

## HOPE'87 POLICY OF EVALUATION

Currently, the overall understanding on 'how M&E should be done' is changing in development cooperation:

### 1. From emphasis on evaluation towards emphasis on monitoring

Much effort has been given to introduce a routine of project evaluation once in every two to five years. However, the recent years have witnessed increasing importance to continuous monitoring. This is done more frequently than the evaluations. But then, these efforts are, invariably, restricted to few aspects of the programme. And in this, the search is always on for the most important issues to be monitored; and about how this could be done from a participatory framework and with better efficiency.

### 2. From monitoring of outputs towards monitoring of outcomes and impacts

Monitoring of outputs is nothing new. This has been in vogue for long and is done to evaluate the performance of an organization. However, it is imperative for us to ask: in what way is this beneficial for the target group? What are the outcomes, the results, and the impacts? This has often been neglected as it is more difficult to find out. Yet, it is more important, as the benefit points to the purpose of the project.

### 3. From monitoring for accountability towards monitoring for management purposes

Up to now, many donors request monitoring information for the accountability of the funded project. Increasingly we discover that the continuous information on the outcomes and impacts of the project interventions is crucial for project steering. It allows making the fine-tuning of project activities in a way to maximize the impacts.

### 4. From monitoring by external experts towards monitoring by protagonists

For a long time, donors expected monitoring and evaluation to be done mainly by external experts as they are expected to be independent and objective. NGOs, however, have for many years appreciated the value of M&E done by the target groups and the project implementers. It is more immediate and facilitates learning processes. However, an external independent expertise is still considered to be very helpful to bring in "a different perspective".

HOPE'87 is aware of these trends and challenges against any change in these established concepts and open to find innovative, reliable and efficient solutions for participatory outcome and impact monitoring.

## HOPE'87 policy on evaluation

Under this policy a systematic evaluation of all projects of HOPE'87 will be introduced. Such evaluations will assess-where appropriate- the following points:

- the strategic context and concept of the intervention
- the relevance (appropriateness) of the intervention in relation to the priorities of the recipient country; including a comparison of results against the immediate (operational) and more general objectives (development objective)
- the compliance with strategic principles and programs of HOPE'87 and its donor(s); comparison of intervention objectives against the strategies of HOPE'87 and it(s) donor(s) exploring the following questions:
  - To what extent is the intervention in line with the HOPE'87 mandate and the strategy of the Country Office?
  - To what extent have standards and instruments for cross-cutting issues been taken into account?
  - Which of the specific strategic intentions and methodological approaches of HOPE'87 and it(s) donor(s) does the activity follow?
- the effectiveness (achievement of targets) of the project in terms of the defined objectives; comparison of output against purpose
  - To what extent are the objectives of the intervention being attained (likely to be attained)?
  - To what extent is the target group being reached?
- the efficiency (use of resources) with a comparison of input against output exploring the following questions:
  - Is the relation between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
  - What precisely is the cost-benefit relation?
  - Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less input?
- the impact and outcome (effects) of the intervention on the general situation of the target group or affected parties, including
  - Positive and negative, intended and unintended effects
  - Short-term, medium-term, long-term effects
  - Technical, economic, social, cultural, political, ecological effects
- the sustainability (durability) of the intervention and its impact exploring the following questions
  - To what extent can activities, results, and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended?
  - To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. political support, appropriate technology, environmental soundness/environmental protection, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality/women's empowerment, institutional and management capacity building?
  - How self-supporting is, in particular, the local counterpart institution?

- the participation or (shared) responsibilities and ownership exploring the following questions
  - To what extent are stakeholders (target group, beneficiaries, affected groups) involved in strategy development and decision-making?
  - To what extent is the intervention designed to rely on local project/program management or to develop the necessary local institutional capacity?

The evaluation should provide evidence-based information which is credible, reliable and useful and enables HOPE'87 to improve its work by using the findings and recommendations in a „lessons learned“-way.

