**ANNEX 1A**

Template: Terms of Reference (TORs) for project evaluations

**Who is this Template for?** This Template is for staff who manage evaluations to prepare the Terms of Reference for both OED-managed and evaluations under Budget Holder’s responsibility. It is valid for both Mid-Term and Final Evaluations, but only for non-GEF projects.

**What is the purpose of this Template?** This template suggests a structure and provides guidance on content. It sets out to harmonise content and ensure quality for evaluation Terms of Reference.

**How should this Template be used?** This template is used alongside the Project Evaluation Manual to ensure that OED quality standards are adequately followed.

**How is this Template structured?** Within this Template:

- Guidance to complete each section
- Specific sections outlining differences between OED-managed and decentralised evaluations are included when relevant.
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Acronyms and abbreviations

[Insert your acronyms and abbreviations here. Check through the whole document and list all the acronyms and abbreviations you have used. Do not include acronyms and abbreviations that are not in the document.

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Budget holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Country Programming Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI</td>
<td>Expression of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Evaluation team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPMIS</td>
<td>Field Project Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Follow-up Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Lead technical officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>Lead technical unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>FAO Office of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Programme Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>Project Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>FAO Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>Sub-regional office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>FAO Investment Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSR</td>
<td>Donor Liaison and Resource Mobilization Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to the template

This document is the template for developing evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) of projects and programmes funded through voluntary contributions by resource partners. It provides information on the process of conducting an evaluation and specific guidance on how to complete each chapter of the ToR.

The primary intended users of the evaluation ToR are: FAO staff responsible for the project, including the Budget Holder (BH) who initiates the evaluation process, the Project Task Force (PTF), and the designated Evaluation Manager (EM).

This template is a living document that can be modified to adapt to the context of a specific evaluation, as well as to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the evaluation process.

Please note the following formatting requirements:

- Body paragraphs should be numbered by applying the Paragraph OED style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)
- For numbered lists use the List Number style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)
- For bulleted lists use the List Bullet style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)

- The text in italics is provided as guidance and should not be included in the final version of the TOR.
1. **Background and Context of the Project/Program**

This section should provide evaluators with an overview of the developmental context in which the project is implemented.

This includes critical social, economic, political, geographic and demographic factors directly related to the project. The section should be focused and concise (a maximum of one page), making clear what is being evaluated.

The section should include the following descriptors:

i. The name/title of the project under evaluation;

ii. Description of the project:
   a. When and how the project was initiated;
   b. Brief description of the different project components;
   c. Geographic location and intended beneficiaries (if possible broken down by component);
   d. Project duration and its implementation status within that timeframe;
   e. Resources: human and financial, specifying contributions from FAO, donors and other funding sources; and
   f. Key stakeholders involved in the project, including the implementing agencies and relevant partnerships.

iii. Description of the context.
   a. Context (region, country, landscape, where relevant also challenges);

iv. How the subject fits into the national policies and priorities, as well as FAO priorities (Country Programming Framework, Strategic Objectives, Regional Initiatives, etc.).

Indicate which type of evaluation (Mid-Term or Final) as well as how this evaluation relates to previous or ongoing evaluations, if applicable.

1.1 **Theory of change**

A theory of change (ToC) helps to identify evaluation objectives and questions. Include here the project theory of change, if available. A post-facto ToC can also be developed for the purposes of the evaluation and with OED’s support, if necessary.

1.2 **Results achieved**

This sub-section highlights results achieved since the beginning of the project implementation. Avoid listing activities and choose instead to focus on what has been accomplished (following the ToC presented, if available). The purpose of the section is to indicate to the evaluation team the current level of progress in project implementation.
2. **Evaluation purpose**

The purpose of the evaluation explains why the evaluation is being conducted and why at this particular point in time. It should answer the question: "why are we doing this evaluation?" If the purpose section is short, you can merge “Evaluation purpose and scope” into one section.

Identify the primary intended users of the evaluation, stakeholders who can use the findings of the evaluation to affect change. This can include the BH, PTF, FAO technical staff, the donor, and other external stakeholders. The PTF and in particular the EM should seek to elaborate the purpose of the evaluation in a consultative manner, in collaboration with all primary intended users and specifying how they intend to use the evaluation results. Please note the utility of the evaluation and related products may vary by stakeholder.

It is possible to address several purposes and uses in a single evaluation design. However, it is necessary to decide during the evaluation design phase where resources will be primarily focused.

