

NZAID Guideline on Developing Terms of Reference for Reviews and Evaluations

Summary

Revisions to this tool were approved by the Tools Steering Group on 7 May 2009.
Last updated 10 August 2009.



What does this guideline cover?

The purpose of this guideline is to provide suggestions on how to develop clear Terms of Reference (TOR) for reviews and evaluations commissioned and/or undertaken by NZAID.

Annexes to the guideline include examples of best practice in TOR, and a template to use in developing TOR (with statements that are highly recommended to be included).

This guideline should be used in conjunction with other NZAID Guidelines and Tools that are noted throughout the guideline, including the Activity Cycle Tool: Terms of Reference Guideline which describes generic requirements in TOR (not specific to reviews and evaluations).

What will this guideline do?

This guideline will assist NZAID staff to develop high quality terms of reference for reviews and evaluations.



Who is this guideline for?

This guideline is for all NZAID staff.

Table of Contents

Summary	2
NZAID reviews and evaluations	4
Why evaluate or review?	5
Guiding principles of evaluative activities	5
The importance of TOR	5
What do we mean by TOR?	6
The process of developing TOR	6
What to include in your TOR	7
References	13
Annex 1 Questions to be Answered in an Evaluation Plan	14
Annex 2 Examples of Good Practice	15
Annex 3 Template for TOR for Review or evaluation	20

NZAID reviews and evaluations

Reviews and evaluations¹ commissioned by NZAID are normally undertaken with development partners, and where possible development partners will lead the development of TOR for reviews and evaluations, and the reviews and evaluations.

This guideline is relevant to any reviews and evaluations that NZAID is associated with. There are various types and levels of reviews and evaluations that NZAID will be associated with. These include:

- policy, strategy, programme and Activity² reviews and evaluations
- sectoral evaluations (such as education or health)
- thematic evaluations (such as human rights and gender)
- institutional evaluations and reviews of multilateral, regional and domestic organisations (such as UN organisations, NZ and international NGOs).

Reviews and Evaluations can occur at any stage in the life cycle of a development activity and take a variety of forms. The decision of whether, when and how to undertake a review or evaluation will be driven by the information required and how, when and by whom the findings will be used. The focus and scope will be influenced by the interests of the stakeholders in the activity.

There are common standards for developing Terms of Reference (TOR) for reviews and evaluations, which are described in this Guideline.

¹ As noted in the NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement, an **Evaluation** is an assessment of outcomes and/or impact carried out after a project or programme has become fully operational, during the completion stage, or some time after the activity has been completed. A **Review** is review or evaluation taking place at key points during the lifetime of an activity to gain a better understanding of what is being achieved and to identify how implementation can be improved.

² NZAID uses the term 'activity' (lower case 'a') to refer to any instrument for partner (donor and non-donor) support aimed to promote development, including strategies, policies, programmes or Activities. The term Activity (capital 'A') includes projects and other aid modalities such as programmatic approaches and sector wide approaches.

Why evaluate or review?

The purposes of NZAID evaluative activities are threefold:

Accountability: NZAID is accountable both to Parliament and the New Zealand tax-paying public who fund the work, and to the communities in which NZAID and its partners are working.

Learning: It's important to learn from the successes and mistakes of international development activities funded by the New Zealand Government. Evaluations will help build understanding about what difference NZAID work is making; what impact New Zealand Government funding is having; and whether and how the work NZAID is doing is making lasting changes to the lives of poor and marginalised women, men, boys and girls.

Improvement: The knowledge gained from reviews and evaluations will help to improve the on-going quality of NZAID's work. Information from evaluation should feed back into policies, strategies and activities ensuring on-going improvement to programme delivery and development impact.

Guiding principles of evaluative activities

When developing TOR for reviews and evaluations, consider the guiding principles for NZAID evaluative activities.

- Partnership - work in partnership with development partners and other stakeholders to design and implement reviews or evaluations.
- Transparency and independence - ensure reviews and evaluations are transparent (open and understood by all partners), and independent (carried out in a way that avoids adverse effects of political or organisational influence).
- Participation – stakeholders involved at all stages of the review or evaluation [*Reference: NZAID Evaluation Guidelines on Participatory Evaluation*].
- Capacity building –organisational capacity to undertake reviews or evaluations is enhanced through stakeholder involvement in the review or evaluation process.

