

Terms of Reference - Mid-Term Evaluation

Name of the Projects/Programmes/Framework Agreement

1. General background

- NGO-Country cooperation (since when, sectors, etc.)
- Role of the NGO (NGO working under the framework agreement of the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (MFA))
- Description of the NGO's partner(s)
- Project(s)/Programme(s) concerned by the evaluation¹
 - Objectives
 - Implementation modality
 - Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) marking of the project(s)/programme(s)
 - Duration: actual start date and planned end date (extensions approved or pending)
 - Budget: overall budget with extensions if any and total budget disbursed since the start of the project(s)/programme(s) and at the time of the evaluation mission
 - Organisation of the project(s)/programme(s)
 - Current situation of the project(s)/programme(s) (brief description)
- Brief description of a previous evaluation mission, if any (include hyperlink to the summary with main findings and recommendations)

2. Objectives of the evaluation mission

The main objective of the mission is to carry out an interim evaluation of the **XXX** through a sample of projects/programmes on behalf of **XXX** and its partners.

In this context, the mission will:

2.1. Analyse the results and specific objectives achieved at the time of the evaluation in relation to what was foreseen in the Framework Agreement Document

Describe the results as they have been achieved at the time of the evaluation mission. Refer to the indicators. Note that it is not a question of describing the tasks that have been carried out and listing the output indicators, but rather - with reference to results-based management (RBM) - of focusing on the achievement of results (outcome/change indicators) and, as far as possible, according to the target group (M/F, youth, potential or returning migrants, etc.).

At mid-term, this includes an analysis of the situation, the target indicators foreseen at mid-term and an analysis of whether the results can be achieved at the end of the project(s)/programme(s)/framework agreement.

¹ Here: implementation of the Framework Agreement.

Report possible deviations from what was aimed for in the project/programme document and/or the inception report.

2.2. Analyse the results achieved by the project(s)/programme(s) of the framework agreement

XXX

2.3. Analyse the management and monitoring of the Project, paying particular attention to

- Principles of harmonisation and alignment ;
- Monitoring of the different levels of the project(s)/programme(s) (means, tasks, results, specific objective);
- Analyse the risks and assumptions identified in the logical framework or theory of change, as well as the monitoring done by the project(s)/programme(s).

2.4. Analyse the project(s)/programme(s) according to the evaluation criteria below, also taking into account the cross-cutting themes

The criteria should be adapted according to what is useful to analyse in the context of the evaluation in question and are based **on the OECD/DAC criteria of December 2019**, i.e. relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, while taking into account the cross-cutting themes, i.e. human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability.²

2.5. Analyse in particular the following specific issues

- (Add the issues that are particularly important to you)
- COVID-19 focus: The mission should assess the consequences/impact of the COVID context on the implementation of the project(s)/programme(s).³

2.6. Identify lessons learned and propose recommendations for the future of the project

In terms of knowledge management and sharing, assess the achievements of the project(s)/programme(s) in terms of innovations and/or good practices.

What are the main lessons for the **NGO** to learn from these interventions in terms of organisation, management and coordination, with a view to the continuation of the projects?

3. Methodology and tasks

3.1 Methodology

The evaluation mission will be carried out in a participatory way, taking into consideration the different stakeholders at the different levels involved in the project(s)/programme(s) and ensuring that the particular interests and needs of men and women are taken into account and mentioned, for all actors involved.

3.2. Preparation of the mission

- Briefing with the **NGO** headquarters (face-to-face or via virtual tool)
- Review of project documents, inception report, progress reports, capitalisation documents, etc.

² See Annexes A & B for more details

³ See Annex C for more details

- Research of any other relevant documentation
- Drawing up questionnaires and evaluation forms for the different interlocutors

3.3 Field mission

- Briefing with the country office with the project team (in the presence of representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or other donor, if necessary)
- Meetings at central level with the different institutions involved (National Counterparts and other Cooperation bodies, institutions and bodies working on cross-cutting themes)
- Field visit (**specify what should be included in this visit**, be sure to indicate the gender of the persons/interlocutors met)
- On-the-spot debriefing with the NGO's country office (in the presence of representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or other donor, if applicable)
- Debriefing of the main findings of the mission to the stakeholders, based on an aide-mémoire or PowerPoint presentation (it is important to allow sufficient time for this debriefing and to ensure that all stakeholders (M/F) are represented)

3.4. Debriefing at the NGO HQ after receiving the draft report

Debriefing with the NGO's headquarters in Luxembourg in the presence of representatives of the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs or other donor (via a virtual tool or face-to-face as appropriate).