Each HOPE'87 Country Office will be responsible for carrying out this policy and to decide in cooperation with HQ on the choice of an external or internal evaluation as well as the specific ToR for such evaluations. The HOPE'87 Country Representation Office will also be responsible to share the findings of the evaluation and the related conclusions for future decision making processes with HQ and all other HOPE'87 Country Offices as well as partner organisations and related stakeholders.

HOPE'87 HQ will draft Evaluation Guidelines as well as a format to assist HOPE'87 Country Offices in their duties.

The HOPE'87 Internal Audit Committee will oversee the implementation of this Evaluation Policy.

## **HOPE'87 Evaluation Guidelines**

### **STEP 1: General Information about an EVALUATION**

#### **Format for Terms of Reference**

##### **Background**

- contains a short description of the project to be evaluated.

##### **Purpose**

- explains what learning aspects and accountability functions are referred to. E.g.:
  - a) The evaluation is intended to contribute to an improvement of policies, processes and methods.
  - b) The evaluation makes recommendations on whether a project or programme should be continued.
  - c) The evaluation contributes to the accountability towards the stakeholders and taxpayers (priority: control aspect).

##### **Objectives**

- explain why and for whom the evaluation is carried out.
- illustrate why the evaluation takes place at a certain point of time.
- explain what exactly the evaluation wants to achieve. E.g. a) it revises results (output, outcome, impact) and assesses the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of an intervention. b) represents results, conclusions and recommendations with regard to policies, programmes, etc.

##### **Subject and focus (scope)**

The scope defines which topics/themes relating to development interventions are addressed to or taken into consideration (duration, kinds of interventions, geographic scope, target groups, funds of interventions and other aspects). Deliberate restrictions of the evaluation are substantiated, e.g. if one or more of the five evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) are not applied. A substantiation is also required if additional criteria (e.g. coordination issues, participation) are applied. It also needs to be mentioned whether cross-cutting issues (such as e.g. poverty, gender and environment) are taken into consideration or if the intervention logic (e.g. logframe) will be analysed.

##### **Main evaluation questions**

The questions of evaluation should be formulated as concretely as possible and in accordance with the basic evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability), as well as in accordance with other aspects (e.g. coordination issues, participation).

##### **Evaluation approach and methods**

- comprise a content-related description of what is expected in the respective phases of an evaluation (desk study, inception phase, field studies, preparation of inception report and final report, presentations). Number of the total working days planned, as well as number

and duration of field trips. Brief description of methods.

Indication that data will e.g. be collected and interpreted in a sex-disaggregated manner. Furthermore, it should be indicated that the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards are to be applied and that the compliance of the latter needs to be comprehensible in the evaluation.

### **Timetable**

- is a chronological description of the respective phases of an evaluation (tender, acceptance, desk study, inception phase including submission of inception report, field studies, preparation of final draft report and final report, presentations).

### **Evaluation team**

Number and key qualifications of evaluators (geographic and technical expertise, experience in evaluation, cross-sectoral and gender expertise), requirements of the team leader, composition of the team (national/international), qualifications of national experts. Indications on how qualifications can be proven (e.g. CVs, reference evaluations).

### **Reports**

Inception report, final draft evaluation report, final report. Language, scope and maximal length of reports. Indication that the final draft evaluation report and final report need to be structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions. Notes which criteria are used for the assessment of the quality of the evaluation report (Beyond that, a reference can be made to the evaluation quality criteria of the OECD/DAC in the ToR):

- Were the terms of reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear summary?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions?
- Are cross-cutting issues (e.g. poverty, gender, environment) indicated in the report separately?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe)?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings clearly stated in the report, and are they derivable from the latter?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt?
- Is it comprehensible how the evaluators have achieved their findings?
- Are the recommendations and lessons learnt realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Were the most important documents taken into consideration, and is the content of the latter reflected in the report?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?

- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

### **Coordination/Responsibility**

Responsibility and competence for the evaluation. Clarification whether and what logistical support is offered to the evaluation team.

### **Annexes**

E.g. literature list, project and/or programme details

-----

## **STEP 2: Fill above cited ToR with life... <sup>1</sup>**

**according to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the formulated questions**

### **Definition of evaluation**

“The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.”