[*Reference: NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement*]

The importance of TOR

TOR provide clear guidance on the roles, resources and responsibilities of the evaluation or review contract managers, evaluators or reviewers, and steering, management and/or advisory groups. TOR are part of a contract and can be used in disputes as a legally binding record.

High quality TOR that are acceptable to all key stakeholders are necessary for a high quality evaluation or review. It is important to get the TOR right, and that adequate consultation and discussion contributes to a shared understanding and consensus of what goes into the TOR.

What do we mean by TOR?

The TOR clearly set out the requirements and expectations of a review or evaluation.

They provide a clear explanation, for the review or evaluation, of:

- the background and context
- the rationale and purpose
- the scope
- the objectives and review or evaluation questions
- the methodology and approach
- the governance and management
- the composition of the evaluation or review team and their roles and responsibilities
- the role and involvement of other stakeholders
- the timing of the review or evaluation
- the products and outputs of the review or evaluation, quality and reporting requirements
- how the review or evaluation findings will feed into on-going learning, decision-making and improvement.

The process of developing TOR

The process of developing a TOR should include these steps:

1. establish the need for, and the purpose of the review or evaluation in collaboration with development partners
2. discuss the review or evaluation with an NZAID evaluation advisor, and other appropriate stakeholders and NZAID staff
3. agree with partners who will prepare the draft TOR and establish a consultative process for developing the TOR
4. check and redraft TOR as appropriate following the agreed consultative process
5. ensure the TOR are consistent with the requirements for contracting [*Reference: NZAID Minor Contracting Standards Tool and the generic NZAID Terms of Reference Guideline*]
6. check the draft TOR with appropriate NZAID staff including the appropriate team leader, an evaluation advisor and contract advisor
7. finalise the TOR and have the TOR signed off by the team leader (where appropriate)
8. carry out any procurement procedures as required
9. provide contractors the opportunity to discuss and clarify the TOR (perhaps in the evaluation plan or with the programme manager) before the evaluation or review begins.

What to include in your TOR

The detailed content of TOR will differ for each review or evaluation. The TOR will be tailored to the situation and particular activity being reviewed or evaluated. There are, however, generic elements of a TOR for reviews and evaluations that need to be considered:

Background information and context

Provide a succinct summary of the:

- history of the activity being evaluated or reviewed
- purpose, aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the activity, and how these have changed over time (append the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework to the TOR if appropriate)
- organisational, social and political context in which the review or evaluation will occur
- main stakeholders involved in the activity – including targeted beneficiaries, community groups, civil society organisations, implementing agents, partners and donors.

The rationale and purpose of the review or evaluation

Clearly explain why the review or evaluation is being undertaken and how it will benefit the stakeholders:

- why the review or evaluation is being carried out (specify for different stakeholders)
- the rationale for conducting this review or evaluation at this time
- to whom the results of the review or evaluation will be reported
- how the findings of the review or evaluation will be used (including for accountability, learning and improvement).

The scope of the review or evaluation

The scope describes the boundaries, the scale and/or the limits of the review or evaluation. For example include:

- activities, or aspects of activities, that are being evaluated or reviewed
- time period that is covered by the evaluation or review
- geographical focus
- target groups
- issues that are outside of the scope of the evaluation or review
- which of the five DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) this review or evaluation will address, and why others are not addressed. [*Reference: NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement and NZAID Guideline on Evaluation and the Activity Cycle*]

Objectives of the review or evaluation

This is a key section of the TOR. Here the main issues (objectives) and questions that the review or evaluation needs to answer/address are laid out. Clarity and focus in this section is critical to the outcome of the review or evaluation, and the way the findings of the review or evaluation will be reported.

Refer to the M&E framework for the activity as a basis for identifying the objectives and questions. If an adequate M&E framework is not available, then this can be developed as the first output of the review or evaluation.

While developing objectives, think about the purpose of the evaluation or review, and the DAC Evaluation Criteria that you have specified in the TOR section on scope.

