

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Capacity Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa Phase IV (HAWA IV)

Description:	Evaluation Expert for the Project Capacity Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa Phase IV (HAWA IV)
Duty Station:	Home-based with travel to Vienna, Austria and Accra, Ghana, a country of Multiplier Activities (optional)
Language:	English and French (proficiency in German is an asset)
Contract type:	Consultancy Services (“Werkvertrag” based on Austrian law)
Workdays:	Up to 30
Starting date:	6 th March 2024
Submission of Inception report	27 th March 2024
Deadline for Draft Report:	3 rd June 2024
Deadline for Submission of Final Report (end of Contract)	28 th June 2024
Send to:	hawa@ac4p.at with subject line: Evaluation of Phase IV (HAWA IV) project

Introduction

This document sets out the context, purpose, scope, and other modalities of a final evaluation of the Project “Capacity Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa”, funded by the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) and implemented by the Austrian Centre for Peace (ACP) in cooperation with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Accra, Ghana.

We invite evaluation experts to submit an offer based on the instructions as they appear in this Terms of Reference. Please note that the Terms of Reference form an integral part of the consultant’s contract and may be subject to change until the contract is signed.

Context & Background

Title of the Project:	Capacity Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa (Phase IV)
Contractor:	Austrian Centre for Peace (ACP)
Main Implementing Partner:	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KA IPTC)
Total Duration:	2 years and 6 months (01.01.2022 – 30.06.2024)
Total Budget:	EUR 1,235,000.00
Funded by:	Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) (90%)
Supported by:	Austrian Ministry of Defence

The project “Capacity Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa” – **Phase IV (HAWA IV)** aims at strengthening effective humanitarian crisis response in the **Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) region**. The goal of the project is to strengthen capacities for effective humanitarian crisis response in the ECOWAS through research grounded gender responsive individual competency development for professionals from civil protection authorities, security forces, and NGOs; informed by the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus approach, and to promote networking structures to enhance policy development, deployment capacities, (local) preparedness, and peace. The Outcome (OC) and Outputs (OP1-OP3) of the project are as stated below:

- OC: Improved cooperation and coordination for crisis response between humanitarian actors from state authorities, NGOs, military, and police; striving for equal opportunities and the meaningful participation of women and men.
- OP1: Increased individual competencies for gender responsive Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa among key actors from state authorities, NGOs, military, and police.
- OP2: Effective preparedness, and humanitarian crisis response in target countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal) is enhanced, i.a. through support to local 3C processes.
- OP3: Recommendations for (the development of) career advancement strategies for female West African Humanitarian Workers, based on valid data are considered by relevant stakeholders.

The project is being implemented in the form of training, known as the Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa Courses (HAWA Courses), i.e. **HAWA Core Course, Training of Trainers (ToT) and Women Empowerment Workshop**, which are oriented towards the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (ECPF) and plans of action, the ECOWAS Humanitarian Policy (2012) and the ECOWAS Disaster Risk Reduction Gender Strategy and Action Plan 2020-2030, the Women, Peace and Security Agenda. Additionally, **Multiplier Modules Workshops** are implemented in target countries. The aim of the Multiplier Module (MM) is to enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance in Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Nigeria. Multiplier activities are hosted by a local organization. Civilian, police and mid-career military professionals who graduated from the HAWA Core Course and ToT are encouraged to participate in these events (e.g. workshops, trainings) bringing together national professional humanitarians and other relevant stakeholders under the humanitarian-development-peace nexus (HDP) approach. The project dovetails into the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework as well as the Austrian Development Cooperation Act and the Three-Year Programme of the Austrian Development Policy among others. All courses developed and delivered under the project are jointly organized by the **Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC)** and the **Austrian Centre for Peace (ACP)**, supported by the **Austrian Development Agency (ADA)** and the **Austrian Ministry of Defence (MOD)**. The **financial support (90%)** for the whole project is provided by the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC).