3. **Evaluation scope**

The scope of the evaluation identifies the “evaluand”, or the object of the evaluation (what is being evaluated). It also defines the parameters of the evaluation: the time frame, the segments of the target population to be included; geographic areas of focus; stakeholders to be involved; and which (if not all) components of the project will be included.

To the extent possible, an explanation should be provided to justify choices made, e.g. a focus on a selected component or geographic area.

4. **Evaluation objective and key questions**

The objective of the evaluation describes what the evaluation is expected to achieve. For example, objectives may be to assess the extent to which a pilot project has achieved its intended results and identify design and implementation issues that need to be addressed before scaling up the project model.

While the evaluation objective summarizes what the evaluation will assess, the questions identify what needs to be looked at to meet these objectives. The evaluation questions target the key information needs of the evaluation, the answers for which the primary intended users of the evaluation can use to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge.

4.1 **Evaluation questions**

Evaluation questions should be based on the project objectives and on the Theory of Change (ToC). Questions should be sufficiently broad but at the same time help focus the evaluation, telling a comprehensive story by presenting the evaluation’s main findings.

Evaluation questions must be agreed upon by the Evaluation Manager and principal stakeholders, and refined in consultation with the evaluation team.

Below are examples of evaluation questions:
• Were stated outcomes\(^1\) or outputs achieved?
• What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
• To what extent have FAO outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
• Has the FAO partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
• What factors contributed to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project?
• Was gender equality and other equity issues mainstreamed in the project?
• Is the causal relationship between inputs (resources) and outputs adequate and coherent?

Questions related to mainstreaming gender equality in line with FAO Gender Policy, should be included in all cases in which gender is relevant to the evaluated project/programme. Examples of questions to assess the project’s alignment with FAO Gender Policy are the following:

• Were gender equality considerations reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries?
• Were gender equality considerations taken into account in project implementation and management?
• Have gender relations and equality been or will be affected by the project? Particular attention will be devoted to the four FAO’s Gender Equality Objectives attainable at the level of initiative or thematic area: i) Equal decision-making; ii) Equal access to productive resources; iii) Equal access to goods, services and markets; iv) Reduction of women’s work burden.

5. Methodology

This section should identify how information will be collected and specify how to answer each evaluation question.

The ToR elaborates an overall approach to conduct the evaluation, including on how to address questions, data sources and evaluation tools likely to yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions, given resource limitations and other constraints.

The evaluation should adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards\(^2\) and align with OED Manual, procedures and methodological guidelines.

The methodology described in the ToRs, as well as the identified ToC, should be based on the following:

---
\(^1\) Outcome definition: behavioural changes, among the ‘boundary’ partners of a project. Identifying the behavioral changes that a project aims to deliver becomes synonymous with its outcomes, and part of a wider process of focusing on how change happens.

\(^2\) http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21
• objectives and intended/unintended outcomes\(^3\) of the project/programme and its activities;
• strengths and/or challenges related to design and implementation of the project/programme given the specific context;
• factors that facilitated or hindered the outcomes;
• actual and potential limitations in carrying out the evaluation (time available, lack of documentation, baseline and/or monitoring system, e.g.) and;
• the significance of outcomes vis-à-vis the achievement of national and CPF objectives.

For complex evaluations and in all cases which foresee an inception mission, the ToC and the methodology should be further refined and if possible tested by the evaluation team during the inception mission.

Depending on the size of the evaluation, each question can be divided into sub-questions, creating an evaluation matrix\(^4\). The evaluation team is responsible for developing the evaluation matrix.

Final decisions about the design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations among the project team, OED, the evaluators, and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to answer the evaluation questions, meeting the evaluation purpose and objectives.

The evaluation should adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation, and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

6. Roles and responsibilities\(^5\)

This section describes the different roles that key stakeholders play in the design and implementation of the evaluation in the case of OED-led evaluation and in the case of decentralised evaluations.

---

\(^3\) Un-intended outcomes are those not foreseen and “intended” by a purposeful action but still occurring thanks to it. A useful reading on Outcome Harvesting can be found at the following link: http://www.managingforimpact.org/sites/default/files/resource/outome_harvesting_brief_final_2012-05-2-1.pdf


\(^5\) On evaluation roles, responsibilities and quality assurance, please refer to OED Manual for Decentralised Offices.
6.1 **For OED-managed evaluations**

1. The **Office of Evaluation (OED)**, in particular the Evaluation Manager (EM), develops the first draft ToR with inputs from the PTF and other stakeholders, and based on document review. The ToR includes the Evaluation Theory of Change.

