need to include travel costs, accommodation and per diems as those costs will be covered by Welthungerhilfe in line with German legislation *(Bundes­ reisekostenrecht)*
* All insurances are the responsibility of the evaluator(s)
* Soft copies of relevant documents will be provided by Welthungerhilfe
* Welthungerhilfe staff will facilitate community entry and contacts to other interviewees
* Material for workshop facilitation will be provided by Welthungerhilfe
* Translators, if required, will be provided by Welthungerhilfe
* Laptops need to be provided by the evaluator(s).

Offers have to be signed or should include the phrase “valid without signature”:

* Offers will be accepted by individual consultants, commercial companies, NGOs and academics until the fill in date.

Contact details:

* Offers shall be submitted via email to Welthungerhilfe to the email address below.

Contact person:

* Fill in name, function and email address of the person responsible for the evaluation management

Fill in current date

## KEY REFERENCES / ANNEX

[**TEMPLATE: STANDARD OUTLINE INCEPTION REPORT**](https://www.welthungerhilfe.de/evaluation-manual/step6-inception-report)

[**TEMPLATE: OUTLINE PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT**](https://www.welthungerhilfe.de/evaluation-manual/step9-final-Report)

[**STANDARD CHECKLIST: EVALUATION REPORTING QUALITY**](https://www.welthungerhilfe.de/evaluation-manual/step9-final-Report)

**TEMPLATE: STANDARD MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX**

**TEMPLATE: STANDARD PROJECT ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO OECD/DAC CRITERIA**

Especially if you are not publicly tendering, you may want to attach further (internal) documents (i.e. logframe) instead of handing them over to the evaluator(s) once contracted. These docu- ments will enable the evaluator(s) to produce a more meaningful offer.