The current phase of the project builds on previous phases, thus the pilot phase (2690-00/2013), finalized in January 2016, the phase II (2690-00/2016), which ended in December 2018 and the phase III (2690/01-2018) which started on the March 15, 2019, and ended in December 2021. The current phase (phase IV) started in January 2022 and expected to end in June 2023. The current phase (IV) proceeded an evaluation of the phase III which established the need for the Multiplier modules in the project. The evaluation also established the need to improve on coordination in the humanitarian sector and to develop a practical approach to address gendered capacity development gaps which were very pivotal in the current phase of the project.

Further information on the project and the partner organisation is available at www.ac4p.at and <http://kaiptc.org/>.

Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The **purpose** of the evaluation is to use evidence-based approach and consultative reflection on the progress of implementation of the phase IV of the HAWA project to enable the implementing partners learn and improve subsequently. Three specific focus of the evaluation are:

- Provide key learnings to the partners regarding the implementation of the Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa Project, focusing on what works, what does not, weaknesses and strengths, and the factors behind performance;
- Assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and the potential for sustainability of the outcome / outputs of the project as well as crosscutting themes such as gender, social inclusion, and climate & environmental protection;
- Provide recommendations on the design, interconnection/linkages between results areas, interventions, and processes with a view to improve performance for the next phase of implementation of the project. Eventually, lessons learned that will be identified from this evaluation will be used to develop future projects and programmes in the respective field.

The target group and direct beneficiaries includes civilians (humanitarian workers, advocates, policymakers, researchers, regional bodies representatives ECOWAS), police and military affiliated professionals, with due attention to a balanced geographical, ethnical, gender and professional distribution¹.

The evaluator will share key findings, conclusions and related recommendations on strategies and modifications which should ultimately also feed into a possible new project phase. The evaluation's primary audience are the project key partners ACP, ADA, and the Austrian MoD. Additionally, lessons learnt, and best practices can provide a reference and be valuable for other organizations (e.g. the implementing partner KAIPTC, national host organisations for Multiplier Modules Workshops) that engage in capacity-building activities and training for peacekeeping and peacebuilding personnel.

Scope

According to the ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluation (2020: 11) this evaluation is a **partner-led evaluation**, managed by ACP and conducted by (an) external, independent evaluator(s). The project and evaluation results will be disseminated among stakeholders at the strategic level.

The evaluator will conduct the evaluation in accordance with the Terms of Reference. Documents will be reviewed as well as collect primary data from key project participants. The data collection and interviews will be conducted in **(1) Vienna, Austria and (2) in Accra, Ghana**. Data collection in a **country of Multiplier Activities is recommended** but optional. Stakeholders in other locations will be contacted by email or phone.

The evaluation will cover activities that have taken place **since the beginning of the current project phase (1 January 2022) until the time of the evaluation (February 2023)**. For the purpose of this evaluation, the key questions identified by the stakeholders are based upon the OECD DAC evaluation criteria as stated below in the evaluation questions.

¹ Annex 8: HAWA Summary 2015-2023

Design & Approach

The approach shall include (but will not be limited to): Review of documents and analyses of appropriate data; interviews with the key project stakeholders and partners in Austria, Ghana and the Project target countries using both in person and online where appropriate. The ADC principles such as human rights-based approach, the cross-cutting issues (gender, environment and social standards) and conflict sensitive approach must be applied in the evaluation.

The tools to adopt will be semi-structured and structured interview guides. The analyses and reporting shall focus on measuring the change which has occurred and has considerably impacted on the direct beneficiaries of the project. ACP suggests that data collection shall mainly focus on a qualitative approach, such as stakeholder interviews, significant testimonies of impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries, focus group discussions, and document/reports review. Furthermore, all data collected must be disaggregated. The evaluator shall propose an outline of methodology as part of their offer, and a detailed methodology as part of the Evaluation Inception Report.

Evaluation Questions

The Evaluator should propose a final set of evaluation questions together with relevant indicators in the inception report, as well as any relevant data collection sources and methods. The design of an evaluation matrix is strongly recommended². Such document shall clearly indicate the data collection process against each evaluation question and how triangulation between different data sources and methods will be performed. The evaluation questions become binding once the inception report is finally approved.