2. The OED EM is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and for the identification of the evaluation team members. The OED EM shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided as well as for the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report.

3. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

4. The **Project Task Force (PTF)**, which includes the FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Team of the project to be evaluated, are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, as necessary, make available information and documentation, and comment on the terms of reference and draft evaluation report. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and by other members of the PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

5. The **Evaluation Team (ET)** is responsible for drafting the inception report, further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided by OED. The ET will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, consults the BH and PTF where necessary. The ET is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

---

6The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team, will be decided on a case-by-case basis.
6. The ETL guides and coordinates the ET members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating all inputs.

6.2 For Evaluations under Budget Holder’s responsibility

- The BH is responsible for launching the evaluation, informing OED, and assigning key responsibilities throughout the process. The BH, should appoint an Evaluation Manager, who will be responsible for: ensuring all steps of the evaluation are carried out.
- developing the first draft evaluation ToR, ensuring input from all project stakeholders (including the donor);
- incorporating OED’s comments and finalizing the ToR;
- identifying and recruiting the Evaluation Team, with backstopping as needed from OED;
- briefing the ET at the beginning of the evaluation on process, methodology and tools, with support from OED focal point;
- ensuring wide availability of all project information and documentation, including available baselines, progress reports, monitoring data, background information on project context, stakeholder analysis, etc.;
- organizing meetings with relevant stakeholders and partners for the ET;
- organizing the field mission(s), including all logistical aspects;
- circulating draft evaluation report for comments to OED and to all project stakeholders and make sure these are addressed by the Evaluation Team;
- ensuring communication among all evaluation stakeholders, as well as for timeliness of key evaluation deliverables.
- share the final report with OED and with the BH

7. The BH is responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and Follow-up Report to the evaluation, with support and inputs from PTF members and other FAO or non FAO stakeholders, as relevant.

8. The Office of Evaluation (OED) will appoint an OED evaluation focal point to provide technical backstopping through the evaluation process, including guidance and punctual support to the EM and to the PTF on technical issues related to evaluation. In particular, OED shall support the EM/PTF in the identification of the evaluation team members, participate in interview panels, brief the ET on the evaluation process and discuss, if necessary, evaluation methodology and tools with the ET. In addition, OED

---

7 For further details related to the tasks of the ETL and ET members, please refer to Annex 2A of OED Manual for Decentralised Offices - “Template job descriptions”

8 The PTF will be responsible for the administrative procedures related to the ET’s recruitment.
reviews the draft ToR and draft report for Quality Assurance purposes to review presentation, coherence with the ToR, and finally review the quality, clarity and soundness of evidence and analysis upon which evaluation conclusions and recommendations are based.

9. The Evaluation Team’s (ET) roles and responsibilities are the same as outlined in section 6.1 (paragraphs 5-6).

7. **Evaluation team composition and profile**

   This section details the skills and competencies needed in the ET team, the expected structure and composition of the ET, and the roles and responsibilities of the ET members.

   The section also should specify the type of evidence (resumes, work samples, references) that will be expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience. The ToR should explicitly demand evaluators’ independence, and ensure lack of involvement in the design, execution or advising of any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation.

8. **Evaluation products (deliverables)**

   This section describes the key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing. At the minimum, these products should include:

   i. Evaluation Matrix

   v. Evaluation inception report (for all complex project or programme evaluations) — an inception report should be prepared by the evaluation team before going into the main data collection phase. It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, explain how each evaluation question will be answered by detailing methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.

   vi. Draft evaluation report—the project team and key stakeholders in the evaluation should comment on the draft evaluation report.

   vii. Final evaluation report: should include an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. The report will be prepared in English/French/Spanish, with numbered paragraphs, following the OED template for report writing. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO’s responsibility.

