Terms of Reference

Mid-term evaluation: "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda"

I.   Background and context

The "Building national and local capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" project is a Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity development initiative initiated in 2013. The 5 year project builds upon the Project Initiation Plan for National Capacity Building for Disaster Risk management Programme signed in 2011 by UNDP and Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR) and whose implementation ended in 2013.

The project started its implementation in June 2013 and is designed to end in June 2018. It aims to support the national development framework, the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II 2013-2018) where disaster Management has been mainstreamed as a cross cutting issue.

The project is geared towards helping the Government of Rwanda strengthen its DRM capacity, enhance preparedness and reduce risks, and achieve its global commitment to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and the MDGs. It aims at building national capacities for disaster risk management through advisory, policy and technical support to render fully operational an effective disaster risk management system at the national and local levels.

Furthermore, the project is in line with Outcome 3 of the United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2013 – 2018 (UNDAP)[1]: "Rwanda has in place improved systems for: sustainable management of the

---

[1] UNDAP is the business plan of all the UN agencies, funds and programmes in Rwanda for the period July 2013 to June 2018. UNDAP Rwanda supports the realization of the Millennium Declaration, the related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the other international development aspirations, the transition from the MDGs to

environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources, energy access and security, for environmental and climate change resilience, in line with Rio+20 recommendations for sustainable development."

The project has five inter-related outputs.

- Output 1: Enhanced capacities of national and local institutions to manage disaster risks and recover from disaster events; including improved national and local coordination mechanisms.
- Output 2: DRR mainstreamed into national/district/sectorial plans and policies; and capacities on DRM Planning enhanced.
- Output 3: A functioning national disaster risk assessment and monitoring system (DRAMS) established.
- Output 4: End-to-end early warning systems established and operational.
- Output 5: Reduced community vulnerabilities and increased household resilience in selected high-risk districts and increased public awareness on DRR.

Output 1 aims to support institutional capacity strengthening of MIDIMAR and local DDMCs to reinforce national coordination mechanisms for DRM. Output 2 aims to support mainstreaming of DRR in development plans and key relevant policies. Output 3 aims at building risk knowledge through a comprehensive risk assessment and development of the country's National Risk Profile. Output 4 aims to support the establishment of the end-to-end early warning systems and Output 5 aims at developing a risk reduction strategy based on vulnerability reduction and risk mitigation measures as well as at raising public awareness on DRR.

The project is mainly financed by UNDP with some support from the European Union, the World Bank (ACP-EU Natural Disaster Risk Reduction Program) and the Government of Japan (Japan-UNDP Partnership Fund). MIDIMAR is the primary implementing partner of the project. The total resources required for the implementation of the project are USD 8.8 million half of which has to be mobilized.

II. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to examine the results, achievements and constraints in the implementation of the project "Building national and local capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda". The Project, which was initiated in 2013 and supposed to end in June 2018, is coming to its mid-term point at the end of 2015. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation and lessons learned from the 2.5 first years of its implementation will inform for the implementation of the project in

---

the post-2015 framework, the country's medium-term national development priorities as set out in the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS 2) for the period 2013-2018, as well as the Rwanda Vision 2020.

its 2.5 remaining years.   The Evaluation also aims at assessing UNDP's contribution to the achievement of UNDAP Outcome 3.

The MTE is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the remaining project period, after evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assessing the progress towards achieving the project outputs and outcomes to date. The evaluation will also assess early signs of project success or failure and prompts adjustments. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would therefore help UNDP and MIDIMAR to adjust the project for its remaining period.

III.   Evaluation scope and objectives

Objectives

In line with the project's objectives, UNDP Rwanda, in collaboration with the project's implementing partner (MIDIMAR), plans to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project. The evaluation aims to assess the state of progress towards the achievements of the planned outputs and outcomes. The mid-term evaluation main objectives are the following:

- Assess the Project's implementation strategy.
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions.
- Assess the Project's processes, including budgetary efficiency
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs have been achieved.
- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the project's activities
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets
- Document lessons learnt
- Make recommendations for the project's remaining implementation period

The evaluation's finding and results will serve as an information source for the 2015 UNDAP mid-term review.