Relevance:

1. To what extent do the capacity development activities address the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and actors in humanitarian assistance in the context of West African countries, the ECOWAS and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)?
2. How well has the project been adjusted in response to the local challenges also concerning the Humanitarian Sector, such as extreme weather hazards or increasing poverty?
3. Is the Core Course content equitably targeted to the practical requirements of different groups of participants (I-NGOs, military, police, governmental actors, civil society) and to gender specific (training) needs?

² Ref. [Evaluation Matrix Template10 KB | XLSX](#)

4. Similarly, are the curricula of the HAWA-WPS other courses (e.g. the combined session Training of Trainers / Women Empowerment Workshop, and the Specialization course on gender climate action in humanitarian assistance) equitably targeted to the practical requirements of different groups of participants (I-NGOs, military, police, governmental actors, civil society) and to gender specific (training) needs?
5. Are the contents of the Multiplier Activities equitably targeted to the practical requirements of different groups of participants (I-NGOs, military, police, whole actors) and to gender specific (training) needs?
6. Is the project approach still relevant after four different phases of implementation and changing context and increasing security challenges in the West African region?

Coherence:

7. How are the project objectives aligned to the ECOWAS and African Union Peace and security frameworks?
8. Are the project's objectives sufficiently aligned with the Austrian Development Cooperation's Regional Strategy for Sub-Sahara Africa³
9. To what extent are the project goal, outcome, and expected outputs articulated in a coherent way? What are the lessons learnt and best practices regarding design, implementation, and management of the project?
10. To what extent is the project complementary to other capacity building (training) offers in the peace and security, development, and humanitarian sector in West Africa? Are there synergies? Was there any evidence of duplication of effort among partners?
11. Are the contents of the Multiplier Activities reinforcing coordination of local stakeholders and humanitarian actors at the local level?

Effectiveness:

12. Are there unintended positive and/or negative effects/impacts which can be possibly attributed to the project/programme?
13. Has the project been implemented in a gender-sensitive manner? Is the course content gender responsive? Have measures for women's empowerment been undertaken? Which approaches towards the adoption of a gender sensitive approach have been applied and how effective are they?

3

https://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Publikationen/Landesstrategien/EN_Regional_Strategy_in_Sub-Saharan_Africa_2020-2030.pdf

14. Has the ACP-KAIPTC cooperation developed/changed over the four phases of project implementation and if so, how (in terms of information flow, ownership, involvement in decision-making etc.)?
15. How effective have ACP and its partners (e.g. KAIPTC, UN OCHA, UN WOMEN, IOM and local partners for the implementation of the Multiplier Modules Workshops) been in designing and implementing this project?
16. Does the Austrian WOGA⁴ have any effect on the implementation of the project, and if so, how and to what extent?

Sustainability:

17. Are there indications of ownership and possible continuation to sustain the outcomes of the project by key partners like KAIPTC and other humanitarian organizations in West Africa?

During the inception phase, these questions can be jointly refined and restructured.

Workplan and Deliverables

The evaluator shall deliver the following reports in line with the requirements of the ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations (2020) within the timeframe set out below.

- Evaluation Inception Report including an Evaluation Matrix (template see annex 5) (15-20 pages without annexes). The Report shall mainly focus on the description of the methodology to be applied rather than focusing on the description of the context of the project.

The inception report should be structured as follows:

1. Background (incl. stakeholder mapping), Purpose and Objectives
2. Evaluation Design and Approach
 - 2.1. Methodology and Methods
 - 2.2. Evaluation Matrix
 - 2.3. Data Collection Instruments
 - 2.4. Data Analysis
 - 2.5. Limitations, Risks and Mitigation Measures
3. Quality Assurance and Ethical Considerations
4. Work plan
5. Annexes
6. Included Quality Checklist of Inception Report in ADA Guidelines of Programme and Project Evaluations

⁴ [EN_WGA_Synthesis_Report.pdf \(entwicklung.at\)](#)