An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process of both recipients and donors. (OECD. Development Assistance Committee Working Party on Aid Evaluation. Glossary of Key terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Paris. 2002  
(<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>).

**ATTENTION:** your evaluation MUST include the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria which are (as explained further below): relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability

### **1. Relevance**

**OECD/DAC: *The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner' and donor's policies.***

Are we doing the right things? What is the **relevance or significance** of the intervention regarding local and national requirements and priorities?

- To what extent does the intervention comply with development policy and planning of the recipient country or the partner government?

<sup>1</sup> ATTENTION: for "Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid" go right to "STEP 3"!

- How important is the intervention for the target group and subgroups (e.g. women), and to what extent does it address their needs and interests?
- for ADA: To what extent do the basic principles of Austrian development policy – poverty

reduction, promotion of democracy and human rights, gender equality, respect for the cultural background and ecology – correspond with the respective strategic goals and programmatic targets?

- for other donors: To what extent do the basic principles of the donors development policy correspond with the respective strategic goals and programmatic targets?

### Additional examination questions:

To what extent does the development intervention aim at the solution of a **core problem of the target group(s)**? Is the most recent perspective taken into account? Does it play a role in terms of development policy (according to gender, ethnic groups, conflict parties, etc.)?

To what extent does the development intervention correspond with the most recent objective of the partner country's development policy (Government: **Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper** (PRSP) or similar other relevant groups in case of conflict of interests, if applicable)? Is the solution of a core problem that is important in terms of development policy or a decisive development shortage of the partner country being tackled by the development intervention?

To what extent does the objective of the development intervention in terms of development policy correspond with the objectives and directives of the donor (e.g. poverty reduction, **SDG** cross-cutting issues, gender equality, participatory development, good governance, protection of environment and resources, as well as crisis prevention, objectives of the country concept and the focus strategy paper(s), targets of relevant sectoral concepts)?

To what extent does the basic orientation and conception regarding development policy of the development intervention correspond with the most recent requirements, standard of knowledge and framework conditions (for example, is the **cause-effect hypothesis** plausible?)?

### Examination questions especially for ADA:

- a) What is the relevance of the instruments and the projects/programmes selected by the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) for the partner countries of ADC? To what extent do they correspond with the priorities, the needs and the practical requirements of the partner countries?
- b) What development and other effects are the development and business partnerships supported by ADC aspiring to?
- c) Was the humanitarian assistance provided in line with the humanitarian policy and

procedures of the donor, as well as the needs, priorities and rights of the affected populations?



## 2. Effectiveness

**OECD/DAC:** *The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Note: Also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgement about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional developmental impact.*

Have the objectives of the development intervention been achieved? How big is the **effectiveness or impact** of the project compared to the objectives planned (Comparison: result – planning)?

- To what extent will the objectives of the intervention be (most likely) achieved?
- To what extent is the target group reached?

### **Additional examination questions:**

To what extent were the originally defined objectives of the development intervention realistic? To what extent do they still meet the most recent requirements and the most recent standard of knowledge?

To what extent have the (direct) objectives of the development intervention been achieved in accordance with the (adjusted, if applicable) target system?

What are the (concrete) contributions of interventions of the donor for achieving the objectives of the development intervention?

What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives so far (indication of strengths and weaknesses, e.g. the monitoring and evaluation system)?

What is the quality of development-policy and technical planning and coordination (e.g. donor, project partner, partner)? How can it be judged?

What other effects – also negative ones – can be established regarding services and (project/programme) objectives?

### **Examination questions specially for ADA:**

a) Has the project contributed to sustainable capacity building, knowledge transfer in partner countries as well as to the improvement of the scientific/technical potential?

b) To what extent did the ADA humanitarian assistance provided achieve its purpose?

### 3. Efficiency

**OECD/DAC: A measure of how economically resources/ inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.**

Are the objectives achieved in a cost-efficient manner by the development intervention? How big is the **efficiency or utilisation ratio** of the utilised resources? (comparison: provided means – results):

- Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable? What is the cost-benefit ratio?
- To what extent have individual resources been used economically?
- Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?