For each objective develop evaluation questions [*Reference: NZAID Guideline on Evaluation and the Activity Cycle*]. Design the questions to be 'open ended' to avoid limiting the evaluator or reviewer. Keep questions specific, and focused on the activity being evaluated or reviewed. Prioritise and limit the number of questions to make the objectives achievable.

Check that there is a logical 'flow' in the TOR between evaluation questions, objectives and purpose: by answering or addressing the evaluation or review questions, the objectives of the review or evaluation should be achieved. By achieving the objectives, the review or evaluation should fulfil its purpose.

Cost effectiveness/value for money: A key objective of an evaluation (and often a review) should be an assessment of whether the activity provided value for money. An assessment of how much money has been spent on activity(s) can be compared qualitatively with the broad outcomes, impacts or changes brought about by the work.

Generally, the evaluation or review should examine value for money in two ways.

- If possible, comparisons of value for money should be drawn with experience or norms in other activities (in the same country/region or internationally), where similar outcomes or impacts have been aimed for and/or achieved.
- The activity's own cost structures should be analysed to identify cost effectiveness issues, including whether savings could have been made (without disproportionately compromising outcomes) through different methods or management, procurement, prioritisation, design, etc.

Evaluation methodology

Avoid prescriptions

Rather than identifying a sequence of tasks, focus on clarifying the **principles** underpinning the evaluation, and an **approach** that will ensure an accountable, independent and transparent evaluative process that builds local capacity.

It is the responsibility of the evaluation/review team to design the detailed methodology to the answer or address the evaluation/review questions set out in the TOR, while adhering to the principles and approach specified in the TOR.

The methodology describes the processes by which evaluations and reviews are carried out. An effective methodology is very important as it engenders stakeholder ownership, accountability, independence, transparency, reliability of findings, and helps build capacity.

In considering the methodology of the review or evaluation, refer back to the purpose of the review or evaluation, and NZAID evaluation guiding principles. Use participatory processes in the review or evaluation where ever possible. [*References: NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement; NZAID evaluation guidelines on Participatory Evaluation*]

In the methodology section of the TOR, provide the evaluators or reviewers with enough guidance so that they understand the approach that is expected, and the principles underlying the review or evaluation. Further, provide enough detail so that evaluators or reviewers will have confidence that the objectives of the TOR can be achieved.

Consider the following key questions when describing the approach and principles of the methodology in the TOR:

- Which of the NZAID Guiding Principles (Page 5) apply to this review or evaluation?
- How can the evaluation or review be made into a capacity building and learning process?
- Who should be involved in the evaluation process and how?
- How can we understand the perspectives of those whose lives should have been affected by this work?
- If a participatory approach is appropriate, in what ways should the evaluation or review be participatory: in the design? in carrying out the review or evaluation? In collecting data and information?, and who should be involved in the participatory process?
- How can we keep this simple, while involving the right groups in the right ways?
- How can we ensure honesty, openness, transparency and independence in this process?

- How will crosscutting and mainstreamed issues be considered in the evaluation? [*Reference: Screening Guide for Mainstreamed and Other Cross Cutting Issues*]
- How can we ensure evaluation and review key informants and participants are identified and available to participate?
- Are there other details that the contracted evaluators/reviewers need to consider?

Ensure that the review team receives copies of and understands the NZAID policies on crosscutting and mainstreamed issues, and other relevant policies.

State in the TOR that reviewer(s) or evaluator(s) provide an **'evaluation plan'** that clearly sets out how the review or evaluation will be carried out in line with the approach and principles specified in the methodology section of the TOR, and describes in detail the methodology that will be used. Some examples of questions that evaluators/reviewers should answer in their 'evaluation plan' are set out in **Annex 1** of these guidelines.

Also state in the methodology section:

- who will 'approve' the evaluation plan (this could be a steering committee, or the NZAID staff managing the review or evaluation)
- the level of detail required in the evaluation plan
- that the 'evaluation plan', questionnaires, checklists of questions and a summary of survey results should be appended to the main written report.

Note: SAEG Evaluation Advisors can assist with the development of the methodology.