- The **Results Assessment Form** (RAF, ADA Results-Assessment Form (RAF) for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations⁵) captures the degree of results achievement on different levels and must be submitted in Excel format and in compliance with the ADA Guidelines of Programme and Project Evaluations⁶).
- Final Evaluation Report (45-60 pages without annexes) including ADA Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews.
 1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction
 3. Background and Context Analysis
 4. Evaluation Design and Approach
 - 4.1. Methodological Approach
 - 4.2. Data Collection and Analysis Tools
 - 4.3. Limitations, Risks and Mitigations Measures
 5. Findings
 6. Conclusions
 7. Recommendations⁷
 8. Annexes
 9. Quality Checklist of Evaluation Report in ADA Guidelines of Programme and Project Evaluations

The executive summary shall be presented as a stand-alone document which reproduces the structure of the evaluation report. Therefore, it should not contain any new information. ACP recommends that emphasis be placed on presenting the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary shall not exceed 5 pages and may be published on the ADA website.

All Reports must meet the Quality Assurance standards as per the ADA guidelines on Programme and Project Evaluation⁸.

The evaluator shall submit the deliverables in English, making them reader-friendly by including tables, boxes and graphs where appropriate. The recommendations based on the evaluation shall be concrete, specific and addressed to clearly identified recipients. All reports

⁵ Results Assessment Form (RAF) Template15 KB | XLSX

⁶

https://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/Guidelines_for_Programme_and_Project_Evaluations_ADA_2020.pdf

⁷ These shall include forward looking insights and lessons learnt and possibly answer to questions such as : In case of a possible follow-on project (project phase V), are there any specific recommendations for the ACP to focus on?

What lessons are there for improvement in similar interventions in the future?

shall be produced using Calibri or Times New Roman (letter size 11 and 12 respectively), single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

Tentative schedule of evaluation activities⁹:

Date	Phase	Responsible person
19 th of February	Deadline of Application	
	Interviews and Selection process on a rolling basis	
4 th of March	Selection of evaluator, announcement of contract award	ACP
6 th of March	Signature of Contract for Evaluation Services and Kick off Meeting	ACP
	Inception & Desk Phase	
	Desk study: Inception phase (review of documents, preparation of Data Collection and Drafting)	Evaluator
27 th of March	Deadline submission Inception Report	Evaluator
12 th of April	Feedback of ACP & ADA on Inception Report	ACP/ADA
	Field phase	
Between mid April and 19 th of May	Travel to Accra: Stakeholder meetings & Data collection	Evaluator
Between mid April and 19 th of May	Optional travel to 1 Country of Multiplier Activities : Stakeholder Meetings: Data Collection	Evaluator
Between mid April and 19 th May	Data collection and interviews in Austria (e.g. at ACP, ADA, MoD), online and offline, and initial analysis	Evaluator
	Review, Preparation of Data and Drafting of Report	
3 rd of June	Deadline submission of Draft Evaluation Report and ADA Results-Assessment Form (RAF) to ACP for feedback and quality assurance	Evaluator
17 st of June	ACP provide (preliminary) feedback to the evaluator	ACP
	Synthesis phase	
28 th of June	Evaluator sends back final version of the report with incorporated feedback of ACP, Final Draft validated by ACP	Evaluator
Subsequently	Dissemination of final evaluation report	ACP and ADA

⁹ An updated and detailed schedule of evaluation activities will be part of the inception report.

The total number of working days is estimated to be 35 days in the period from 6th of March until 28th of June 2024.

Requirements for Experience and Qualifications of the Evaluation Consultant

Academic Qualifications

Advanced university degree in a relevant field (social sciences, e.g. sociology, political science, international relations, legal studies, public policy, international development) field, PhD an advantage.