#### **Additional examination questions:**

How high were the costs? (e.g. by instruments, sectors, interventions)? To what extent were the costs and benefits of the development interventions in a reasonable proportion to each other from a business and economic point of view?

Would there have been cheaper solutions/alternatives concerning the utilisation of instruments and the conceptualization of the development intervention achieving the objectives on a sustainable basis?

Are the services, capacities created and potentials used appropriately?

Were services provided in time and impacts achieved within an appropriate time period?

#### **Examination questions especially for ADA:**

a) Were the financial resources and other inputs efficiently used to achieve results?  
Issues to be addressed:

- Aid management (programme and project cycle, staffing, tasks and responsibility of ministry departments and embassies, inter-ministerial co-operation include civil-military co-operation)
- Criteria used in the selection of implementing partners (comparative advantage or other)
- Use of monitoring of progress and achievements for programming, learning and accountability

## 4. Impact

**OECD/DAC: *The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.***

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?

Does the development intervention contribute to the achievement of overall development objectives (tendentially, overall goal)? What is or are the **impact(s)/effects** of the intervention compared to the total situation of the target group or those affected:

- positive and negative, intended and unintended effects
- technical, economic, social, cultural, political, ecological effects – disaggregated by sex or other relevant social groups, such as minorities

### **Additional examination questions:**

To what extent were the originally intended, overriding objectives in terms of development policy (goals) realistic? To what extent do they still correspond with the most recent requirements and the most recent standard of knowledge?

To what extent have (according to the most recent requirements and the most recent standard of knowledge) appropriate overriding effects regarding development been achieved so far? What has the development intervention contributed to so far and what is it still contributing to?

To what extent was the development intervention exemplary, created structures and/or had a broad effect/impact in terms of leverage (e.g. adaptation among target groups and organisations)?

What other effects – also negative ones – can be determined on a goal level?

What would the development have been like without the development intervention?

To what extent are the positive changes and effects of the development intervention (summarily) sustainable compared to the objectives regarding development policy?

Particularly: How stable is the situation in the surrounding field of the development intervention regarding social justice, economic efficiency, political stability and ecological balance?

What risks and potentials are visible regarding the sustainable effectiveness of the development interventions and how likely is their occurrence? Will the effectiveness of the development intervention most likely improve or worsen in future?

To what extent is/are the target group(s) capable and prepared to receive the positive effects of

the development intervention without support in the long term?

## 5. Sustainability

**OECD/DAC: *The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time***

Are the positive effects sustainable? How is the **sustainability or the continuity** of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?

- To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended?
- To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects?
- How self-supporting in particular is the assisted local counterpart?

### **Additional examination questions:**

To what extent are the positive changes and effects of the development intervention (summarily) sustainable compared to the objectives regarding development policy?

Particularly: How stable is the situation in the surrounding field of the development intervention regarding social justice, economic efficiency, political stability and ecological balance?

What risks and potentials are visible regarding the sustainable effectiveness of the development interventions and how likely is their occurrence? Will the effectiveness of the development intervention most likely improve or worsen in future?

To what extent is/are the target group(s) capable and prepared to receive the positive effects of the development intervention without support in the long term?

To what extent did the projects/programmes strengthen local ownership and leadership?

## STEP 3: ESPECIALLY FOR EVALUATION OF HUMANITARIAN AID

Fill above cited ToR with life... <sup>2</sup>

**according to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the formulated questions  
(check all points cited further below and decide which to use in your evaluation format  
(as explained under STEP 1)!)**

### OECD/DAC evaluation criteria for humanitarian aid

During the revision of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact for humanitarian aid, the request was made in pertinent circles of experts to concretise or adapt them so that they can better meet the requirements of humanitarian aid.

Four of the five criteria have remained the same in their basic definition. The criterion of sustainability is not specifically examined, because interventions of humanitarian aid generally are of short-term duration. The question relating to sustainability is therefore defined differently and is presented as 'Connectedness'. New criteria are: connectedness, coverage, coherence.