4. Report

The evaluation report will be drafted in (**introduce language: French/English/Spanish/Portuguese**).

The draft report will be sent to the **NGO** by e-mail at least 5 working days before the debriefing. The date of the debriefing is ideally set during the briefing.

The final version of the report should be delivered to the **NGO** within 2 weeks of the **NGO's** comments being received.

The executive summary should also be submitted in **French/English/Spanish/Portuguese**.

The report should not exceed 35 pages excluding annexes:

- Executive summary
- Description of project achievements at the time of the evaluation :
 - Coverage (area and beneficiaries, M/F)
 - Details of objectives, results achieved
- Description of the implementation :
 - Project management structure
 - Measures taken to put capacity building at the heart of the project
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Measures taken to ensure partnership
 - Local input

- Evaluation of the project :
 - Relevance
 - Coherence
 - Effectiveness
 - Efficiency
 - Impact
 - Sustainability
 - Cross-cutting themes
 - Specific issues
- Lessons learned and recommendations

Annexes:

- Terms of reference of the evaluation mission;
- Programme of the evaluation mission and people met; - budgets (budgets planned in the Project Document and budgets realised) and analysis of DAC markers;
- Budgets (Project Document budgets and actual budgets) and analysis of DAC markers;
- Logical framework and indicators or theory of change at the time of the evaluation;
- Project timelines (planned and realised);
- Technical documents;
- Bibliography;
- Maps;
- Photos, etc.

5. Duration of the assignment and profile required

5.1. Duration of the mission

The consultancy firm consulted will appoint the mission leader who will coordinate the mission and carry out the briefing and debriefing with the **NGO's** headquarters. In the methodological note (to be submitted as part of the call for tenders), the tenderer will detail the team's coordination arrangements.

The consultancy firm, or the mission leader, must guarantee the quality (content, language and form) of the documents to be provided.

The mission to **XXX** must be carried out **XXX**.

5.2. Head of mission: Required profile of the expert

Academic background: Degree (**introduce**)

Professional experience of at least **XX** years.

Proven experience in (**sector concerned**) and evaluation of development projects.

In-depth knowledge of the consideration of cross-cutting themes (governance for development, gender equality, environment and climate change) and of the implementation of related tools (environmental

assessment, gender analysis, OECD-DAC marking, etc.). Knowledge of the (country/region) is considered an important asset.

Proficiency in **XX** (languages). Computer literacy.

5.3. Required profile of the national/regional/international expert(s)

Academic background: Degree (**introduce**)

Professional experience of at least **XX** years.

Proven experience in (**sector concerned**) and evaluation of development projects.

In-depth knowledge of the consideration of cross-cutting themes (governance for development, gender equality, environment and climate change) and of the implementation of related tools (environmental assessment, gender analysis, OECD-DAC marking, etc.). Knowledge of the (country/region) is considered an important asset.

Proficiency in **XX** (languages). Computer literacy.

Note: Experts who have been involved in the formulation and/or implementation of the Project under evaluation will not be part of the evaluation team.

*If applicable: The security context in the areas of intervention discourages the presence of foreigners in certain areas of intervention of **XXX (country)**. It is preferable that the mission leader or at least the expert 2 be able to travel without difficulties and access restrictions according to the recommendations made by the teams on site. The methodology to be presented should include elements on how to take into account the security situation while ensuring the quality of the assessment and analysis in the field. In the case of external expertise, the **NGO** is not responsible for any problems.*

6. Annexes

A. Evaluation criteria

Relevance – is the intervention doing the right things?

The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries⁴, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

- "Relevance" refers to the general and specific objective, while "appropriateness" refers to the activities and resources;
- Consideration of local absorptive and implementation capacities in the design of the project;
- What mechanisms have been put in place or arrangements made by the project to address poverty? Did the most vulnerable part of the population (M/F) benefit from the project? What risks exist that could exclude this group from benefiting from the intervention?
- Taking into account any recommendations from previous missions of this project or similar projects carried out by the **NGO** in the country concerned.

Coherence – how well does the intervention fit?

⁴ That is, the individuals, groups, or organizations that benefit from the development intervention, directly or not, intentionally or unintentionally. Other terms may be used, such as "rights holders" or "affected persons."

The extent to which the intervention is consistent/compatible with other interventions within a country, sector or institution.