Experience

- At least 7 years of demonstrated experience in evaluation of international development projects and programmes.
- Conducted at least three evaluations in the last five years, ideally in the relevant field.
- Experience with projects focusing on (1) training and/or capacity development in Humanitarian Assistance and on (2) peace and security, in particular civil-military cooperation and humanitarian and/or development settings.
- Experience in/with Africa, preferably West Africa/ECOWAS region.
- Strong knowledge of feminist and gender theory and practice as well as conflict sensitive approaches.
- Substantial experience in project cycle management.
- Familiarity with donor funded projects, preferably with ADA.
- Demonstrated experience in social science methods and in applied research with data collection, analytical skills and demonstrated ability to structure information.
- Sound MS Office and IT skills.

Competencies

- Excellent interpersonal, communication and interview skills and cultural sensitivity.
- Proficiency in English & French. Ability to review information in German is an asset (Documents to be included when submitting the Technical and Financial Offer)

Specification for the Submission of Offers

Financial Offer

The financial offer shall be based on the indicative schedule as set out in the Terms of Reference and consist of a breakdown of costs in Euro, in this format:

Days	Activities
------	------------

Total in EUR	

The evaluator undertakes to observe any applicable law and to comply with his/her fiscal obligations in conformity with the legislation of the supplier's country of fiscal residence. The evaluator will be responsible for covering costs of needed office space, administrative support, telecommunications, printing of documentation and implementation of data collection instruments. The Austrian Centre for Peace will facilitate the evaluation to the extent possible, by providing logistical support, contact information, documentation for desk review, reviewing draft report and providing feedback to the evaluators.

Payment Conditions

In return for the provision of services, and subject to their acceptance by the ACP, the consultant will receive a remuneration in accordance with their offer.

This sum shall be paid in two installments, based on an invoice from the evaluator, as follows:

- 40% upon submission of the Evaluation Inception Report.
- 60% upon approval of the Final Evaluation Report.

The lump sum will include the consultant's remuneration, applicable taxes and all other expenses. The consultant shall undertake all necessary measures to arrange for health and social insurance during the entire period of the performance of work under the contract. The consultant acknowledges and accepts in this regard that the ACP shall not assume any responsibility for any health and social risks concerning illness, maternity or accident, which might occur during the performance of work under the contract.

Evaluation and Selection of Technical and Financial Offer

The ACP applies a fair and transparent selection process that considers both the technical qualification of potential consultants, as well as the financial offers submitted as part of the applications. The selection criteria weight as follows:

- Technical Evaluation – documents based (40%)

- Technical evaluation – interview based (40%), only for shortlisted candidates.
- Financial Evaluation (20%)

The ACP will only contact shortlisted candidates and may ask them for an interview.

Application Documents

Please include the following documents/information when submitting the Technical and Financial Offer:

1. Cover letter (max 1 page) stating your interest, key qualifications and experience.
2. Curriculum Vitae (no longer than 4 pages)
3. Technical offer: a three pages concept describing the approach and suggested methodology and workplan for answering the evaluation questions and conducting the evaluation; including the number of estimated working days for the evaluation and team member. This component will constitute 70% of the assessment rating.
4. Financial offer: Proposed budget of all-inclusive fee, including separate lines for the Consultancy fee and travel costs (e.g travel, data collection assistance, printing, etc.), as deemed necessary for the assignment. The financial component will constitute 30% of the assessment rating.
5. At least three references who can comment on your evaluation and other relevant experience and qualifications (please include full contact details with email and phone)
6. Overview of relevant evaluation related work (a brief description of previous assignments carried out in the subject areas covered by the contract, indicating the type of evaluation, summary of activities undertaken, date and recipient of the evaluation, date, client)
7. Up to three recent evaluation report/s on a related topic and/or region.

Please attach the documents listed above under points 1. to 6. as one MS Word or PDF document to the email. Please attach electronic copies of sample evaluation reports to your email.

Please send the complete package of documents to Ms. Fatou Ndour:

hawa@ac4p.at with subject line: Evaluation Phase IV (HAWA IV)

Selected candidates will be asked to submit a signed copy of Code of Conduct and Declaration of honour (as in Annex to TOR).