The following criteria and evaluation questions are suggested by the OECD/DAC and the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) in humanitarian aid:

#### 1. Relevance/Appropriateness

*ALNAP: Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy).*

*ALNAP: Appropriateness is the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability, and cost-effectiveness accordingly.*

The criteria of relevance and appropriateness are complementary, relevance refers to wider goals and priorities, and appropriateness refers to activities and inputs.

#### Examples for possible questions:

- Was a needs analysis carried out, in which the needs of men, women, boys and girls were identified?
- Did the intervention take into account the livelihood and capacities of the target group?
- Were interventions in some cases more relevant and more appropriate than in other cases?

---

<sup>2</sup> ATTENTION: for "Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid" go right to "STEP 3"!

## 2. Coherence

ALNAP: *The need to assess security, development, trade and military policies, as well as humanitarian policies, to ensure that there is consistency and, in particular, that all policies take into account humanitarian and human rights considerations.*

Coherence refers to the consistency/complementarity and freedom of contradiction of guiding general principles of different topics, such as development, trade, military, humanitarian aid, analysing whether human rights have been taken into consideration in all principles or not.

### Examples for possible questions:

- How was coordination (coherence) achieved, and/or why was there a lack in coherence?
- What political factors were specifically responsible for the coordination of assistances or relief items or what made the latter more difficult?
- Is coherence necessary or feasible in the present situation at all?

## 3. Effectiveness

ALNAP: *Effectiveness measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within this criterion of effectiveness is timeliness.*

### 3.1. Effectiveness is measured on the basis of the defined outputs and outcomes.

### Examples for possible questions:

- How was the decision taken regarding these results or objectives? Was a needs-analysis conducted? Were the objectives clearly defined? Who participated in the decision-making process? Was the main target group involved in the project planning phase?
- To what extent have the objectives been achieved or not? What are key parameters/determining factors that have influenced the achievement of the objectives ? Lessons learnt have to be taken into account in future interventions.
- Did the interventions reach the target population? In cases where monitoring data (structured according to sex, socio-economic categories, ethnicity) are not available/have not been collected, they have to be collected in interviews with the main target groups.
- Are the statements of the main target group on the attainment of goals identical with the opinions of the actors having provided humanitarian assistance (e.g. employees of the respective organisation)?
- Have goods, services or other subsidies been delivered or offered at the right time according to the main target group?
- Have the interventions contributed to strengthening the core potentials of the target groups with regard to new risks?

### 3.2. Coordination

*ALNAP: While not a 'formal' DAC criterion, coordination is an important consideration in the evaluation of humanitarian action. Coordination cuts across several criteria, but is included here under the heading of effectiveness, as the two are closely related.*

Contrary to coherence, which deals with the question whether the policies of different participants are consistent, coordination refers to the practical activities of governments and organisations – whether the latter have Joint Common Cluster Groups, have discussed geographic target areas and how the information was shared.

Capturing and assessing coordination requires a discussion with mostly a large number of actors, an analysis whether the responsible government was really involved in the decision-making processes, as well as a description of the role of non-traditional partners, such as the military, for example.

#### **Examples for possible questions:**

- Were there any local coordination structures? Were there plans for these local coordination structures? How did the organisations harmonise and coordinate their interventions with other partners? How actively were organisations involved in the coordination?
- What partners were involved in the coordination and how? Why were they included? Were any organisations not involved?
- Were there any reasons for not participating or participating only to a small extent in the coordination?
- Were there any incentives for coordination? Was e.g. the UN coordination supported by donors with any financial means?
- Was a lead agency appointed? Which organisation was appointed lead agency by which procedure? Which tasks has the organisation accomplished for promoting coordination? How effectively is the latter perceived?
- Which factors have restricted the coordination, and which factors have supported it? How was good coordination achieved? What is transferable to other situations in this respect?
- What effects did the coordination have on the interventions of humanitarian aid? Did the coordination lead to better effectiveness and impact of the interventions?
- Was the allocation of financial resources coordinated in an organised manner or were funds provided by donors individually in order to support their own strategic objectives?