Governance and management of the review or evaluation

There is a difference between governance and management. The TOR should clarify and differentiate between the governance (decision-making arrangements, often using a steering committee) and the management of the review or evaluation. Include the following points in a TOR:

- Who is the evaluation or review commissioner/client?
- Governance - what are the roles and responsibilities of a steering committee (e.g. signing off TOR, approving the evaluation plan, addressing issues that arise)?
- Who will ultimately 'sign off' the evaluation report as final?
- Management - what are the management arrangements for the review or evaluation? Who is responsible for contracting issues, and other day to day administration and arrangements? Who is responsible for managing feedback from stakeholders and ensuring the feedback is adequately addressed by the evaluation or review team?
- Who else has responsibility for the evaluation process, and what responsibilities do they hold?
- What level of evaluative independence is required, and how should this reflect in the governance and management arrangements?

Note: You can discuss these questions with a SAEG Evaluation Advisor.

Composition of the evaluation or review team

Review or evaluation can be internally or externally led, and be conducted by an individual or a multi-disciplinary team. An experienced evaluator should be included in the team.

Clearly state the roles and responsibilities of the team leader and team members. If more than one person is to conduct the review or evaluation, all should have specific roles and responsibilities, and each should contribute to the report writing.

Consideration should be given to the level of independence required if the evaluation/review team is likely to include an NZAID staff member.

In the TOR state the attributes required of the evaluation team. Consider the following when choosing team members:

- Given the review or evaluation objectives and likely methodology, what skills, knowledge, experience does the evaluation team need?
- Does the team need to be internal (from NZAID or a Partner) or external to the programme/activity (independent) or should the team be a mixture of the two?
- How will the team reflect gender/ethnic concerns in the work?
- How will partner capacity be developed, and how can team membership assist in developing partner capability?

[Reference: Further information on team composition, skills and experience can be found in the generic NZAID Guideline on Terms of Reference]

Outputs and reporting requirements

[Reference: NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports]

In this section of the TOR note:

- the deadlines for submission of the draft and/or final versions of the evaluation plan, the findings of the review or evaluation, the written report and other outputs of the review or evaluation, and milestones for payment
- the format(s) of the evaluation or review findings/feedback (video, oral feedback in-country/region, debriefings or workshops, written reports, etc)
- the proposed content and approximate length of the written report
- the content of the appendices to the written report
- the method of delivery (e.g. by hand, electronic versions)
- the processes around what will happen to the written report:

- the **final draft** report will be ‘peer reviewed’ by NZAID staff, or other appropriate person(s), and feedback from stakeholders requested³. Further work, or revision of the report, may be required if it is considered that the report does not meet the TOR, there are errors of fact or the report is incomplete or not of an acceptable standard
- the **final report** will be ‘appraised’ before being considered for public release by NZAID’s Evaluation and Research Committee (ERC).

Note that adequate time should be built in for feedback from stakeholders and peer reviews, and resulting changes to the report

[Reference: NZAID Evaluation and Research Committee Process Guideline]

- NZAID’s policy of making part or all of review/evaluation reports publically available (e.g. on the NZAID website) and providing full reports if requested, unless there is prior agreement not to do so
- that any information that could prevent the release of a review/evaluation report under the Official Information or Privacy Acts, or would breach evaluation ethical standards must be placed in a Confidential Annex *[Reference: NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports]*
- that the report will comply with NZAID requirements for review and evaluation, and meet quality standards as described in the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. *[References: Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports; NZAID Style Guide; DAC Evaluation Quality Standards]*

Follow up of evaluation or review

This section of the TOR should outline how:

- the evaluation findings will be discussed, who will be involved in discussions and how any outcomes from this process will be followed up and/or included in the final report
- how the final written report will be followed up.

[Reference: Guideline on Dissemination and Use of Evaluation Findings]

Sources of written information

The TOR should include a list of written material and documents that evaluators or reviewers are required to refer to, but not limited to, as part of the review or evaluation.

³ Some questions that may be asked of stakeholders and peer reviewers are: is the information accurate and relevant? is the report clear and logical? is the analysis of findings strong? are there gaps in the report? are views expressed appropriately?

References

The following documents have been used or referenced in preparing these guidelines:

NZAID Evaluation and Research Committee Process Guideline

NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement

NZAID Guideline on Evaluation and the Activity Cycle

NZAID Evaluation Guidelines on Participatory Evaluation

NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports

NZAID Guideline on Dissemination and Use of Evaluation Findings

NZAID Minor Contracting Standards Tool

NZAID Screening Guide for Mainstreamed and Other Cross Cutting Issues

NZAID Style Guide

NZAID Terms of Reference Guideline

OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards

Finally, a word of warning: TOR can often be too long, too prescriptive or too unfocused.

