

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of the Crisis Management and Recovery (CMR) programme final evaluation is to draw lessons both in design and implementation of the project that will aid the Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit in the design of new projects. The evaluation should lead to a clear understanding of what has worked and what has not, and also provide necessary management information for decision making to enable the design of new projects to support UNDP's new CPAP (2010-2014). The Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), local governments of the thirteen districts (Soroti, Dokolo, Keberamaido, Katakwi, Amuria, Oyam, Amolatai, Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum, Pader, Apac and Lira) in which the programme was implemented, the NGOs (ACTED, CPAR and ASB) the project implementers and the beneficiaries want to understand how successful project implementation was. The evaluation should provide recommendations on how best to design and implement crisis management and recovery project in setting like Uganda.

Description of the social, economic and political context

The armed conflict that affected Northern Uganda for nearly two decades led to loss of human security, life, assets, and occurrence of social upheaval including dismantling of social safety nets, a marked drop in productivity and the destruction of vital infrastructure such as health centers and schools. A combination of armed conflicts and other forms of disasters, both human induced and natural have weakened communities and institutions in the Northern, North Eastern as well as some areas in the Western region of Uganda.

The armed conflict in Northern Uganda led to widening regional disparities in terms of human and economic development. The 2005 Uganda Human Development Report indicated the human development indices for Northern Uganda to be the lowest at 0.418. The northern region was lagging in all the indexed variables mainly because of the insurgency in the region, which hindered profitable economic activities and results in the displacement of the population.¹

The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), whose mandate is to coordinate specific programmes including monitoring activities of non government actors, has limited ability to effectively fulfil its mandate largely due to the absence of policy frameworks, inadequate staffing levels and inadequate financial resources to execute this function. As a result, efforts of actors in the areas of peace building, conflict prevention and disaster risk reduction and response have remained largely un-coordinated and have failed to be effective because they are not harmonized through an established policy and strategic institutionalized framework.

Another challenge to coordination was an inadequate and sometimes weak system of information collection, analysis, sharing and dissemination between government departments and nongovernmental actors involved in peace building and disaster risk reduction and management activities. The Department of Disaster Management and Refugees in the OPM had limited human resource and technological capacity to collect the relevant data/information, analyse it, disseminate it and use it for risk reduction and preparedness in terms of management and for contingency and strategic planning purposes.

Government of Uganda (GoU), the development partners, NGOs, CSOs and other stakeholders voiced the need for peace building and conflict prevention programmes to consolidate the relative peace prevailing in Northern Uganda and Uganda as a whole as well as policy frameworks that among other things would facilitate the framing of coordination mechanisms to guide activities in the areas of peace building, Crisis Management and Recovery and management.

Subject of the Evaluation

The subject of the evaluation will cover the five components of the programme and their respective strategic objectives. The components of the programme are (1) Recovery; (2) Peace Building and Conflict Prevention; (3) Disaster Risk Reduction and Management; (4) Information Management and

¹ Uganda Human Development Report 2005 *Linking Environment to Development: A Deliberate Choice* UNDP p. 22

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

(5) Institutional Strengthening. The evaluation will cover the programme intended outcome(s) and output(s).

The programme was intended to lead to a more rapid recovery from conflict in the affected areas, a reduction in the tendency to resort to conflict, including armed conflict as well as a substantial reduction of other disasters and/or the effects of disasters. Opportunities would be created for stakeholders at all levels to network and share information on best practices and lessons learned. More effective coordination mechanisms highlighted in the programme will lead to cohesiveness, teamwork, efficiency and effectiveness that would in turn contribute to the building of peace and greater resilience of communities to natural and human induced disasters but more importantly would propel the recovery process to more sustainable development in the conflict affected areas.

The programme was to be implemented in collaboration/partnership with Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, district local governments, NGOs, CSOs, cultural institutions, religious institutions, development agencies, the private sector and local communities. The Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, in the OPM, had the overall oversight responsibility to ensure that the programme was implemented in line with government policy and procedures.

Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The primary focus of the evaluation is design and implementation of the project. The evaluation seeks to document how well the project was designed and implemented and how the lessons gained from these will help in the formulation of new projects. In terms of implementation the evaluation will cover partners at all levels of implementation i.e. Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, district local governments, NGOs. The evaluation will cover the project implementation period 2007 – 2010. All project beneficiaries will be represented in the evaluation.