### 4. Efficiency

*ALNAP: Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used.*

During humanitarian aid often a large quantity of material goods is provided, therefore conducting a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis is important. In connection with efficiency,



political considerations should also be taken into account,

e.g. if an intervention takes place in a conflict area but the government does not approve the support in the long run.

### **Examples for possible questions:**

- Was a needs assessment carried out, in which the needs were clearly assessed and the services required mentioned in accordance with the situation?
- Were the commodities (inputs) utilised as planned?
- Is there a potential to make better use of the resources than previously?

Generally, is there a potential for optimisation concerning planning, procurement and logistics? Would it have been possible to obtain certain goods in a better way and, perhaps, cheaper somewhere else?

### **5. Impact (only for evaluation done long after the activity ended)**

*ALNAP: Impact looks at the wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical, environmental – on individuals, gender- and age groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).*

Impact refers to the long-term changes and is not equally relevant for all evaluations. Consequently, evaluations carried out during or shortly after an intervention can only partly provide information on long-term effects. Classic impact evaluations are characterised by a very complex methodology.

### **6. Connectedness/also Sustainability**

*ALNAP: Connectedness refers to the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.*

Connectedness derives from the criterion of sustainability. Although operations of humanitarian aid are generally planned as short-term interventions, they should nevertheless contribute to interventions planned in the longer term, such as recovery or development.

### **Examples for possible questions:**

- Does a sensible exit strategy exist including schedule and guidelines for the transfer of responsibility and activities to government departments and/or development organisations? Is there a budget scenario for the time after the assistance?
- Were financial means used for relief or recovery?
- What influence did already existing networks have (e.g. national and international non-governmental organisations) on the implemented interventions? Which lessons learnt could be relevant for others?
- To what extent were local capacities developed or strengthened through the humanitarian interventions?



## 7. Coverage

ALNAP: *The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening risk wherever they are.*

Coverage is to be viewed in connection with effectiveness. ALNAP summarises detailed questions concerning the target group in a criterion of its own. Evaluation questions referring to that, however, can also be included in the criterion of effectiveness (OECD/DAC 1999).

### Examples for possible questions:

- Who was supported by the humanitarian interventions? Which groups were taken into account and which not?
- What were the main reasons for certain parts of the target groups having received support and protection and others having been excluded?
- Was the support aligned to regionally different needs? What decisions were taken or not in this regard?
- Who has really received support on a local level (village, slum, community and/or refugee camp)? Data should be analysed and interpreted in a sex-disaggregated manner, socioeconomic categories and ethnicity.
- Have all of those in need of protection received protection during the interventions?

ALNAP covers the topic of protection within the criteria of coverage. The OECD/DAC considers protection as an additional topic:

(cit.) "Beside the criteria already mentioned, the OECD/DAC also mentions protection. If protection is inadequately and there is the risk of members of the target group losing their lives, this must be considered in the analysis of the evaluation. The topic of security or protection should also be included in every evaluation referring to humanitarian aid (OECD/DAC 1999)".

**FORMAT**  
**MONITORING/ EVALUATION MANDATE**  
**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

---

Title:

Country:

Project No.:

1. Background

- 1.1 Short project description (objectives, location, time span, budgetary framework, implementing agency/partner)
- 1.2 Strategic context and concept of intervention
- 1.3 Phase of implementation
- 1.4 Indication of information sources

2. Objectives of the Monitoring/ Evaluation

- 2.1 What is the reason for conducting the monitoring/ evaluation (specific project stage, contract, service)?
- 2.2 What purpose and whom are the findings intended to serve (evaluation of experience, decision-making, modification of concept, model development, contribution to program development etc.)?

3. Key Questions

- 3.1 On which elements of the project cycle – design, implementation, monitoring, results, impact – should the monitoring/ evaluation focus specifically?
- 3.2 Where should the main emphasis be placed regarding the evaluation criteria (refer to item 4)? Keeping a limited focus, depending on the purpose of the monitoring/ evaluation, can be essential!
- 3.3 Type and depth of the review (des and/or field study, form a participation of the parties involved)
- 3.4 Whom should the recommendations address?