Keep processes light, enjoyable and most of all useful to engendering learning and understanding changes that have occurred as a result of the activity.

Ensure the TOR are well presented, free of typographical errors, and use language which makes it clear what is expected (eg use 'will' rather than 'should'). [*Reference: NZAID Style Guide*]

Annex 1 Questions to be Answered in an Evaluation Plan

In the methodology section of the TOR, ask evaluators and reviewers to answer these types of questions in their 'evaluation plan':

- Who are the stakeholders in the review or evaluation, what is their interest or stake in the evaluation or review, what type of stakeholder are they (primary – directly benefit from the activity being evaluated or reviewed, secondary – indirectly involved with the activity etc), what issues or constraints are there in their involvement in the review or evaluation (e.g. power issues, access, confidentiality)?
- What information will be needed to answer each of the evaluation or review questions?
- What are the most appropriate methods for data/information collection to address each of the evaluation or review questions? e.g. Will qualitative or quantitative methods be used and why? How will evaluation or review participants be selected? What specific methods will be used – interviews (face-to-face or phone), email questionnaire, workshops, survey, focus groups etc? For quantitative surveys how will the appropriate sample size be decided, and what statistical analysis will be used to allow judgement on the reliability of results?
- From whom will information be collected to answer each of the evaluation or review questions, and how will the evaluation or review team ensure that the opinions of all appropriate stakeholders (eg women and men, young and old, powerful and less powerful) are included?
- What questions will be asked in questionnaires or interviews?
- How will information gathered be cross checked?
- What procedures will be used for data analysis – how will qualitative data such as interview notes be analysed, how will survey results be analysed?
- How will the way that crosscutting and mainstreamed issues (gender, environment and human rights, and if appropriate HIV/AIDS and conflict) have been addressed in the activity being evaluated or reviewed be assessed, and how will the evaluation/review be conducted in a way that takes crosscutting issues into account? [*Reference: Screening Guide for Mainstreamed and Other Cross Cutting Issues*]
- How will the findings be fed back and discussed with appropriate stakeholders during the evaluation process, and how will this be incorporated into the report?
- What risks, limitations or constraints are there likely to be to the review or evaluation and how can these be mitigated?
- How will ethical issues be addressed? For example how will participants of the review or evaluation be informed of the purpose and use of information they will provide? How will sensitivity to gender and culture be ensured during the review or evaluation? Is informed consent required from evaluation or review participants, if so how will this be obtained? How will confidentiality of participants be ensured and how will confidential material be stored? What potential harm to participants is there and how will potential harm be minimised?

Annex 2 Examples of Good Practice

The following are examples (section by section) of good practice that were included in NZAID TOR for evaluations and reviews.

Purpose and rationale of review or evaluation:

Adapted from the TOR for the Evaluation of NZAID support to World Vision – Humanitarian / livelihood response to Manam Island Internally Displaced (2008), this example is well written and includes aspects considered in these guidelines to be important. It specifies the purposes of the evaluation for the different stakeholders

The two World Vision projects which were implemented concurrently 2005-2006 are now complete and it is an appropriate time to undertake an evaluation. The broad purpose of the evaluation is to provide:

- *analysis and recommendations for the Government of PNG which will assist the government to develop lasting solutions to the specific humanitarian and livelihood needs of the displaced Manam Islanders*
- *information for NZAID to determine whether and how it should best support solutions that are developed by the Government of PNG*
- *general learning from the Manam Islanders situation and the humanitarian/livelihood response as a case study of permanent environmental displacement*

Scope:

Adapted from the TOR for the VSA Review (2008), this example is well written and covers most of the important aspects that need to be considered in the scope. However, note that scope should **ALSO** include which of the DAC criteria (efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact) the review will address.

The time period the review will cover is the duration of the current funding arrangement, that is, 1 July 2003 – 30 July 2007.