Evaluation Management Arrangements

The evaluation will be managed and monitored by Ms Fatou Ndour, HAWA Project Manager and supervised by Ms Monika Psenner, line manager Capacity Development of the ACP. Ms Fatou Ndour also acts as the primary point of contact for the evaluator.

At the beginning of the assignment, ACP will provide the Evaluator with an evaluation dossier containing the relevant documents. Additional documents may be requested by the evaluator as appropriate. The evaluator will be provided with background documents on the Austrian development cooperation and foreign policy, and information about KA IPTC and ACP and all relevant documents of the project. In particular, the Project Document, Budget plan (original and revised), Logframe Matrix, Performance Monitoring Framework, operational planning, Project Progress reports, Project Deliverables, OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria for the HAWA Project, Multiplier Module Reports, Evaluation Report of Phase III.

Any travel arrangements shall be made by the evaluator following prior approval with ACP. Travel costs shall be reimbursed based on invoices (economy class). The ACP will provide support in organizing accommodation in Accra, Ghana and Vienna, Austria for the time of the field mission, and scheduling of interviews with stakeholders in Accra and Vienna.

Annexes

1. Evaluation Policy of the Austrian Development Cooperation, please see: [Evaluationpolicy.pdf \(entwicklung.at\)](#)
2. ADA Evaluation Guidelines, please see: [Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations ADA 2020.pdf \(entwicklung.at\)](#)
3. Quality Checklist for Inception Report (see Annex 5 of ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations)
4. Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report (see Annex 6 of ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations)
5. Results and Assessment Form, to be used in the Evaluation Report: [Annex9 Results AssessmentForm Template.xlsx \(live.com\)](#)
6. Declaration of honour
7. Code of conduct for evaluators
- 8.
9. HAWA Summary 2015-2023

Annex 1: Quality Assurance Checklist – Inception Report (IR)

This checklist serves as guidance for evaluator(s) when structuring the IR, to ensure that it meets ADA requirements. Please use the following structure and include the aspects listed:

1. Evaluation Background, Purpose & Objectives	
	The intervention logic of the programme or project being evaluated is depicted.
	The purpose, objective(s) and scope of the evaluation are stated and in line with the ToR
	The primary users and the intended use of the evaluation are stated.
	The most important background & contextual information is included.
2. Evaluation Questions	
	The IR includes a comprehensive and tailored set of evaluation questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria.
3. Evaluation Design and Approach	
3.1 Methodology and Methods	
	The methodological approach put forward in the IR is suitable to obtain reliable findings in line with the evaluation purpose, objective(s) and questions as per ToR.
	The stated objectives are realistic and achievable given the information that can be collected in the context of the evaluation.
	Criteria and reference frameworks that evaluative judgements will be based upon are stated.
	Means for quality assurance and triangulation are outlined.
	Reference is made to how the selected methodology and methods will enable the application of ADA's basic principles and cross-cutting issues as well as the human rights-based approach and other approaches, such as the conflict-sensitive approach, as relevant.
3.2. Evaluation Matrix	
	The choice of indicators, sources and methods used to answer the evaluation questions, and the triangulation thereof, is presented and mapped against each evaluation question (see ANNEX for Evaluation Matrix Template).
3.3. Data Collection Instruments	
	Data collection instruments to be applied during the evaluation are outlined
	The sequencing of data collection instruments is outlined and follows a logic
	Relevant interview partners are identified, and approximate numbers indicated.
	Key documents to be consulted are identified and approximate numbers indicated.