4. Monitoring/ Evaluation Criteria

**Relevance** (appropriateness) of the intervention in relation to the priorities of the recipient country; comparison of results against the immediate (operational) and more general objectives (development objective).

- How important is the intervention of the target group(s) and/or to what extent does it conform with their needs and interests?
- To what extent does the intervention comply with development policies and development planning of the recipient country or counterpart government?
- Does it make sense to continue the intervention or is it necessary to redesign or stop it?

**Compliance** with strategic principles and programs of HOPE'87 and its donor(s); comparison of intervention objectives against the strategies of HOPE'87 and its donor(s).

- To what extent is the intervention in line with the HOPE'87 mandate and the strategy of the Country Office?
- To what extent have standards and instruments for cross-cutting issues been taken into account?
- Which of the specific strategic intentions and methodological approaches of HOPE'87 and its donor(s) does the activity follow?

**Effectiveness** (achievement of targets) of the project in terms of the defined objectives; comparison of output against purpose

- To what extent are the objectives of the intervention being attained (likely to be attained)?
- To what extent is the target group being reached?

**Efficiency** (use of resources); comparison of input against output

- Is the relation between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
- What precisely is the cost-benefit relation?
- Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less input?

**Impact** (effects) of the intervention on the general situation of the target group or affected parties

- Positive and negative, intended and unintended effects
- Short-term, medium-term, long-term effects
- Technical, economic, social, cultural, political, ecological effects

**Sustainability** (durability) of the intervention and its impact

- To what extent can activities, results, and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended?
- To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. political support, appropriate technology, environmental soundness/environmental protection, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality/women's empowerment, institutional and management capacity building?
- How self-supporting is, in particular, the local counterpart institution?

**Participation** or (shared) responsibilities and ownership

- To what extent are stakeholders (target group, beneficiaries, affected groups) involved in strategy development and decision-making?
- To what extent is the intervention designed to rely on local project/program management or to develop the necessary local institutional capacity?

#### 5. Country Office Performance Monitoring (by interviews with beneficiaries, staff members and local partner(s))

- Beneficiary assessment: were the staff members attentive, fair and impartial in the performance of their functions and in selecting the beneficiaries without any discrimination? Did the staff members at no time afford any undue preferential treatment to any group or individual or improperly discriminate against any group or individual, or otherwise abuse the power and authority vested in them? Did staff members adhere to the code of conduct?
- Duty assessment: did staff members perform their duties and functions efficiently, effectively and with integrity, in accordance with laws and administrative policies? Did staff members ensure that resources for which they are responsible were administered in the most effective and efficient manner?
- Work conditions: Did staff members receive the best possible guidance from their Country Representative/Regional Directors/HQ? Were all staff members treated on an equal basis without any discrimination and were complaints treated in an objective manner and according to internal procedures?

#### 6. Evaluation Team

- Size and general requirements (experience, independence, gender equality, team skills, familiarity with local and cultural background)
- Required professional profiles and complementary composition of the team
- Roles within the team, leadership/guidance and coordination

#### 7. Timetable and Work Plan

- Time frame for preparation, execution, and completion of the evaluation
- Consultations and cooperation in the field
- Presentation of findings and recommendations in the partner country
- Presentation of the draft main report to the commissioning agency
- Completion of the final report

#### 8. Report

- Format and quality standards of reporting (incl. technical / electronic data processing standards)

- 
- Language /translations, if any

## 9. Budget

- Cost items and budgetary frame
- Accounting and general terms and conditions

Date:

Author:

**FORMAT**  
**MONITORING/ EVALUATION MANDATE**  
**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

---

Title:

Country:

Project No.:

1. Background

- 1.1 Short project description (objectives, location, time span, budgetary framework, implementing agency/partner)
- 1.2 Strategic context and concept of intervention
- 1.3 Phase of implementation
- 1.4 Indication of information sources

2. Objectives of the Monitoring/ Evaluation

- 2.1 What is the reason for conducting the monitoring/ evaluation (specific project stage, contract, service)?
- 2.2 What purpose and whom are the findings intended to serve (evaluation of experience, decision-making, modification of concept, model development, contribution to program development etc.)?