The review will consider all VSA's work except that of the External Relations Unit (public awareness, development education and fundraising). It will not involve undertaking a field visit to Africa, but will be able to draw on the feedback provided by VSA's partners to NZAID as part of the ongoing Africa Strategy Review. The review will consider key questions in particular detail in two geographical localities.

The main stakeholders involved in the review are staff of both NZAID and VSA, including New Zealand and in-country staff, and in-country partner organisations.

Objectives:

Adapted from the TOR for the Evaluation of the NZAID/Tonga Graduate Diploma in Public Sector Management Courses (2008), these objectives are well written with clear evaluation objectives associated with each objective. The objectives address the DAC Criteria of effectiveness and relevance.

1. *To assess the effectiveness of the Dip PSM programme in achieving the objectives and outcomes expressed in the original letter of commission with the Massey University Institute of Executive Development (25 March 1998).*
 - *How effective was the course documentation, teaching resources, delivery mechanisms and student materials for the Dip PSM in Tonga?*
 - *To what extent did all reports and documentation relate to the various intakes of the diploma programme?*
 - *Using the data from a tracer study of the graduates, to what extent are the objectives and outcomes of the course reflected in their ongoing work?*
 - *What are the issues that supported or constrained graduates from implementing the outcomes of the course in their ongoing work?*

2. *To assess the relevance of the Dip PSM to the needs of the public service in Tonga.*
 - *To what extent do the Tongan authorities feel the Dip PSM supported activities of the GOT to strengthen its public sector?*
 - *Was the material studied under the Dip PSM programme relevant to the management of the public sector in Tonga?*
 - *How could training assistance better coordinate with and support continuing development and increasing effectiveness of the management of the public sector in Tonga?*
 - *What other donor activity strengthens the public sector in Tonga, especially with reference to training and capacity building?*

3. *To undertake an evaluation of the management of the Tonga Dip PSM programme.*
 - *Was the reporting satisfactory and meet agreed objectives?*
 - *Was diploma programme monitored and evaluated effectively during the activity?*
 - *Was the diploma programme cost effective?*
 - *Was administration and management of the Dip PSM - including any roles undertaken by NZAID (the DPM and the Post) - and the GOT and Massey University –effective?*

Value for money

Adapted from the review of the Tongan National Centre for Women and Children (2008), this statement clearly described expectations in terms of reviewing value for money.

While an assessment of relevance and sustainability is the primary focus of the review, NZAID also emphasises a ‘value for money’ approach. The review will therefore provide an assessment of how the money spent compares with the broad outcomes, impacts and changes brought about by the scheme. The review will consider whether savings could have been made without compromising outcomes, eg through improved design or management of the activity.

Methodology

Adapted from the TOR for the Review of the Cook Islands Marine Resources Institutional Strengthening (CIMRIS) Programme (2008), this methodology (although not including all the aspects suggested in these guidelines) clearly described approach without being prescriptive and requested an evaluation plan (termed a 'design and plan for the review').

The review will ... a participatory approach. This will include (at a minimum) a pre-review briefing with stakeholders (in this case PCC members), participatory information gathering, and an end of visit debriefing to check that the draft findings and recommendations are representative of the stakeholder views.

The team leader will develop a draft design and plan for the review methodology based on the briefing with CIMRIS Programme Steering Committee in Rarotonga and in consultation with the team member(s) (by telephone and/or email if necessary). The Steering Committee will have the opportunity to review the design prior to finalisation.

The approach taken will ensure that the views of all PCC members are heard and incorporated into the findings or the review. It will specify the roles and responsibilities of each team member. The draft design of methodology and timeframe for the review will be submitted to the Steering Committee and refined as necessary.

It is not anticipated that a visit to the outer Cook Islands will be feasible within the timeframe. Pearl farmers (from Manihiki) and other people involved in the marine sector in the outer islands and other leading sector members may be contacted by telephone and email or face to face interviews are not possible. Industry representatives are mostly based in Rarotonga.

In Cook Islands the review team will:

- a. Attend an in-country briefing with NZAID and the Steering Committee*
- b. Conduct the review*
- c. Present a draft summary of findings at the end of the in-country mission in the form of a short briefing paper and to a workshop with MMR and other stakeholders.*

Management and governance of the review or evaluation

This example from the VSA Review (2008) clearly noted who was commissioning the review, and the composition and function of a steering committee. However, note that this section should **also include** a note on the management of the review (and who will approve the final report).

