

Annex 4: Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

1. Introduction

It is a DFID requirement that all funded programmes are subject to regular reporting and monitoring processes and a final evaluation process. Each programme has a statement of Purpose and a number of Outputs (intended results) agreed by DFID. These are set out in the programme's Logical Framework (logframe), together with indicators of achievement. Annual Reporting records progress against these indicators and where necessary records agreed changes to update the logframe as programme implementation progresses.

By the end of the programme, results may not be exactly as planned. However, there will be some impact and change, intended and unintended, positive and even in some cases negative. This information needs to be recorded in the final evaluation. Through an honest examination of what actually happened against the planned results important lessons for future programmes can be learned. The purpose of the final evaluation is to:

- Identify the impact of the programme and ways that this can be sustained
- Record and share lessons
- Account to local stakeholders for the programme's achievements
- Improve future programme design and management
- Verify funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results
- Enable DFID to evaluate the performance of the GTF as a whole, making sure the overall portfolio has increased accountability and responsiveness.

2. Outputs from the Evaluation

The evaluator(s) will produce a report of **no more than 30 pages** plus appendices, in Microsoft Word using Arial font 12. While the format and content of the full evaluation report is for the Grant Holder to decide, a common structure for a final evaluation report includes:

- Title Page including Programme Identification Details
- Table of Contents page
- Abbreviations and acronyms page
- Executive summary
- A short introduction to the programme
- The evaluation methodology
- Findings in relation to Key Evaluation Issues (see below)
- A summary of recommendations

- A one page summary of lessons indicating with whom and how lessons should be shared
- Common annexes include the terms of reference, the evaluation schedule, people met, and documents consulted. Further annexes could include any detailed statistical data on baselines and end of programme surveys.

3. Key Evaluation Issues

The final identification of key issues is for the Grant Holder to decide, however as a minimum there are several broad issues which must be addressed. These include: a) Impact; b) Relevance; c) Equity; d) Efficiency; e) Effectiveness; f) Sustainability; g) Replicability; h) Lessons Learned; and, i) Recommendations. Definitions and leading questions for each broad issue are:

a) Impact: Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the programme and how it contributed to the overall objectives of the Governance and Transparency Fund (increased capability, accountability and responsiveness).

- *What was the programme's overall impact and how did this compare with what was expected?*
- *Did the programme address the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?*
- *Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the programme?*
- *What difference has been made to the lives of those involved in the programme?*

b) Relevance: Details of the programme's significance with respect to increasing voice, accountability and responsiveness within the local context.

- *How well did the programme relate to governance priorities at local, national or internal levels?*
- *How well did the programme relate to DFID's country assistance plans?*

c) Equity: Discussion of social differentiation (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic group, disability, etc) and the extent to which the programme had a positive impact on the more disadvantaged groups.

- *How did the programme actively promote gender equality?*
- *What was the impact of the programme on children, youth and the elderly?*
- *What was the impact of the programme on ethnic minorities?*

- *If the programme involved work with children, how were child protection issues addressed?*
- *How were the needs of excluded groups, including people with disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS addressed within the programme?*

d) Efficiency: How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.

- *How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?*
- *How well did the financial systems work?*
- *How were local partners involved in programme management and how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?*
- *Were the risks properly identified and well managed?*

e) Effectiveness: Assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved in relation to targets set in the original logical framework.

- *How effective and appropriate was the programme approach?*
- *With hindsight, how could it have been improved?*

f) Sustainability: Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms following the withdrawal of DFID support

- *What are the prospects for the benefits of the programme being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match the intentions?*
- *How has/could collaboration, networking and influencing of opinion support sustainability?*

g) Replicability: How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/had impact? Refer especially to innovative aspects which are replicable.

- *What aspects of the programme are replicable elsewhere?*
- *Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the programme be replicable?*

h) Lessons Learned: Key lessons learned throughout the period of the programme, which can be utilised to guide future strategies,

programmes or agencies working in development. It is useful to divide these into programme, sector and broader developmental lessons.

- *Were there any significant changes in the programme design or the programme context? What were the reasons for these and can any useful lessons be learned from this for application elsewhere?*
- *How did the programme engage with poor and marginalised groups and support their empowerment most effectively?*
- *For whom could these lessons have relevance?*
- *How do the lessons relate to any innovative aspects of the programme that were highlighted in the programme proposal?*
- *Have lessons been shared during the life of the programme – with whom, and to what effect?*

i) Recommendations: Recommendations for improvements based on observations during the evaluation process (e.g. for sustainability, future programme design and management)

4. The Evaluation Process

The terms of reference for the evaluation should lay out the expertise required and the methodology for the evaluation including the documents to be consulted, specific visits and people to meet, the timing of the process and deadlines for reporting. It should be made clear who the evaluation team reports to and how responsibilities for planning the logistics of the exercise are to be shared e.g. organising interviews with key people, arranging transport and booking accommodation etc.

The evaluation team would usually comprise independent consultants. One of the team should be the designated Team Leader. Consultants may be subject area specialists, consultants with local knowledge, or organisational management specialists. The exact composition of the evaluation team will be decided by the Grant Holder. (DFID may, under special circumstances, recommend specialists to be included in the evaluation team.)

The Grant Holder should recruit the evaluation team and organise key dates and deadlines for the evaluation within 3 months of the end of the programme to ensure that the findings of the evaluation feed into the Programme Completion Report.

At the start of the evaluation process, the Grant Holder staff should meet and hold a briefing session with the evaluators to agree the overall evaluation methodology and highlight any key issues to be addressed. Appropriate site visits and key interviews should be arranged, in advance if necessary, to minimise the logistical difficulties.)

The evaluation process should include:

- A desk review of programme information including the key documents listed in these terms of reference;
- Interviews with programme managers and partners to collect information on achievements and impact and difficulties faced by the programme including the management aspects of work;
- Interviews with key programme stakeholders to include questions on the degree to which programme has had the intended impact; and what could have been done differently or better so that the lessons can be learned;
- Evaluators would normally present a preliminary overview of their findings to the programme team in-country and receive comments from stakeholders before preparing the draft evaluation report;
- Evaluators should submit the draft report to the programme management team for written comment before finalising the report, to minimise the chance of inaccuracies and to maximise ownership of the findings.

5. Documents to share with the evaluators

It is important for evaluators to have ready access to key programme documentation. As a minimum, this should include:

- The approved programme proposal document.
- The approved programme Inception Report
- The original programme logframe and any subsequent amended logframes with the rationale for the changes.
- Annual Programme Reports, including financial information.
- Any case studies submitted to DFID.
- Examples of lessons shared during the lifetime of the programme.
- Original baseline studies and any subsequent studies to show impact.
- Other evidence of impact that the programme team thinks is important. This could include anecdotes of decisions having been taken, policies or programmes that have changed or communication material that may have an impact on decision-making.