---

9 See Annex 3A of the Project Evaluation Manual for the evaluation report outline.

10 Select as appropriate.
Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

9. Evaluation timeframe

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time-frame (e.g. briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch of the evaluation</td>
<td>6 months before the project NTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BH/PTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR finalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF and OED for comments and quality control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team identification and recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading background documentation provided by PTF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of ET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF, supported by OED when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the Evaluation Mission (travel arrangements, meetings arrangements with project stakeholders and partners, field visits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>ET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Report first draft for circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF and OED for comments and quality control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Report final draft for circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF and OED for comments and quality control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of the recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>ET to the PTF (OED may attend)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report, including publishing and graphic design</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Response</td>
<td>1 month after the Final report is issued</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up report</td>
<td>1 year after the MR is issued</td>
<td></td>
<td>PTF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Annexes

Annexes can be used to provide additional detail about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators. Some examples include:

1. **Overview of the Available Documents**: For the evaluation team to have a good overview of all the documentation available here an updated list is provided.

2. **Project Results Framework and Theory of Change**: Provides more detailed information on the project being evaluated.

3. **Key stakeholders and partners (Stakeholder Mapping)**: A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, together with an indication of their affiliation and relevance for the evaluation and their contact information. This annex can also suggest sites to be visited.

4. **Documents to be consulted**: A list of important documents and webpages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report.

5. **Evaluation Matrix**: The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details the evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer; data sources & data collection methods; analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source & data collection method; and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

6. **Project evaluation report outline**: Here their main outline for the evaluation report should be provided, with reference to the outline for project evaluations.

7. **FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019**: Outcomes that are related to the strategic objectives are described here:
   
   [http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mg015e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mg015e.pdf)
ANNEX 2A

Template: Consultants job descriptions for Evaluations under Budget Holder’s responsibility

Team Leader and Team Member
Name: [Name of Consultant]

Job Title: Senior Evaluation Specialist/Team Leader

Division/Department: [Name of Division/Department in charge of the evaluation, for example, the country/regional office or the LTU]

Programme/Project Number: (Mid-Term) Evaluation of the Project "[Name of Project (Code)]"*

Location: Home-based with missions to HQ and the project countries ([Name of Countries])

Expected Start Date of Assignment: [EOD of Consultant] Duration: [Number] days

Reports to: Name: [Name of Supervisor] Title: [Job Title of Supervisor]

* Please note: If this TOR is for Consultant / PSA.SBS contract, the minimum relevant experience required for the assignment is as follows:
  1 year for a category C
  5 years for a category B
  12 years for a category A

** Please enter a short title (max 25 chars) for this assignment.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF TASK(S) AND OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED

[Overall Project Description – one paragraph]

[Project Objectives – one paragraph]

Under the direct supervision of the [Job Title of Supervisor, for example, Budget Holder, Project Coordinator, Operations Officer or LTO etc.], the Senior Evaluation Specialist/Team Leader is responsible for coordinating the contribution of the evaluation team for the Evaluation of "[Name of Project (Code)]". His/her mandate is derived from and must fully comply with the overall Terms of Reference for the Evaluation. He/She reports to the [Job Title of Supervisor].

The team leader will coordinate the evaluation team’s activities, ensure that the methodology foreseen in the ToR is fully implemented and organize the division of labour within the team according to respective areas of expertise.

[Include if relevant:] He/she will also cover in detail the analysis of the [insert as appropriate] aspects of the project and the following sections of the evaluation report: [insert as appropriate].

Specific responsibilities include:

- Review relevant background documentation made available by [Division/Department] and the project team, including the project document, the project’s logframe, progress and final reports, workshop and technical reports, among others;
- Review and complement the methodology described in the TORs, prepare an evaluation matrix and contribute to the field work design if needed.
- In accordance with the evaluation ToR: produce an evaluation Theory of Change, the Evaluation matrix and the Inception Report; further develop the evaluation methodology; contribute to the preparation of data collection tools, including questionnaires, check-lists and interview protocols as appropriate; insofar as possible, participate to the finalization of the team’s work programme;
• Lead and coordinate the collection of primary data by the evaluation team through, inter alia, interviews and meetings, face to face or virtual, with FAO concerned officers in HQ, and/or [list as appropriate: project coordination unit, FAO Decentralized Offices]; and during the country visits, with key stakeholders including the Government, the FAO Representation, external partners, project teams and ultimate beneficiaries as appropriate;

• Coordinate the collection of primary data by the evaluation team during the briefing and the country visits through, inter alia, interviews and meetings, face to face or virtual, with key stakeholders such as the government entities (including the [Name of Project Partners]), the FAO Representative, international organizations, information firms, private sector, civil society, academia and research institutes;

• Lead and coordinate the collection of relevant secondary data, in addition to the initial desk reviews carried out by OED, as required and identified in the evaluation matrix;

• Ensure that all the primary and secondary data collected are recorded during the evaluation process, and organized in a structured format agreed with [Division/Department];

• Lead the analysis and discussion of findings within the evaluation team to reach preliminary conclusions that answer all evaluation issues and questions, as well as to formulate preliminary recommendations in line with findings. Ensure that all the findings are sufficiently triangulated and validated.

• Lead, coordinate and prepare all deliverables planned in the evaluation Terms of Reference. These include: preparing the final draft report according to specifications provided in the ToRs, integrating comments and suggestions received during the stakeholder meetings, and after circulation to OED, FAO and other stakeholders, as appropriate; finalize the evaluation report; prepare the comment matrix.

• Coordinate the participation and contribution of team members in all deliverables as required.

• Present the evaluation findings to key stakeholders as required; and

• [Other Responsibilities stated in the Evaluation TOR, for example, Lead in the conduct of a Theory of Change Workshop and based on the workshop results, elaborate and update the project’s Theory of Change]

• Provide specialised expertise in [complete as appropriate], assessing outputs, deliverables and activities carried out under his/her specific area – (outputs/outcomes could be listed – if necessary)

### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outputs:</th>
<th>Required Completion Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[list as appropriate, eg:]</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of change/Evaluation matrix</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work design/ inception report</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field reports</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary data in support of evaluation findings in respective area of expertise</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of the report</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partial payments of 70% of the honorarium will be released upon delivery of the first evaluation draft. The remaining 30% of the honorarium will be authorized upon completion of the above deliverables.
Name: [Name of Consultant]

Job Title: [Technical Expertise of Consultant, for example – Forestry Expert or NRM Expert]/Team Member

Division/Department: [Name of Division/Department in charge of the evaluation, for example, the country/regional office or the LTU]

Programme/Project Number: Mid-Term Review/Final Evaluation of the Project "[Name of Project (Code)]"

Location: Home-based with missions to HQ and the project countries ([Name of Countries])

Expected Start Date of Assignment: [EOD of Consultant] Duration: [Number] days

Reports to: Name: [Name of Supervisor] Title: [Job Title of Supervisor]

* Please note: If this TOR is for Consultant / PSA.SBS contract, the minimum relevant experience required for the assignment is as follows:
  1 year for a category C
  5 years for a category B
  12 years for a category A

** Please enter a short title (max 25 chars) for this assignment.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF TASK(S) AND OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED

[Overall Project Description – one paragraph]

[Project Objectives – one paragraph]

Under the administrative supervision of the [Job Title of Supervisor, for example, Project Coordinator, Operations Officer or LTO, BH etc.], the [Technical Expertise of Consultant, for example – Forestry Expert or NRM Expert]/Team Member the Team Member will contribute to the evaluation for his/her area of specialization and is responsible for supporting the Team Leader of this evaluation. His/Her mandate is derived from and must fully comply with the overall Terms of Reference for the Evaluation. He/She will provide inputs as agreed with the Team Leader and Evaluation Manager. The team member reports to the Evaluation Manager.

He/she will also cover in detail the analysis of the [insert as appropriate] aspects of the project and the following sections of the evaluation report: [insert as appropriate].

Specific responsibilities include:

- Review relevant background documentation made available by [Division/Department] and the project team: the project document, the project’s logframe, progress and final reports, workshop and technical reports, among others;
- In accordance with the methodological approach described in the ToR: contribute to the preparation of data collection tools, including questionnaires, check-lists and interview protocols as appropriate; insofar as possible, participate to the finalization of the team’s work programme;
- Participate actively in the collection of primary data as required and identified in the evaluation matrix, under the leadership of the Team Leader during the country visits through, inter alia, interviews and meetings, face-to-face or virtual, with key stakeholders such as the government entities, project partners ([insert as appropriate])...
name of project partners]), FAO Representative, external partners, project beneficiaries, international organizations, private sector, civil society, academia and research institutes;