NZAID is commissioning the review. NZAID will choose a consultant or team of consultants to undertake the review, in consultation with VSA. A steering group will be established by NZAID including a representative of SAEG, the Civil Society Programme Manager, the CEO of VSA and another person nominated by VSA. The steering group will:

- Provide feedback to the consultant on the review plan and budget*
- Provide practical support to the consultant(s)*
- Provide written comment on a draft report.*

Composition of the evaluation or review team

From the TOR for the Evaluation of NZAID support to World Vision – Humanitarian/livelihood response to Manam Island Internally Displaced (2008), this section on composition of the review team, and responsibilities, was clear and well written.

The evaluation team will be recruited locally by NZAID in PNG. The evaluation team will have strong professional skills and experience in:

1. *participatory evaluation*
2. *humanitarian relief*
3. *livelihoods under displacement situations*
4. *resettlement within a PNG context*
5. *gender analysis*
6. *fluency in Tok Pisin and if possible Manam language.*

A Team Leader will be appointed by NZAID to lead the evaluation and take responsibility for ensuring the timing and quality of process and outputs and drawing together the final report.

The Team Leader is required to have skills in:

1. *team leadership*
2. *excellent communication skills (including report writing)*
3. *evaluation*
4. *humanitarian and/or Livelihoods sectors.*

Two team members – one from OCHA and one from Bismarck Ramu Group have been recruited to ensure full coverage of the above skills. The team leader will agree on the teams' respective roles once the team meets in PNG (or in correspondence prior to meeting). The team leader will be responsible for the final report but the other team members will work on various aspects of the report (as agreed by the team and NZAID).

The Evaluation team leader and members will be sufficiently independent of the agencies involved in funding and delivery of the programme and the affected communities to be able to elicit.

Outputs and reporting requirements

Adapted from the review of the Tongan National Centre for Women and Children (2008), while this example was chosen because it was concise and well written, it should have also have included a description of what would happen to the final report in terms of peer review and appraisal, that the report should comply with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, and that a summary of the report will be placed on the NZAID website, and the full report provided if requested (any information that could prevent the release of the report should be included in a confidential annex). Also dates of deadlines for the outputs are needed.

The consultant will produce the following outputs:

Output 1: a methodology framework (evaluation plan) for discussion with NZAID at the outset of the review;

Output 2: end-of-visit workshop in Tonga to feedback draft findings to key stakeholders;

Output 3: a verbal debrief with NZAID (both New Zealand High Commission and NZAID Wellington staff, by teleconference) following the completion of the end-of-visit workshop;

Output 4: a draft written report within five days on completing the in-country review;

Output 5: a final written report within five days of receiving feedback from NZAID.

The consultant should refer to the NZAID guideline on the structure of review and evaluation reports to ensure correct formatting and structure. The Contractor shall ensure that the assignment is carried out with due diligence, efficiency and economy in accordance with the time specified in this Contract, observing sound management and technical practices, and complying with professional consulting standards.

The Tonga Programme will prepare a submission to NZAID's Evaluation Committee. This Committee will make recommendations regarding the distribution of the report within NZAID and advise whether any additional external distribution steps need to be taken.

Follow up of evaluation or review

This example from the review of the Tongan National Centre for Women and Children (2008) is concise and well written and describes what will happen after the final report has been accepted. It does not, however, consider follow up on preliminary findings.

Following submission of the final report, NZAID (including the Pacific Group, Strategy Advisory and Evaluation Group and the NZHC) will consider the draft report in consultation with the NCWC. NZAID will then work with the NCWC on implementing agreed recommendations.

Sources of written information

From review of Fair Trade Australia and New Zealand (2008)

*Oxfam/NZAID Funding Arrangement
FTAANZ & FLANZ Joint Business Plan "Moving Fair Trade Forward in ANZ" 2005-2008
Programme Logic Framework
7 x Steering Committee Meetings – Papers, Reports and Minutes
4 x 6 monthly Reports to NZAID
End of Project Report
FTAANZ and FLANZ Project Staff Job Descriptions
FTAANZ Constitution
FLANZ Constitution
FTAANZ/FLANZ Service Agreement
FTAANZ Executive Committee Meetings – Papers, Reports and Minutes
FLANZ Board Meetings – Papers, Reports and Minutes
NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement
DAC Evaluation Quality Standards
NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports*

Annex 3 Template for TOR for Review or evaluation

This template includes sections required in TOR, main aspects to include in each section, and examples of statements to include. Note that this template should be used in conjunction with the explanation and description in the guidelines, and examples of best practice in Annex 2.