Evaluation questions:

The following key questions need to be addressed in the evaluation:

1. How relevant and strategic were the project strategic objectives to national goals and UNDP mandate?
2. To what extent were the project interventions aligned to the project components and strategic objectives?
3. How appropriate was the design of the project in addressing the development challenge?
4. To what extent are the project management structures functional and responsive in addressing the development challenge (i.e. UNDP Kampala office, UNDP Sub-offices, Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, local governments, NGOs etc)?
 - a. What factors were responsible for functionality and responsiveness?
5. How effective and efficient was the project implementation?
 - a. What factors both positive and negative influenced project implementation?
6. To what extent are project results (output, outcomes and impact) sustainable?
7. What lessons have been learned that could be used to strengthen design and implementation in future programming?

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation team is expected to use the following research methods among others:

1. A desk review of relevant documents (country programme, project document, annual work plans, progress reports, financial reports, etc.)
2. Interviews and consultations with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries i.e. (UNDP Kampala office, UNDP Sub-offices, Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, local governments, NGOs and representatives of project beneficiaries etc)
3. Field visits to project sites
4. Any other methodology deemed necessary by the evaluation team

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

The detailed evaluation methodology will be developed by the evaluation team and submitted to UNDP as part of the inception report for approval. The detailed methodology will include and not limited to the following:

- Sample size
- Sample selection (geographical location and beneficiaries)
- Research methodology
- Data collection approach
- Data collection tools
- Data analysis techniques
- A table indicating how to get to answers for all evaluation questions.

Expected Evaluation Deliverables

The following key products are expected from the evaluation team:

- Inception Report including detailed methodology
- Field work debriefing before draft report writing
- Draft Evaluation Report
- PowerPoint Presentation for UNDP and all stakeholders
- Final Evaluation Report (The final evaluation report structure will be guided by UNDP evaluation report format and quality control checklist).

Composition, Skills and Experience of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be undertaken by a team consisting of international and local evaluators with experience in development, crisis and conflict situations in the Horn of Africa. The team should have the skill set required to address the five components of the programme. The detailed skills, experiences and qualifications are presented below

i) International Evaluator

The evaluation will be lead by an international evaluator with the following skills, experiences and qualifications are required:

- Master's degree in development studies or related social science fields
- Familiarity with crisis and conflict situations in the Horn of Africa
- Proven experience in conducting independent project evaluations in conflict setting
- At least 10 years of relevant experience in evaluation or development, crisis management and recovery programming
- Proven experience in leading evaluation team
- Excellent ability to communicate in English both written and spoken
- Proven experience in report drafting and writing
- Experience with UNDP or UN agency funded project will be added advantage

ii) Local Evaluators

The local evaluators will support the international evaluator and should have the following skills, experiences and qualifications are required:

- Master's degree in development studies or related social science fields
- Familiarity with crisis and conflict situations in the Karamoja area
- Proven experience in conducting independent project evaluations in conflict setting
- At least 5 years of relevant experience in evaluation or development, crisis management and recovery programming
- Excellent ability to communicate in English both written and spoken, and to work in a team
- Experience with UNDP or UN agency funded project will be added advantage

Plan for Evaluation Implementation

The timetable for the evaluation, including when different deliverables or products – such as inception report, briefs, draft report, final report is provided in the table below:

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

The timing² and duration for the assignment will be 35 working days effective from the date of signing of the contract. The work schedule should run as follows

Deliverable	Time
Inception Report	7 days after signing of contract
Weekly progress report	Weekly
Power point presentation of field work findings to UNDP	28 days after signing of contract
Draft Report submission	28 days after signing of contract
Power point presentation of draft report to stakeholders	30 days after signing of contract
Stakeholders' workshop to validate draft report findings	32 days after signing of contract
Final Report	35 days after signing of contract

The Evaluation team shall present an Inception report within one week of signing the contract.

The team shall work closely with the relevant UNDP Programme Analyst and report weekly on the progress of the consultancy to the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative in charge of the Crisis Prevention and Recovery Programme or any designated office.

The draft evaluation report shall be presented to UNDP and other stakeholders for review not later than 28 days after start of the assignment. Comments and feedback from all stakeholders should be incorporated into the final version of the report.

The evaluation team shall submit the final evaluation report to the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative in charge of the Crisis Prevention and Recovery Programme 35 days after signing of the contract.