Scope

The evaluation covers the implementation period of the project, from July 2013 up December 2015. The geographic coverage of the evaluation is the whole country (Rwanda). The scope of the mid-term evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments.

- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

(i)   Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;

(ii)   An evaluation of the project's progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;

(iii)   An evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document; An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the project outputs produced to date in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first 2.5 years of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the project;

(iv)   An evaluation of the project's contribution to the achievements of UNDAP's outcome and outputs;

(v)   Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document;

(vi)   An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:

    a.   Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;

    b.   The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms used by MIDIMAR in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in project implementation;

    c.   Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project;

    d.   An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC);

    e.   Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.

(vii)   A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;

(viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities;

(ix)   Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach[2]

---

[2] For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights

(x) Assess of the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly

(xi) Lessons learned during project implementation;

IV. Evaluation

Evaluation criteria

The project will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria:

- Relevance: measures whether the project addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- Effectiveness: measures whether the project activities achieve its goal.
- Efficiency: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.
- Sustainability: measures whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The project needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.
- Impacts of intervention: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Evaluation Questions

More specifically, the mid-term evaluation aims at addressing the following questions for each evaluation criteria:

Relevance

- Where is this Project being implemented? How was the Project site selected? What has been the main focus of the project implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the project aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS 2, Vision 2020)?
- The extent to which the project activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

---

and Gender Equality in Evaluation" http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616

Effectiveness

- To what extent were the objectives achieved/are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?
- Have the different outputs been achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- To what extend the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?
- What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?
- How did UNDP support the achievement of project outcome and outputs?
- How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other projects?

Efficiency

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What was the original budget for the Project? How have the Project funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?
- Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the Project? What are they and how are they being addressed?

Sustainability

- To what extend the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?
- To what extent will the benefits of the programme or project continue after donor funding stops?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
- Does the project have a clear exit strategy?

Impact of interventions

- What are the stated goals of the Project? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the programme and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the project contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?
- What has happened as a result of the project?

- What have been the main impact of the project on the Disaster Management framework in Rwanda?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project?
- What difference has the project made to beneficiaries?

V. Methodology

General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results). UNDP's Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

 The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluators and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluators, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Further data on the project indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the project progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of project document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of LPAC meeting, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, Project annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);

(ii) Review of specific products produced so far, including datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;

(iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Project Manager, Technical Assistant/Project Coordinator and the Administrative Assistant in MIDIMAR

(iv) Interviews with UNDP International DRR Specialist, Head of Poverty and Environment Unit and UNDP Programme Analyst

(v) Interviews with District Disaster Management Officers (DDMOs), Sector Disaster Management Officers (SDMOs) and other project beneficiaries

(vi) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, including the co-financers, namely the European Union, representative of the Government of Japan as well as the World Bank.

(vii) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders

VI.   Deliverables (Evaluation Products)

This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:

- **Evaluation inception report—**An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with MIDIMAR. **1week after signing the contract**

- **Draft evaluation report—**Submission of draft evaluation report to UNDP for comments and inputs. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will then review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.

- **Presentation of Draft evaluation report (PPT presentation)** to the Project Steering Committee for inputs and comments.

- **Final evaluation report.** The final report should be completed **1 week after receipt of consolidated comments from stakeholders**.

VII.   Evaluation Team Composition and required competencies

The Individual consultant should have the following skills/competencies and characteristics:

- At least master's degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences or/and Disaster Management;
- At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation.
- At least 10 years accumulated experience in programme management support, programme/project formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;
- Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Disaster Management/ Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives;
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-right based approach and environmental sustainability concepts;
- Strong Interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner

- Proven understanding of key elements of result-based programme management in International development cooperation
- Fluent in English and working knowledge of French would be an added advantage.
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English

VIII.   How to apply

Candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

(i)   **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

(ii)   **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects as well as the contact details (e-mail and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

(iii) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology, if applicable, on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment

(iv)   **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

IX.   Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation[3] .The critical issues evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation include evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, (for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality

X.   Implementation Arrangements

This section describes the organization and management structure for the evaluation and defines the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

---

[3] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Available at www.uneval.org/**ethicalguidelines**

UNDP

UNDP is responsible for the management of this mid-term evaluation and will contract independent consultant to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. UNDP will be the focal point for the evaluation and will facilitate the logistical requirements and provide technical assistance during all phases of the evaluation process, including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

UNDP Programme Analyst

Day-to-day management of the Evaluation Team will be provided by UNDP programme analyst overseeing the project. He will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluation Team, including payments are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluation Team. He will provide all documentation to the team for the desk review, set up interview appointments and field visits and convene focus group meetings.

Steering Committee

The Building National and Local capacities for DM in Rwanda project Steering Committee will oversee the conduct of the evaluation and will be responsible for providing guidance and direction for the evaluation process and inputs and comments on the draft evaluation report as well as for approving the final document.

Evaluation Management Team

An Evaluation Management Team led by UNDP composed of a representative of MIDIMAR, UNDP Environment Head of Unit, Programme Analyst, the Chief of UNDP Management Support Unit and the International DRR Specialist will oversee the conduct of the evaluation at the technical level. The team will provide quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria. The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, ensure wide stakeholder consultations, will be in charge of verifying all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final report and the drafting and implementation of follow up actions.

XI.   Time Frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted in August 2015 for an estimated 35 working days. The evaluation will include the following phases with their respective time frame.

Phase	Tasks and deliverables	Time-Line
Desk Review and Inception report phase	• Desk review conducted • Briefings of evaluators • An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators detailing the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.	**5 days**
Stakeholder consultations and Interviews	• The evaluators will consult with all relevant stakeholders and conduct a series of interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits in order to collect the required data.	**15 days**
Analysis of data and drafting report	• Once the data is collected, the evaluators will analyse them and draft the evaluation report.	**8 days**
Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting	• Once the draft final evaluation report submitted, it will be presented to all stakeholders for reviewing. The comments shared by the stakeholders will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.	**2 days**
Final Report	• The evaluators will revise the final evaluation report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP.	**5 days**
	Total number of working days	**35 days**

XII.   Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultancy fee will be paid as a Lump Sum (inclusive of all expenses related to the consultancy), and will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components of the consultancy. The consultancy fee will be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

- 30% after presentation and adoption of the inception report
- 30% after presentation and approval of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final report

XIII.   Annexes

Annex 1: Key Stakeholders and partners

Stakeholder	Function	Institution	Contact
Patrice Izerimana	Coordinator, SPIU	MIDIMAR	izerimana.patrice@gmail.com
Veneranda Ingabire	Project Manager	MIDIMAR	veningabire@yahoo.fr
Antoine Ruvebana	Permanent Secretary	MIDIMAR	
Tite Bizimana	Disaster Project Specialist	MIDIMAR	bizimanatite@yahoo.fr
Erasme Ntazinda	Project Manager, ACP-EU/WB project	MIDIMAR	erasmen@yahoo.fr
Philippe Habinshuti	Director Disaster Response and Recovery Unit, Secretary NPDRR	MIDIMAR	nerinshuti@yahoo.com
Jean Baptiste Nsengiyumva	Director, Research and Public awareness	MIDIMAR	jbatigol@yahoo.com
Gemma Dalena	DRR Specialist	MIIDMAR/UNDP	gemma.dalena@undp.org
Sophie Nyirabakwiye	Head of Poverty and Environment Unit	UNDP	sophie.nyirabakwiye@undp.org
Nicolas Schmids	Programme Analyst	UNDP	Nicolas.schmids@undp.org
Stephen Rodriques	Country Director	UNDP	Stephen.rodriques@undp.org
Representative of MINECOFIN		MINECOFIN	
Representative of MINALOC		MINALOC	
District Authorities (District Disaster Prone areas)	District Disaster Management Officers (DDMOs)	District	
Sector Authorities (Sector Disaster Prone areas)	Sector Disaster Management Officers (SDMOs)	Sector	
Olivier Machiels	Programme Officer	European Union delegation to Rwanda	olivier.machiels@eeas.europa.eu
Luis Corrales	DRM Consultant	World Bank Washington	lcorrales@worldbank.org
Francis M Muraya	Team leader	World Bank Washington	fmuraya@worldbank.org