Background information and context

Include history, overall purpose, aims and objectives of the activity being evaluated/reviewed. Include context and main stakeholders involved.

Rational and purpose (of the review or evaluation)

Include why the review or evaluation is being carried out at this time, to whom the results will be reported and how the findings will be used.

Scope (of the review or evaluation)

Include activity(ies) being evaluated/reviewed, time period covered, geographic focus, target groups, issues outside the scope.

The TOR should state which of the five DAC criteria are being assessed, and if any are not to be assessed why not. For example: *'this evaluation (or review) will assess the efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and relevance of the activity. Impact will not be considered as the activity is not yet complete and it is too early to assess impacts.'*

Objectives (of the review or evaluation)

Include objectives and evaluation questions. Assessing **value for money** will normally be one objective of the review or evaluation. Such as objective could be worded *'... to assess whether the activity provided value for money'* and the evaluation questions could be worded *'How did the activity compare in terms of cost with other comparable activities that have had similar outcomes and impacts?'* and/or *'Could savings have been made in the activity (without compromising outcomes) through different systems of management, procurement, prioritisation design etc?'*

Methodology

Include approach and principles of the methodology, noting the guiding evaluation principles which will underpin the review or evaluation. For example include some or all of the following: *'The evaluation (or review) will be guided by the NZAID evaluation principles. The evaluation team will use a participatory approach, work in partnership with ... to design and conduct the evaluation and make a contribution to the evaluative capability of Evaluative activities will be transparent, and independent' (Reference: NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement).'*

Include a requirement that the evaluators/reviewers provide an evaluation plan. For example: *'The evaluation team should prepare an evaluation plan which will be submitted to ..., and will be approved by The evaluation plan should include The evaluation plan (or a summary of it) should be appended to the report, and the main points of the evaluation plan included in the methodology section of the report.'*

Ensure that cross-cutting and mainstreamed issues are considered in the evaluation and review. State that: *'The evaluation/review will describe and assess how the activity being evaluated/reviewed has addressed cross-cutting and mainstreamed issues of gender, environment and human rights (and conflict and HIV/Aids if appropriate). The contractor will ensure that the evaluation is conducted in a way that incorporates crosscutting issues. Details of how this will be done will be made explicit in the evaluation plan. (Reference: NZAID Screening Guide for Mainstreamed and other Crosscutting Issues)'*.

Management and governance (of the review or evaluation)

Include the evaluation/review commissioner/client, management and governance arrangements, who will sign off the report, and roles and responsibilities of team leader and team members.

Composition of the evaluation/review team

List the attributes (skills and experience) required of the evaluation/review team and team leader, and responsibilities.

Outputs and reporting requirements

Include outputs, deadlines for submission of evaluation plan and other outputs, milestones for payment, format, content etc of outputs. Include the following statements:

'The final draft report will be peer reviewed. NZAID will advise the contractor if further work and/or revision of the report is required if it the report does not meet the TOR or the quality is not of an acceptable standard. The final report will be appraised before being considered for public release by NZAID's Evaluation and Research Committee (ERC).

'The report, or any part of the report, will be made available publically (e.g. on the NZAID website), unless there is good reason not to do so. Any information that could prevent the release of the report under the Official Information or Privacy Acts, or would breach ethical standards, must be placed in a confidential annex'.

'The report will comply with NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports and DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The NZAID Guideline on the Structure of Review and Evaluation Reports and DAC Quality Standards are available ...'.

Follow-up (of the review or evaluation)

Include aspects of how the findings of the evaluation will be discussed and with whom and how outcomes of this process will be followed up.

Sources of written information

Include a list of written material that the evaluation/review team should refer to as part of the review or evaluation. This list should include relevant NZAID guidelines.