3. Key Questions

- 3.1 On which elements of the project cycle – design, implementation, monitoring, results, impact – should the monitoring/ evaluation focus specifically?
- 3.2 Where should the main emphasis be placed regarding the evaluation criteria (refer to item 4)? Keeping a limited focus, depending on the purpose of the monitoring/ evaluation, can be essential!
- 3.3 Type and depth of the review (des and/or field study, form a participation of the parties involved)
- 3.4 Whom should the recommendations address?

4. Monitoring/ Evaluation Criteria

**Relevance** (appropriateness) of the intervention in relation to the priorities of the recipient country; comparison of results against the immediate (operational) and more general objectives (development objective).

- How important is the intervention of the target group(s) and/or to what extent does it conform to their needs and interests?
- To what extent does the intervention comply with development policies and development planning of the recipient country or counterpart government?
- Does it make sense to continue the intervention or is it necessary to redesign or stop it?

**Compliance** with strategic principles and programs of HOPE'87 and its donor(s); comparison of intervention objectives against the strategies of HOPE'87 and its donor(s).

- To what extent is the intervention in line with the HOPE'87 mandate and the strategy of the Country Office?
- To what extent have standards and instruments for cross-cutting issues been taken into account?
- Which of the specific strategic intentions and methodological approaches of HOPE'87 and its donor(s) does the activity follow?

**Effectiveness** (achievement of targets) of the project in terms of the defined objectives; comparison of output against purpose

- To what extent are the objectives of the intervention being attained (likely to be attained)?
- To what extent is the target group being reached?

**Efficiency** (use of resources); comparison of input against output

- Is the relation between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
- What precisely is the cost-benefit relation?
- Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less input?

**Impact** (effects) of the intervention on the general situation of the target group or affected parties

- Positive and negative, intended and unintended effects
- Short-term, medium-term, long-term effects
- Technical, economic, social, cultural, political, ecological effects

**Sustainability** (durability) of the intervention and its impact

- To what extent can activities, results, and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended?
- To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. political support, appropriate technology, environmental soundness/environmental protection, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality/women's empowerment, institutional and management capacity building?
- How self-supporting is, in particular, the local counterpart institution?

**Participation** or (shared) responsibilities and ownership

- To what extent are stakeholders (target group, beneficiaries, affected groups) involved in strategy development and decision-making?
- To what extent is the intervention designed to rely on local project/program management or to develop the necessary local institutional capacity?

#### 5. Country Office Performance Monitoring (by interviews with beneficiaries, staff members and local partner(s))

- Beneficiary assessment: were the staff members attentive, fair and impartial in the performance of their functions and in selecting the beneficiaries without any discrimination? Did the staff members at no time afford any undue preferential treatment to any group or individual or improperly discriminate against any group or individual, or otherwise abuse the power and authority vested in them? Did staff members adhere to the code of conduct?
- Duty assessment: did staff members perform their duties and functions efficiently, effectively and with integrity, in accordance with laws and administrative policies? Did staff members ensure that resources for which they are responsible were administered in the most effective and efficient manner?
- Work conditions: Did staff members receive the best possible guidance from their Country Representative/Regional Directors/HQ? Were all staff members treated on an equal basis without any discrimination and were complaints treated in an objective manner and according to internal procedures?

#### 6. Evaluation Team

- Size and general requirements (experience, independence, gender equality, team skills, familiarity with local and cultural background)
- Required professional profiles and complementary composition of the team
- Roles within the team, leadership/guidance and coordination

#### 7. Timetable and Work Plan

- Time frame for preparation, execution, and completion of the evaluation
- Consultations and cooperation in the field
- Presentation of findings and recommendations in the partner country
- Presentation of the draft main report to the commissioning agency
- Completion of the final report

#### 8. Report

- Format and quality standards of reporting (incl. technical / electronic data processing standards)
- Language /translations, if any



## 9. Budget

- Cost items and budgetary frame
- Accounting and general terms and conditions

Date:

Author: