

Terms of Reference for the End-of-Project Evaluation of the Migration III Project in West Nile, Uganda

Project Title: Secure Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees and Host Communities in West Nile region, Uganda, Phase 3 (Migration III)

Countries of Implementation: Uganda

Project Number: OEZA 2826-00/2023

Project Timeframe: January 2023 – April 2025

Project Budget: EUR 333,333

Table of Contents

- 1. Project Background and Project Components 3
 - 1.1. The project “Secure Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees and Host Communities in West Nile region, Uganda, Phase 3 (Migration III)” 3
 - 1.2. horizont3000 3
 - 1.3. Partner Organisations 3
 - 1.4. Project Components 4
- 2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation 5
 - 2.1. Specific Objectives 6
 - 2.2. Primary users & expected evaluation use 6
- 3. Scope 6
- 4. Evaluation Questions 7
- 5. Design and Approach 7
- 6. Workplan and Evaluation phases 8
- 7. Deliverables 9
- 8. Evaluation Management Arrangements 9
- 9. Requirements for the Evaluator(s) 9
- 10. Specifications for the Submission of Offers 10
- Annexes 10

1. Project Background and Project Components

1.1. The project “Secure Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees and Host Communities in West Nile region, Uganda, Phase 3 (Migration III)”

Since 2017 **horizont3000**, in partnership with **The Agency for Accelerated Regional Development (AFARD)** and **PALM Corps (PC)**, have been implementing the **"Secure Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees and Host Communities in West Nile region"** project in three phases with funding from the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), BSIN (Bruder und Schwester in Not Innsbruck) and Caritas Kärnten. Phase I (2017-2019) and II (2020-2022) were implemented in Yumbe and Arua districts. The current and third phase represents the final consolidation phase of an endeavour to support South Sudanese refugees and host communities in north Uganda in their effort for a secure livelihood and is implemented in Yumbe and Terego, in West Nile.

West Nile, one of Uganda's poorest regions, faces significant challenges due to underdeveloped infrastructure and social services, a result of nearly two decades of civil war. The recovery process is slow, compounded by the presence of refugees who place additional pressure on local resources. Yumbe and Terego districts, where the consolidation phase of the Migration (III) project will be implemented, experience poor roads, limited access to essential services, and a heavy reliance on food aid. Yumbe hosts a large refugee population in Bidibidi Settlement, while Terego accommodates refugees in Imvepi and Yoro settlements. Both districts are predominantly rural, with subsistence farming as the primary livelihood. Women play a central role in agriculture but face challenges accessing financial resources and productive assets.

1.2. horizont3000

horizont3000 is an Austrian Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) for development cooperation, formed by eleven (11) grassroots organisations of the Catholic Church. Its core activities include co-financing, advisory services, and knowledge management, working with nearly 100 partner organisations primarily in East Africa, Mozambique, Senegal, and Central America. Focusing on Human Rights & Civil Society and Sustainable Livelihoods with emphasis on Gender Equality, Climate Action, and Policy Dialogue. The East Africa Regional Office of horizont3000, located in Kampala, Uganda, oversees programs and projects in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania. Currently, horizont3000 manages 25 projects in East Africa with an annual budget of approximately EUR 3 million, and deploys 20 Technical Advisors to local partners in Uganda, Tanzania, and Kenya¹.

In general, horizont3000 coordinates and oversees overall action planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, accounting, and learning of the implemented projects. Moreover, horizont3000 manages the grant, lead donor relations, and ensures cohesion with district initiatives and coordination with development actors. Specific responsibilities within the Migration III project include managing contracts, submitting reports, building AFARD's capacity, and selecting external evaluators and auditors for the annual audit.

1.3. Partner Organisations

Both AFARD and PALM Corps are responsible for overseeing the day-to-day implementation of the Migration III project, including the selecting of action areas, youth, and enterprises with growth potential. They are coordinating trainings and support Youth Business Groups (YBG) organisational development, provide business stimulus kits, and facilitate youth advocacy and community engagement. Additionally, they manage staff and logistics, disseminate lessons learned, and handle planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, as well as output reporting.

AFARD and PALM Corps bring extensive experience working with refugees and host communities in Uganda's West Nile Region. Their partnership since 2015 has successfully combined AFARD's

¹ For more information, please visit <https://www.horizont3000.org/en>.

community empowerment expertise with PALM Corps' facilitation of market development, integrating lessons learned into this project, such as working in small youth groups and empowering marketing committees for direct buyer engagement.

Please see a brief profile of each organisation below:

AFARD

The Agency for Accelerated Regional Development (AFARD) is a Ugandan NGO established in 2000, operating in 11 districts of West Nile with its headquarters in Nebbi and additional offices in Yumbe, Zombo, and Pakwach. Governed by a gender-balanced Board of Directors and managed by a skilled team of 111 staff, AFARD is recognized for its leadership in rural development and robust internal systems, including computerized financial management and annual audits by international firms. With extensive experience in implementing donor-funded projects like ALENU (EU-funded) and DANIDA-funded initiatives, AFARD has a proven track record in supporting refugees and host communities. Its strong networks with government, civil society, and the private sector ensure effective and impactful project delivery.

PALM Corps

PALM Corps, established in 2014, is a Ugandan NGO addressing development challenges in West Nile and Northern Uganda with a mission to transform livelihoods and promote environmental harmony. Guided by a reputable board, it has extensive project implementation experience and strong partnerships with organisations such as horizont3000, ZOA, and Welthungerhilfe. Operating in sectors like agriculture, education, public health, and the environment, PALM Corps works in refugee settlements with approval from the Office of the Prime Minister and actively engages in UNHCR-led technical working groups and inter-agency meetings.

1.4. Project Components

The project aims to promote sustainable development in both refugee and host communities by strengthening the capacity of local farmer institutions and partner organisations (AFARD and PALM Corps) to sustain results and replicate best practices. It seeks to foster gender equality and peaceful coexistence through shared conservation and promotion of natural resources, while addressing key gender-related and environmental goals. Additionally, the project supports the establishment of profitable and sustainable income-generating activities (IGAs) for youth and farmers (67 % female), with a focus on improving livelihoods through both on-farm and off-farm ventures. Together, these interventions aim to build resilience, economic opportunities, and social cohesion in the region.

The **project components** are outlined below:

Project Outcome:

Refugees and host communities have secure livelihoods and contribute to sustainable development within Rhino (District Terego) and Bidibidi (District Yumbe) resettlement areas, in West Nile Region, Uganda.

SDG (Sustainable Development Goal) Targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 5.1, 5.a, 8.2

GAP III (Gender Action Plan) Overall Thematic objective: Women, men, girls and boys, in all their diversity, fully enjoy and exercise their equal economic, labour and social rights.

GAP III Specific Thematic Objectives: a) Increased access for women in all their diversity to financial services and products, and productive resources b) Women in all their diversity have improved access to entrepreneurship opportunities, including social entrepreneurship, alternative livelihoods and strengthened participation in the green and circular economy c) Reduction in gender disparities in enrolment, progression and retention at all levels of education and lifelong learning for women, men, girls and boys

Project Outputs (OP):

OP 1: Profitable and sustainable Income Generating Activities (IGA) (on-farm and off-farm) practiced by 850 (150 youth; and 700 farmers; 67% female) in refugees and host communities. (SDG Targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.2, 8.3)

OP 2: Gender equality and peaceful co-existence for refugees and host communities where natural resources are conserved, shared, and promoted (SDG Targets 1.5, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.a, 10.2, 13.1, 13.3)

OP 3: Strengthened capacity of farmer institutions and partner organisations (AFARD and PALM Corps) to sustain results and enhance replication of best practices (SDG Target 17.9)

Target group(s):

Direct Target group: Female 510 / Male: 340 TOTAL 850

Indirect Target group: Female 2.340 / Male: 2.160 TOTAL 4.500

Activities:

- A0.1: Conduct stakeholders briefing meeting
- A0.2: Awareness raising activities and support mission
- A0.3: Lobbying and Advocacy
- A0.4: Expenditure verifications
- A0.5: Terminal evaluation
- A0.6: Hold district close out meeting
- A1.1: Retrain and equip poultry Paravets and train FFS members
- A1.2: Provide agro inputs
- A1.3: Strengthen the Romogi Kiri Cooperative
- A1.4: Form Cooperative in Yelulu (PALM Corps)
- A1.5: Conduct market linkages (collective marketing)
- A1.6 Conduct youth business mentorship and coaching
- A1.7: Train FFS members in financial literacy
- A2.1: Hold dialogue on land access
- A2.2: Hold dialogue on Gender equality (Gender based violence and child protection)
- A2.3: Hold refresher training on GALS methodology
- A2.4: Establish and support GALS champions in the community.
- A3.1: Train farmer institutions (FFSF and cooperatives) and selected AFARD staff on participatory M&E
- A3.2: Training on strategic planning (PALM Corps) and Business Plan development (Yelulu cooperative).

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

In accordance with the guidelines and rules of the Austrian Development Agency, horizont3000, as ADA's contract partner responsible for the implementation of the programme, is commissioning this evaluation. As planned, this independent final evaluation will take place in the final months of project implementation (for details on the evaluation's timeline see 6. Workplan and Evaluation phases).

The evaluation serves multiple purposes:

- **Accountability and reporting:** The evaluation serves to report to partner organisations, funders and other interested parties on results and the use of funds.
- **Learning:** The evaluation will provide evidence on what has worked well and what could have been improved. The findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations will be used for evidence-based decision-making and planning for future decision-making, programming,

implementation and monitoring by the implementing organisations as well as donors. It will also promote interorganisational learning.

2.1. Specific Objectives

The evaluation aims to assess:

- 1) the **relevance** of the intervention, especially as to what extent the project addresses the needs and interests of the target population;
- 2) the **effectiveness** of the project in achieving its intended results (outcome level) taking into account the project's gender equality targets;
- 3) the **sustainability** of project results with specific focus on gender sensitive capacity development and the use of climate resilient commodities within the agribusinesses.

2.2. Primary users & expected evaluation use

- Partner organisations that implement the activities and interact with the project's target groups and are to a certain degree target group themselves.
- horizont3000, with regard to learning, project/programme management, but also accountability and communication
- Donors / funding partners, in particular the Austrian Development Cooperation Agency and Caritas Kärnten and BSIN, especially with regard to programme quality and quality of implementation
- Other actors working on the same issues and interested in the lessons learned from this evaluation. (NGOs in East Africa and Austria, technical services, local authorities etc.)

3. Scope

The evaluation will encompass the entire duration of the Migration III project, from its inception to its conclusion (January 2023 – end of data collection of this evaluation).

Geographically, the evaluation will focus on West Nile region, where the project has been implemented in Uganda. Data collection in the field will be conducted within Rhino (District Terego) and Bidibidi (District Yumbe) resettlement areas. As a reference for the sampling strategy, the Migration III project directly engaged 767 people in 2023, including 597 farmers and 170 youth. Indirectly, the project reached approximately 5,369 households, averaging seven members per household, in the districts of Yumbe and Terego in the West Nile Region.

The evaluation will cover all project components. The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability will serve as framework for the assessment.

The evaluators also need to assess whether and how the “**do no harm**” principle has been followed in design, implementation and monitoring. In addition to assessing **gender equality** as an intended result by itself (see OP2 above), the evaluators are requested to assess how gender equality has been mainstreamed in all the design, implementation and monitoring and how this contributed to results achievement.

4. Evaluation Questions

Relevance:

1. How well has the project been aligned with the needs and priorities of the target population?
2. To what extent has the intervention involved the rights-holders, including marginalised groups, in the design of the project?

Effectiveness:

3. To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objectives?
4. What were the major factors influencing their achievement or non-achievement?
5. Has the intervention achieved inclusive results? Were there differential results for different groups of rights-holders, diverse groups of women, men?

Sustainability:

6. What, if any, measures are in place to ensure the sustainability of the project's results?
7. What have been facilitating and hindering factors for sustainability and how could prospects for sustainability be enhanced?

Questions can be refined and restructured in agreement with horizont3000 during the inception phase. Any suggested changes need to be explained in the offer and the inception report, adequately reflect the overall purpose and scope of the evaluation and be agreed upon in writing by h3.

5. Design and Approach

The evaluation team should propose a detailed methodology for the assignment, based on a non-experimental design and mixed methods-approach, including both qualitative and quantitative methods.

The data collection must rely on various sources and might include:

- Document review (project documents/reports/data, other relevant documents/reports/data);
- Field observations and case studies;
- Interviews, key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGDs) with representatives of stakeholders and project participants (men, women), project partner organisations (men, women), the regional office of horizont3000 East Africa in Kampala, Uganda and horizont3000 Vienna either online or in physical meetings and field visits.

The data collection should be focused on field data, involving implementing partners, project participants and the target population, as well as key informant interviews. The use of participatory methods is recommended. The evaluation team should detail and justify in its offer which evaluation approach and mix of data collection and analysis methods they deem appropriate and feasible to answer the evaluation questions.

The data collection and analysis methods suggested must be sufficiently rigorous to allow for a solid, fair and unbiased assessment. Findings must be relevant to the evaluation questions, numbered, clearly formulated, substantiated and based on triangulated evidence which is documented in relation to each finding to ensure credibility. The logical connection between evidence => findings => conclusions => recommendations must be documented, traceable and understandable for the evaluation users.

The principle of do-no-harm must be at the centre of every stage of the evaluation and guide data collection and analysis. The evaluation must follow Austrian Development Cooperation and OECD/DAC norms and standards as well as ethical guidelines for evaluations (see relevant references in the annex).

6. Workplan and Evaluation phases

The assignment should start in January 2025 and finish in April 2025. It is estimated that a minimum of 53 working days are required for the conduct of this assignment.

Within the scope of this assignment, the evaluation team must deliver the following:

Evaluation phase / tasks	Working days	Timeline	Deliverables (in English)
Kick-Off and Inception	12		
Virtual kick-off meeting	0,5	Week of January 20, 2025	
Document Review, Desk Research and Drafting Inception Report, including evaluation matrix and data collection instruments	9,5	Week of January 20, 2025	
Inception Report (IR) Deadline		Draft IR due February 7, 2025	Draft IR
Validation of IR	1	Final IR due February 21, 2025	Final IR
Start-up workshops with key stakeholders and detailed planning	1	End of February 2025	
Data Collection	25		
Data collection and data processing in the field	23	End of February till End of March 2025	
Data collection with key stakeholders (KII)	2		
Analysis and Reporting	16		
Data Analysis	3	End of March 2025	
Draft report with first conclusions and recommendations	10	Draft Report due April 11, 2025	Draft Report
Feedback workshop on the first findings and recommendations with ROEA; horizont3000 Vienna and local partners (online)	1	Week of April 14, 2025	Presentation on evaluation results (PPT)
Review and validation of final report including feedback loops	2	Final Report due April 25, 2025	Final Evaluation Report (.doc and pdf)
TOTAL	53		

7. Deliverables

- **Inception Report (see Annex 2 for structure and quality checklist)**
- **Draft and Final Evaluation Report, including the Results Assessment Form (RAF) (see Annex 3 for structure and quality checklist)**
- **A PowerPoint presentation (or other) of the findings and initial recommendations for the feedback workshop.**

Important: The inception, draft and final evaluation report will be assessed by horizont3000 and its technical and financial partners for completeness and only approved if they are in line with the respective **Quality Checklists in the ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project evaluations (see Annexes 2 and 3)**.

The evaluation team will be provided with written feedback to the inception, draft and final evaluation report, using the quality checklists in Annex 2 and 3 that will also document the evaluation team's comments and reasoning on the incorporation of the feedback into the reports.

Available information sources:

- Project documents
- Project Partner Self-Assessment findings
- Gender analyses of the projects
- Documents of the project implementing partner organisations
- Bi-annual and Annual project reports

8. Evaluation Management Arrangements

For the follow-up of this project evaluation, a reference group will be set up on the side of horizont3000 with the following participants:

- Katrin Jordan, horizont3000, Programme Coordinator Tanzania, Uganda
- Kenneth W. Massa, Programme Manager East Africa
- Patricia Nyasuna, Gender Focal Point, East Africa
- Alice Bayer, MEAL Expert horizont3000
- ADA-representative (programme management and/or staff unit for Evaluation – tbc.)

The Evaluation Reference Group is responsible for the management of this evaluation and ensures that technical and ethical standards and guiding principles of the evaluation, including impartiality and independence, are met.

The contact persons for the evaluation team are Katrin Jordan (Katrin.jordan@horizont3000.at) and Alice Bayer (alice.bayer@horizont3000.at).

9. Requirements for the Evaluator(s)

A consultancy company with local expertise and good knowledge of the project area is preferred. The team must be able to offer the following expertise

- Programming and evaluation of projects with relevant and proven experience in the programmatic approach;
- Expertise in gender-sensitive approaches, understanding of GEM, human rights-based approaches and participatory approaches
- Fluency in English for all team members

- Fluency in Kiswahili and further local languages is an added value
- The team leader must have minimum 6 years' working experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis as well as managing of evaluation teams proofed by a track record
- The evaluation team working on the report must be the same team conducting the data collection;
- Commitment to adhere the OECD-DAC and ADA standards for programme and project evaluations regarding development projects (see Annexes 1-3).

Members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation of the programme. We propose a minimum of two experts and a maximum of 3 experts for this evaluation. The evaluation team should be gender-balanced and diverse in experience/qualification background.

The composition of the team must be detailed and explained in the technical offer, as well as the division of tasks between all team members and the added value of each of them.

10. Specifications for the Submission of Offers

A technical and financial offer must be submitted (max. 15 pages - without annexes).

Tenders must include:

- The curriculum vitae, experience and references of the evaluators.
- Suggestions on the methodology, work plan, sampling strategy and, if necessary, suggestions and recommendations to the mandate
- The number of working days planned for the assignment, including daily rates
- A detailed budget, which must be presented in Euros and must include all taxes, travel costs, logistics (including workshop costs etc.) and other expenses. (horizont3000 is not allowed to deduct VAT - the offer must therefore stipulate:
 - The net budget of the evaluation (before VAT, to be compared with competing proposals)
 - the gross budget of the evaluation (including VAT)

The maximum budget available for this evaluation is **EUR 25.000 (including VAT)**

For all tenders within the budgetary framework, the following evaluation grid will be applied:

- Methodological quality of the technical offer: 80%
- Financial offer: 20%.

The offer should be sent to Katrin.jordan@horizont3000.at (cc: alice.bayer@horizont3000.at) until **January 7th**. horizont3000 reserves the right to extend the deadline if offers received by that date do not meet the requirements.

The payment will be distributed as follows:

- 30% on signing the service contract
- 40% at the end of the feedback session and delivery of the draft report
- 30% after validation of the final report by the coordination team.

Annexes

Annex 1: Relevant guidelines and references

- [ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations](#)
- [ADA Results Assessment Form \(RAF\)](#) (see Annex 9 in the respective document)

- [Evaluation Policy](#) for Austrian Development Cooperation
- [OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria](#)
- [Project Link](#) to horizont3000 Website

Annex 2: Quality Checklist for Inception Report (IR)

Annex 3: Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report (ER)

Annex 2: Quality Checklist for Inception Report (IR)

This checklist² is designed to provide guidance to evaluation managers and ADA programme and project managers when assessing and before giving their agreement to the inception report. It also serves as guidance for evaluator(s) when structuring the IR, to ensure that it meets ADA requirements.

The inception report³ should be structured as follows:

1. Background, 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. Workplan
5. Annexes

Criteria	yes/no	Reference Page/Section.
1. Background, Purpose and 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.		
2. Evaluation Design and Approach		
2.1. 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.		

² This quality checklist is adapted from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports. UNEG (2010a).

³ In addition to the specific chapters outlined below, the report also should include a title page, a table of contents, a list lists tables/graphs and figures and a list of acronyms.

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.		
2.2. 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.		

2.3. 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.		
2.4. Data Analysis		
Data processing and interpretation are described.		
The data analysis plan and methods are comprehensive and clearly presented.		
2.5. Limitations, Risks and Mitigation Measures		
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.		
3. Quality Assurance and Ethical Considerations		
Means to ensure upholding of Standards and Principles for Good Evaluations ⁴ are specified.		

⁴ MFA 2019.

ADA's basic principles, its 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.		
4. 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.		
5. Annexes		
Data collection instruments, such as (semi-)structured interview guides, questionnaires		
Comprehensive list of documents relevant for the evaluation.		
Comprehensive list of stakeholders.		

Annex 3: Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report (ER)

This checklist⁵ is designed to provide guidance to evaluation managers and ADA programme and project managers when reviewing and before giving their agreement to the evaluation report. It also serves as guidance for evaluator(s) when structuring the evaluation report⁶, to ensure that it meets ADA requirements.

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

Criteria	yes/no	Reference Page/Section
1. Executive Summary		
Included as a stand-alone chapter in the evaluation report.		
Includes the chapters 2-7 outlined above.		
2. Introduction		
The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it is conducted at this point in time, who needs the information and 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 applied.		
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.		

⁵ This quality checklist adapted from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports. UNEG (2010a).

⁶ In addition to the specific chapters outlined below, the report also should include a title page, a table of contents, a list lists tables/graphs and figures and a list of acronyms.

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		
4.1. 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.		
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 equality, 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.		
4.2. 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.		

4.3. 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.		
Findings are based on evidence.		
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.		
6. Conclusions		
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.		
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		
Firm basis on evidence and conclusions is traceable.		
Relevance to the object and purpose of the evaluation is given.		
The target group for each recommendation is identified.		
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 response.		
Aspects related to equality and human rights aspects are adequately reflected.		

8. Annexes		
Results Assessment Form		
Presentation of evidence along assessment grid per evaluation question		
Instruments for data collection		
List of interview partners (anonymised)		
Bibliography		
Evaluation ToR		
Additional annexes as deemed useful		