	Reasonable sampling strategies are developed for each data collection instrument.	
	Tools (e.g. interview topic guides, questionnaires) are elaborated and annexed	
3.4. Data Analysis		
	Data processing and interpretation are described.	
	The data analysis plan and methods is comprehensive and clearly presented.	
3.5. Limitations, Risks and Mitigation Measure		
	All foreseeable limitations of the evaluation and the proposed methodology are highlighted and their implications on the evaluation are outlined.	
	Appropriate measures to mitigate the risks are proposed.	
4. Quality Assurance and Ethical Considerations		
	Means to ensure upholding of Standards and Principles for Good Evaluations ⁸⁴ are specified.	
	ADA's basic principles, it's human rights approach and commitment to cross-cutting issues are adequately reflected in evaluation design and approach, including the evaluation questions and data collection tools.	
	Potential harms for participants of the evaluation and for evaluator(s) are identified and mitigation measures identified.	
	Approaches used to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of sourced are outlined.	
5. Workplan		
	Timelines and deliverables throughout the evaluation process are presented in a workplan	
	Any changes or adaptations from the ToR agreed upon during inception are made explicit.	
	The work plan states the outputs that will be delivered by the evaluator/evaluation team, including information on the degree to which the evaluation report will be accessible to stakeholders (incl. the public).	
	The work plan describes the key stages of the evaluation process and the project timeline.	
	The work plan establishes clear roles and responsibilities for evaluator/evaluation team members, the managing organization and others.	
	The work plan describes the evaluation quality assurance process.	
	The work plan describes the process, if applicable, for obtaining and incorporating comments on a draft evaluation report.	
	The work plan includes an evaluation project budget.	
6. Annexes		
	Data collection instruments, such as (semi-)structured interview guides, questionnaires	



**Austrian
Centre for Peace**
SCHLAINING · VIENNA

With funding from

 **Austrian
Development
Cooperation**



KAIPTC
...where peace begins

	Comprehensive list of documents relevant for the evaluation.	
	Comprehensive list of stakeholders	

Annex 2: Quality Assurance Checklist – Final Report

The evaluation report should be structured as follows:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Background and Context Analysis
4. Evaluation Design and Approach
 - 4.1. Methodological Approach
 - 4.2. Data Collection and Analysis Tools
 - 4.3. Limitations, Risks and Mitigations Measures
5. Findings
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Annexes

The report uses gender sensitive and appropriate language and terms throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.

Title Page and opening pages	
	Provide key basic information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Name of the evaluation object; - Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; - Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object; - Names and/or organizations of evaluator/s; - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation; - Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes; - List of acronyms
1. Executive Summary	
	max. 10 pages that includes
	Overview of the evaluation object
	Includes the chapters 2-7 outlined above. Overview of Evaluation methodology
2. Introduction	
	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.
	The objective(s) of the evaluation is stated.
	The scope of the evaluation is delineated
	Reference is made to the quality standards and criteria as well as to the cross-cutting issues.
3. Background and Context Analysis	



	The context of key social, political, economic, demographic and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the programme or project being evaluated is described	
	The scale and complexity of the programme or project being evaluated are presented, including its components, geographic boundaries, purpose, management and budget (from all sources)	
	The key stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of the programme or project are mentioned, including implementing and other development partners, as well as their roles.	
	The logic model, theory of change and/or expected results at different levels are described.	
	The implementation status of the programme or project, including its phase and any significant changes that have occurred over time and their implications for the evaluation are explained.	
4. Evaluation Design and Approach		
9.1. Methodological Approach		
	The methodological approach, including literature references, is described and justified.	
	A description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation, is included.	
	The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.	
	An assessment of the design, implementation and monitoring of the programme/project being evaluated with a view to sound gender and human rights analysis as well as actual results on gender, environmental sustainability, human rights and other fundamental principles of development cooperation through which cross-cutting issues are implemented is included.	
	A description of how the approach chosen reflects the basic principles underlying ADA’s work as well as the human rights-based approach and the commitment to cross-cutting issues.	
9.2. Data Collection and Analysis Tools		
	Data collection methods are described and the rationale behind their choice outlined.	
	The sampling frame – areas and populations to be represented, selection criteria and mechanics, sample size and limitations – is described and relevant choices justified.	