Responsibilities and Logistics

- The evaluation team leader will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables to the UNDP country office.
- UNDP, Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, local governments and NGOs will review, provide feedback on the evaluation TORs and evaluation reports
- UNDP will be responsible for quality control
- UNDP will be responsible for organizing the stakeholders' workshop to review the draft and eventually share final evaluation report with Ministry of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, local governments and the beneficiaries.
- UNDP will provide logistical support to the evaluators in form of a vehicle for up-country project visits and work space.

Reference Materials

- i. Crisis Management and Recovery Programme Project Document
- ii. Project annual and quarterly performance reports
- iii. Evaluation Report Format
- iv. UNDP Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report
- v. Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
- vi. The Evaluation Policy of UNDP
- vii. United Nations Evaluation Group Standards for Evaluation in the UN (2005)
- viii. Norms of Evaluation in the UN system
- ix. Any other Documents that the team will deem necessary

² This will be firmed up after a discussion on who will undertake the evaluation

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

Annexes

Annex I

The following documents should be appended to the TOR when provided to the evaluator(s):

- Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report
- Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
- Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators

Quality Criteria:

The following checklist provides a basis for reviewing the quality of the TOR. It may be used by the drafters of evaluation TOR to ensure that all necessary elements are contained with the TOR document. This checklist is aligned with the United Nations Evaluation Group Standards for Evaluation in the UN (2005).

- 1. The purpose of the evaluation is clear and realistic**
 - There is an explicit mention of who requires the evaluation results and what they will do with them.
- 2. The subject of the evaluation is elaborated**
 - The conceptual linkages between the strategy and the intended outcome(s) are clearly explained.
 - In the case of an outcome³ evaluation, the specific projects to be considered are clearly mentioned, including their timelines, executing agencies and budgets.
 - There is a clear description of the external political, economic and social context within which the programme(s) and/or project(s) are situated
- 3. The evaluation questions address the contribution to development effectiveness.**
 - The questions address the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the programmes or projects being evaluated, as well as the sustainability of results.
 - The questions address the value-added of the programmes and projects in comparison with alternatives
 - The questions address UNDP's partnership strategy and its relation to effectiveness in achieving the outcome
 - The question address UNDP strategic positioning and its comparative advantage
 - The questions require the evaluation to provide disaggregated information by gender, ethnicity and other relevant criteria

Where appropriate, the questions should address contribution to changes human development as measured by people's well being.

- 4. The evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:**
 - Human rights
 - Equity
 - Capacity development
 - Institutional strengthening
 - Innovation or added value to national development
- 5. The TOR should reflect the findings of an assessment of evaluability assessment, or require such an assessment prior to the definition of the evaluation approach and methodology**

³ Or other evaluation where the unit is larger than a single project.

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

In accordance with the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System, evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process*⁴

- 6. The scope of the evaluation is clear and consistent in relation to the purpose and the questions**
 - The scope of the evaluation, including time period, phases in implementation, geographical area, parameters with respect to the subject and stakeholders being examined is made explicit.
- 7. The evaluation should be manageable within time requirements and budget allocation.**
- 8. The product(s) of the evaluation respond to information demands identified in the statement of purpose**
 - The TOR clearly describes the deliverables or product(s) and the audience(s) of such product(s) in terms of format, structure and length
 - They define which audience(s) requires what products.
 - There is a proposed structure for the final report that meets the requirements for evaluation reports in UNDP.
- 9. The composition, skills and experience required are commensurate to the task**
 - The TOR outline the requisite skills, experience, qualifications and other relevant competencies for the tasks outlined
 - There is a requirement for the independence of the evaluators, meaning that they have not been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the programmes or projects to be evaluated.
- 10. The legal and ethical bases for conducting the evaluation are outlined**
 - The TOR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations
 - The TOR is accompanied by the formal agreements outline the obligations of all parties, responsibilities and accountabilities and understandings of actions for non-compliance.

Procedures and Accountabilities:

The TOR should be developed through an inclusive process with the key evaluation partners and stakeholders. Preparing the TOR should involve gathering together, reviewing and logically structuring all of the relevant material on the subject of the evaluation (including the results framework, outcome and output indicators and available monitoring data). This material should assist in the drafting of the TOR itself, and provide additional information to the evaluator(s).

Programme Manager and the members of the outcome/project board or other advisory panel/board should establish a system for quality assuring the TOR for the evaluation.

⁴ Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System, para 7.2.

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

Annex II

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

This statement is to be included in the Terms of Reference for each evaluation.
For details on the ethics in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines.

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

Annex III

Evaluation Report Format

Purpose/Description of the Evaluation Report:

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programmes, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

This note draws extensively from the Standards for Evaluation for the UN system.

Format:

The Evaluation Report should contain the following:

- Title Page
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Table of contents, including list of annexes
- Executive Summary
- Introduction: background and context of the programme
- Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
- Approach and methodology
- Findings
- Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons, generalizations, alternatives
- Annexes

Quality Criteria:

A good evaluation report must be guided by the criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness as defined below.

Utility: An evaluation report is useful when the report is:

- Complete in providing information on the context for the evaluation to allow reader to decide on the value it will derive from the evaluation (i.e. evaluability assessment, stakeholder involvement, evaluator or institutional credibility, alignment of evaluators with national institutions, bases for interpretation, budget, timing, national involvement and alignment).
- The presentation of the evaluation process and findings are complete and well structured to provide ease in accessing information needed for decision-making and for assessing how justified conclusions are based on the linkages among the parts of the report.
- The recommendations are clear and actionable.
- Information on expected plans for follow-through with the evaluation by key stakeholders is provided.

Credibility: An evaluation report is credible when there is professional rigor for objectivity, validity and reliability of the procedures and instruments used.

- Evaluators are competent professionals and valid in the eyes of the users/stakeholders.
- There is accuracy and validity (programme content and contextual factors, instruments, information coverage/sampling, external validity or linkage with other development findings).
- There is reliability or consistency in the information provided.

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

- The bases for making judgements are transparent and based on negotiated agreements.

Relevance, appropriateness and added-value: A report is relevant, appropriate and adds value when information provided addresses priority or strategic information needs, is not duplicative, and is appropriate given institutional goals. The conduct of evaluation is aligned with national systems.

- The purpose and incentives for use are clear.
- There is alignment with national and government demands, harmonization and coherence within UN and organizational lens: human development and human rights.
- Addresses organizational mandate and the Strategic Plan priorities.
- Advances knowledge or priorities for development (equity, capacity, cooperation and others).

The following provides for each criterion, performance indicators which would provide the basis for assessing report quality in an objective and reliable manner.

1. Utility – Enhancing use and impact of information provided

1.1 The title page and opening pages provide key basic contextual information

- Title of the evaluation that includes a clear reference to the project / programme being evaluated.
- Links to the **evaluation plan** (with information on strategic value, national involvement and alignment, timing, resources and financing).
- Links to UNDAF outcomes and the Strategic Plan priorities.
- Geographical coverage of the evaluation.
- Name and organization of the evaluators and information in annex for assessment of competence and trustworthiness.
- Name of the commissioning organization (e.g. UNDP country office X).
- Date when the evaluation report is completed.
- Expected actions from the evaluation and dates for action.
- Dates for stakeholder meetings and status of meetings.
- Name of UNDP contact point for the evaluation (e.g. evaluation task manager).

1.2 For a joint evaluation or for the evaluation of a joint programme, the roles and contributions of the different UN organizations or other partners, are clearly described. The report should describe who is involved, their roles and their contributions to the subject being evaluated, including:

- Financial and in-kind contributions such as technical assistance, training and logistic support.
- Participation and staff time.
- Leadership, advocacy and lobbying.

1.3 For a country-led joint evaluation, the framework for the leadership, governance, conduct, use and capacity development are clearly described, and norms and standards for the evaluation are delineated if necessary.

1.4 The information in the report is complete, well structured and well presented. The report should provide information on:

- The purpose of the evaluation.
- Exactly what was evaluated.
- How the evaluation was designed and conducted.
- What evidence was used in the evaluation.
- What conclusions were drawn.
- What recommendations were made.
- What lessons were distilled.

1.5 The report should be clear and easy to read with complementary graphics to enhance understanding:

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

- The report should apply a plain, non-specialist language.
- Graphics, tables and illustrations should be used, when applicable, to enhance the presentation of information.
- The report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
- In the case of an outcome evaluation, the related projects should be listed in the annex, including timelines, implementation arrangements and budgets.

1.6 The executive summary of the report should be brief (maximum 2-3 pages) and contains key information needed by decision-makers. It should contain:

-
- Brief description of the programme.
 - Evaluation purpose, questions and scope of evaluation.
 - Key findings.
 - Conclusions.
 - Key recommendations.

The executive summary should not include information that is not mentioned and substantiated in the main report.

1.7 The recommendations are relevant and realistic, with clear priorities for action.

-
- Recommendations should emerge logically from the evaluation's findings and conclusions.
 - Recommendations should be relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and decisions to be made based on the evaluation.
 - Recommendation should be formulated in a clear and concise manner and be prioritized to the extent possible.

2. *Credibility - accuracy, reliability, and objectivity*

2.1. The subject or programme being evaluated is clearly and accurately described.

-
- *The goals and objectives of the programme/project/subject are clearly described and the performance indicators presented.*
 - *The conceptual linkages or logic theory among programme/project strategy, the outputs and the outcomes should be described, explaining their relation to national priorities and goals.*
 - *The context in which the programme/project existed is described so its likely influences in the program can be identified.*
 - *The level of implementation of the programme/project and major divergences between the original implementation plan or approach should be described and explained.*
 - *The recipient /intended beneficiaries, the stake holders, the cost and the financing of the programmes/projects should be described.*

2.2. The report provides a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation.

-
- The objectives, scope and coverage of the evaluation should be explicit and its limitations should also be acknowledged.
 - The original evaluation questions from the TORs should be made explicit as well as those that were added subsequently or during the evaluation and their rationale provided.
 - The results of an evaluability assessment are noted for its effects on defining the scope of the evaluation. Evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process*⁵.

2.3. The methodology is fully described for its role in ensuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation.

⁵ Norms for Evaluation for the United Nations System, para 7.2.

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

Any description of the methodology should include the following in addressing the questions of the evaluation:

- The universe of data needed to answer the questions and the sources of this data.
- The sampling procedure applied to ensure representativeness in collecting information from these sources (area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sampling).
- Procedures applied (including triangulation) to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected.
- Bases for making judgements and interpretation of the findings including performance indicators or levels of statistical significance as warranted by available data.
- Description of procedures for quantitative and qualitative analyses.
- Innovations in methodological approach and added value to development evaluation.
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
- How a human development and human rights perspective provided a lens for the evaluation and influenced the scope of the evaluation.

2.4. *The findings of the evaluation address the following in response to the key questions of the evaluation.*

- Cost efficiency and relevance.
- UNDP partnership strategy and the extent to which it contributed to greater effectiveness.
- External factors influencing progress towards the outcome.
- UNDP contribution to capacity development and institutional strengthening.

2.5 *Conclusions are firmly based on evidence and analysis.*

- **Conclusions are the judgement made by the evaluators. They should not repeat the findings but address the key issues that can be abstracted from them.**
- Conclusions are made based on an agreed basis for making judgments of value or worth relative to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability.
- Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the subject being evaluated, determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.

2.5. **Annexes are complete and relevant.**

-
- The original Terms of Reference for the evaluation.
 - Details on the programme and its context in development.
 - Details of data and analyses.
 - Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, and surveys).
 - Evaluation plan.

Relevance and Added Value

3.1. *The purpose and context of the evaluation are described.*

- The reason(s) why the evaluation is being conducted should be explicitly stated.
- The justification for conducting the evaluation at this point in time should be summarised.
- Who requires the evaluative information should be made clear.
- The description of context should provide an understanding of the geographic, socioeconomic, political and cultural settings in which the evaluation took place.

3.2. **The report includes an assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender, in particular, and human rights considerations are incorporated in the project or programme.**

The evaluation report should include a description of, *inter alia*:

Terms of Reference for Crisis Management and Recovery Programme

Final Evaluation

- How a human development and human rights perspective was adopted in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
- How issues of equity, marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups were addressed in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
- How the evaluation used the human development and human rights lens in its defining the scope of the evaluation and in the methodology used.

3.3 The report presents information on its relationship with other associated evaluations and indicates its added value to already existing information.

Procedures and Accountabilities:

The primary responsibility for preparing the evaluation report rests with the evaluation consultant or the leader of the evaluation team (if a team is established). Those who commission the evaluation and those who are actually evaluated can also contribute with their inputs. Particularly, key stakeholders should be involved in reviewing the draft report to check if there are any relevant factual errors or omissions, and to highlight any interpretation of the findings that they consider as incorrect. The evaluators should accept changes related to factual errors, but in safeguarding the principle of independence, they should be free to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

To ensure compliance with the criteria noted, a quality assurance and enhancement system at country level (e.g. a panel comprised of members of the outcome/project board and Programme Manager or designate) should be established and made operational. Where appropriate, a panel of evaluation experts can be established to play an advisory role with a view to enhancing the overall quality of the report.