Tatsuya ONIKI (Mr.)	Coordinator for Economic Cooperation	Embassy of Japan in Rwanda	tatsuya.oniki@mofa.go.jp
UNHCR	Focal points working on DM/DRR with MIDIMAR UNHCR representative	UNHCR	TBD
WFP	Focal points working on DM/DRR with MIDIMAR WFP Representative	WFP	TBD
One UN DRG4 members	DRG4 focal points for WFP, UNHCR, WHO, UNDP, FAO, UNFPA, UNICEF		
National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction	Members of the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (Government, One UN agencies and Civil society representative)		TBD

Annex 2: Documents to be consulted

The list below details the important documents that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. The list might include other relevant documents identified during the inception phase and the consultation process.

Documents
Project Initiation Plan for National Capacity Building for Disaster Risk management Programme, 2011
"Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project document, 2013
Annual report "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project, 2013-2014
Quarterly Progress report "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project, 2013-2015
Project Steering Committee Meetings minutes, "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project , 2013-2015
National Disaster Management Policy, MIDIMAR, 2014
Disaster Management Law, MIDIMAR
MIDIMAR 5 year Strategic Plan (2012-2017)

National Disaster Risk Management Plan (NDRMP), MIDIMAR
Hyogo Framework for Action
Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030
Rwanda National Progress Report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (Monitoring report 2011-2013)
Minutes National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction quarterly meetings, 2013-2015
District Plans (the ones where DRR is mainstreamed)
DRR Mainstreaming to EDPRS Sectors document
"Development of comprehensive disaster risk profiles for enhancing disaster management in Rwanda" project document
Rwanda Comprehensive Disaster Risk profile (Disaster Risk Atlas)
Republic of Rwanda, EDPRS 2
Republic of Rwanda, Vision 2020
United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, CCPD 2013-2018
United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018
UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation
UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluations for Development Results (2009)
UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' 2005.
Addendum June 2011 Evaluation: Updated guidance on Evaluation in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009)
Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Disaster Prevention and Recovery, UNDP 2010 http://www.oecd.org/derec/undp/47871337.pdf http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/manageevaluation/viewevaluationdetail.html?evalid=4782
Evaluation of the Government of Uganda and UNDP Crisis Management and Recovery Program (CMR), 2011 https://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=5296

Annex 3: Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the evaluation criteria as stated below:

The offer will be evaluated by using the best value for money approach. Technical proposal will be evaluated on70% whereas the financial proposal will be evaluated on 30%. Below is the breakdown for the technical proposal on 1005 which will be brought to 70%.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical		
At least master's degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences or/and Disaster Management;	10%	10
At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation	25%	20
Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Disaster Management/ Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives;	10%	10
Overall Methodology (clear demonstration of evaluation methodology and understanding of the ToR)	30%	30
At least 10 years' experience in programme management support including formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation	15%	20
Fluent in English (written and verbal skills) and basic knowledge of French would be a value adding	10%	10

Annex 4: Sample Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators need to create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

The draft sample evaluation Matrix to be used by the evaluators is presented below.

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	**Key Questions**	**Specific Sub-Questions**	**Data Sources**	**Data collection Methods/Tools**	**Indicators/ Success Standard**	**Methods for Data Analysis**

Annex 5: Required format for the evaluation report

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports:

Title and opening pages Should provide the following basic information:
- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.

16

- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—Should:
- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework**, **implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals.**
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- Evaluation scope: The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.

- Evaluation objectives: The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- Evaluation criteria: The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions: Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the

appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Recommendations—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

Annex 6: Code of conduct