Examine how other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention being evaluated, and vice versa. This includes internal and external coherence:

- Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/administration, as well as the coherence between the intervention and the relevant international norms and standards to which the institution/administration adheres.
- External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

Effectiveness - is the intervention achieving its objectives?

The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.

Note: analysis of effectiveness involves taking into account the relative importance of objectives or results.

- Analyse the extent to which the results achieved have led to the specific objectives targeted by the project;
- Assessment of project management and quality of monitoring;
- Relevance of the OVIs and proposal, if any, of more appropriate OVIs;
- What positive or negative unintended effects have occurred? How can they be situated and assessed in the overall context? How have the project and the partner responded?

Efficiency – how well are resources being used?

The extent to which the intervention delivers, 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 efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).

- Analysis of the adequacy of the means/inputs used and assessment of the costs of the project (in comparison with similar interventions);
- Could the same results have been achieved at lower costs?
- Was the duration of the project adequate or could the results be better with a different project duration?
- Assess the flexibility of the project (steering) to readjust project components to take account of the results of previous evaluations.

Impact: what difference does the intervention make?

The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

Note: Impact addresses the ultimate significance 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 effectiveness 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.

The impact focuses on the relationship between the specific objective and the overall objectives of the project. Thus, the final evaluation examines:

- The extent to which the project's objectives have been achieved as intended, in particular the overall objective ;
- Whether the effects of the project
 - Were facilitated/braked by external factors,
 - Whether the project's effects were facilitated/impeded by external factors, had unintended or unexpected spill-over effects and, if so, how these affected the overall impact,
 - Were facilitated/encouraged by the management of the project/programme, by the coordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders,
 - Contributed to economic and social development,
 - Contributed to cross-cutting issues (gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention, etc.).

Sustainability – will the benefits last?

The extent to which 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.

- Are the positive results of the project likely to be sustained after the end of the project? Analysis in relation to existing political support, institutional capacity, socio-cultural factors, financial and economic aspects and technical issues?
- With regard to the financial aspects in particular, has an estimate been made of the costs of project outputs (salaries, management and maintenance costs) and is a local budget available to cover these costs?
- Has the handover phase been well prepared and carried out?

B. Consideration of cross-cutting themes

To what extent did the project take into account the following cross-cutting themes:

Governance for Development

- Has the project put in place mechanisms that address governance for development? Have strategies for the participation of all target groups and in particular those traditionally excluded (e.g. women, socio-ethnic groups, rural population, etc.) been implemented? Were they relevant and successful?
- Think: information flow, organising associations, sharing responsibilities, human/women's rights groups, consultation with different groups, transparent decision-making and management processes, etc.

Gender equality

- Did the gender concept or national gender policies influence the design, implementation and results of the project?
- Was a gender analysis carried out at the time of project formulation/initiation? Did the project take into account the situations of gender inequality that may exist, their causes and influencing factors? Have inequalities in access to and control over resources, access to and control over project benefits been considered? Have strategies been adopted to reduce these inequalities? Has the project had a positive impact on these situations?

Interdependence of cross-cutting themes

To what extent is the interdependence of cross-cutting themes taken into account in the project (e.g. the effects of natural resource management measures on gender relations)?

C. Analysis of the context and impact of COVID-19

Relevance

- How has COVID-19 affected the objectives and design of the intervention in relation to the needs, policies and priorities of beneficiaries?⁵ (How have systems been strengthened and lives protected?)

Coherence

- Internal: if there were direct responses to COVID-19 organised by the project, what synergies and interlinkages were created with other interventions led by the same institution/administration?
- External: responsiveness of development assistance - how have donors adapted to new realities and coordinated their assistance?

Effectiveness

- Analyse the extent to which the COVID-19 situation has had an impact on the achievement of results and objectives? Propose adjustments and recommendations if necessary.

Efficiency

- Analyse the extent to which COVID-19 has had an impact on the efficiency of the project, taking into account budgets, expertise, time, etc. What lessons can we learn about the flexibility of our systems in terms of strategic and operational reorientation?

Sustainability

- Did the COVID-19 context affect the sustainability of the project? Propose adjustments and recommendations if necessary.

Learning

⁵ That is, the individuals, groups or organisations that benefit from the development intervention, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally. Other terms may be used, such as 'rights holders' or 'affected people'.

- Explore how challenges have been met, what new opportunities have been potentially identified and what potential innovations. What opportunities or innovations have emerged that could improve interventions or implementation in the future?