	A description of how data collection methods and related process employed reflects the basic ADA's principles and commitments to human rights and cross-cutting issues.	
	Measures taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of findings (e.g. interview protocols, survey design, observation tools) are described	
	A description of what type of (source, method, data, theory) triangulation was employed	
9.3. Risks, Limitations and Mitigations Measures		
	Risk and limitations faced during the implementation of the evaluation are outlined, along with strategies employed to mitigate these.	
	Gaps and limitations in the evidence and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
5. Findings		
	Relevance to evaluation criteria and questions is ensured.	
	Triangulation is done and documented in relation to each finding to ensure credibility.	
	Findings are numbered and presented with clarity, logic and coherence	
	ADA principles and commitments with regards to human rights and cross-cutting issues are integrated in the findings	
	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.	
	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence (use of graphs, tables etc.)	
6. Conclusion		
	Reasonable evaluative judgements based on the findings and substantiated by the evidence presented is given and traceable.	
	Logical connection to one or more evaluation findings is documented.	
	Insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation and the knowledge interest of evaluation users is given.	
	Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the project, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of the stakeholders.	
	ADA's basic principles, commitment to cross-cutting issues, the human rights-based approach and other approaches, such as the conflict sensitive approach, as relevant, are reflected in their formulation.	
7. Recommendations		
	The target group for each recommendation is identified.	



	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.	
	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.	
	Recommendations are supplemented with suggested modalities of implementation and opportunities for improvement.	
	Firm basis on evidence and conclusions is traceable.	
	Relevance to the object and purpose of the evaluation is given.	
	Language is concise and clear, content is actionable and reflective of an understanding of the commissioning organisation and key intended users and potential constraints as to follow-up	
	Number is reasonable to allow for a manageable management respons	
	Aspects related to equality and human rights aspects are adequately reflected.	
8. Annexes		
	Results Assessment Form (see ADA template)	
	Presentation of evidence along assessment grid per evaluation question	
	Instruments for data collection	
	List of interview partners (anonymised)	
	Evaluation ToR	
	Bibliography & List of documents consulted	
	Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition	

Annex 3: Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interest

Final Evaluation of Project: Capacity-Building for Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa

The undersigned (name of the signatory of this form)

- in his/her own name (*if the economic operator is a natural person or in case of own declaration of a director or person with powers of representation, decision making or control over the economic operator*)

or

- representing (*if the economic operator is a legal person*)

official name in full (*only for legal person*):

official legal form (*only for legal person*):

official address in full: 5

VAT registration number:

declares that the company or organisation that he/she represents:

- a) is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not entered into an arrangement with creditors, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, and is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- b) has not been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of *res judicata*;
- c) has not been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authorities can justify;
- d) has fulfilled all its obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions and the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established, with those of the country of the contracting authority and those of the country where the contract is to be carried out;
- e) has not been the subject of a judgement which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity;
- f) is not a subject of the administrative penalty for being guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by the contracting authority as a condition of participation in the procurement procedure or failing to supply information, or being declared to be in serious breach of his obligation under contract covered by the budget.

In addition, the undersigned declares on his/her honour:

- g) that he/she has no conflict of interest in connection with the contract. A conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest;
- h) that he/she will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest;



**Austrian
Centre for Peace**
SCHLAINING · VIENNA

With funding from



**Austrian
Development
Cooperation**



KAIPTC
...where peace begins

i) that the information provided to the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution within the context of this invitation to tender is accurate, sincere and complete.

Date

Place

Full Name

Signature

Annex 4: Code of Conduct for Evaluations managed by the Austrian Centre for Peaceⁱ

To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the ACP, evaluation consultants working for the ACP are required to commit themselves in writing to the following obligations:

- **Independence:** Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.
- **Conflict of Interest:** Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).
- **Honesty and Integrity:** Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.
- **Competence:** Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.
- **Accountability:** Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost-effective manner.
- **Obligations to participants:** Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.
- **Confidentiality:** Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.



**Austrian
Centre for Peace**
SCHLAINING · VIENNA

With funding from

 **Austrian
Development
Cooperation**



KAIPTC
...where peace begins

- **Avoidance of Harm:** Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.
- **Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability:** Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are able to assess them.
- **Transparency:** Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.
- **Omissions and wrongdoing:** Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the ASRPR Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Date:

Place:

Name:

Signature:

ⁱ Based on UNEG Code of Conduct.