- Provide specialised expertise in [complete as appropriate], assessing outputs, deliverables and activities carried out under his/her specific area – (outputs/outcomes could be listed – if necessary)
- Contribute to the consolidation of all evidence collected during the evaluation process in a structured format following the key evaluation questions and criteria;
- Ensure that all the primary and secondary data collected are recorded during the evaluation process, and organized in a structured format following the key evaluation questions, based on which triangulation of all the findings will be performed;
- Participate in the analysis and discussion of evaluation issues and questions with the team and formulate conclusions and recommendations in his/her specific field of expertise and as discussed and agreed with the Team Leader and the Evaluation Manager.
- Deliver articulate and written inputs on the specific areas of assessment, as per the overall ToR, in all deliverables including: debriefing sessions; final draft report according to specifications provided in the ToRs and integrating comments and suggestions received during the stakeholder meetings, and after circulation to OED, FAO and other stakeholders, as appropriate; support the Evaluation Manager in finalizing the report as may be required.
- [Other Responsibilities stated in the Evaluation TOR, for example, Conduct a technical assessment of the project outputs and/or activities and for this purpose, apply the relevant technical tools and methodologies]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outputs:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required Completion Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[List key expected outputs / milestones of the evaluation team member’s work, for example:]</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collection tools;</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical reports;</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Primary and secondary data in support of evaluation findings in respective area of expertise;</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First draft of the report for review;</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second draft of the report for stakeholder review;</td>
<td>[Target Completion Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Final draft of the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partial payments of honorarium will be authorized upon completion of the above deliverables.
ANNEX 3A

Template: Project Evaluation Report Outline

Who is this Template for? This document is an annotated outline should be used by the evaluation team in conjunction with the OED Project Evaluation Manual.

What is the purpose of this Template? This template suggests a structure and provides guidance on the content of the project evaluation report. It can be used for both final and mid-term project evaluations, and for both OED-managed and under the responsibility of the Budget Holder project evaluations, with exception of GEF projects evaluations.

How should this Template be used? The evaluation team can adjust the structure to suit the specific needs of an evaluation, as long as the logic is maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis are coherent and clear. Section headings should be maintained as in this template. Guidance to complete each section is provided in italic.

What about the format? Please note the following formatting requirements:

- Body paragraphs should be numbered by applying the Paragraph OED style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)
- For numbered lists use the List Number style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)
- For bulleted lists use the List Bullet style (Home tab, Styles, Style Gallery)
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Acronyms and abbreviations

[Insert acronyms and abbreviations here. Check through the document and list all the acronyms and abbreviations that have been used. Do not include acronyms and abbreviations that are not in the report. As a general rule when writing the report, try to avoid their use. Only use them when: (a) the subject is commonly known by an acronym (e.g. UNICEF) or abbreviation (e.g. HIV/AIDS); (b) key words are frequently used in the document and worth memorizing for the reader (e.g. the DRR programme in the report on a disaster risk reduction programme).

Do not abbreviate the names of countries in text, e.g. exports to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, not ... to the UK; and exports to the United States of America, not ... to the USA.

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL</td>
<td>Arid and Semi-arid Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDP</td>
<td>County Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDE</td>
<td>Ending Drought Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human immunodeficiency virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Authority on Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASSCOM</td>
<td>Joint Agriculture Sector Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPPRA</td>
<td>Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Peste des Petits Ruminants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

1. The Executive Summary should be in length approximately 10-15% of the main report, excluding annexes. Paragraphs should use the style Paragraph OED.

2. The Executive Summary structure is the following:

   **Introduction**

   3. Provide key information on the evaluation purpose & use, evaluation questions, scope, and methodology, but avoid details.

   **Main findings**

   4. The main findings of the evaluation are presented below, grouped by evaluation question.

   **Conclusions and recommendations**

   5. Illustrate conclusions and recommendations preferably integrating them into the narrative.
1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Purpose of the evaluation**

1. The purpose of the evaluation states why this evaluation is being conducted and why at this point in time (refer to the evaluation TORs). The type of evaluation (final, mid-term) should also be specified here.

1.2 **Intended users**

2. Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they want to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.

1.3 **Scope and objective of the evaluation**

3. The scope of the evaluation states precisely what is being evaluated, also known as the evaluan (the object of the evaluation), and also defines the parameters of the evaluation which include: the time period, the target population (including a breakdown by gender), the geographic area of focus, targeted stakeholders, and which components of the project are to be addressed (if not all). Provide an explanation for choices made to the extent possible, e.g. a focus on particular but not all components.

4. The objectives of the evaluation describe what the evaluation expects to achieve. This implies defining the main evaluation questions that need to be answered for this purpose. Evaluation objectives summarize what the evaluation needs to look at and the questions are the information needs that the evaluation should target.

5. The list of evaluation questions (as in TORs) should be included here.

1.4 **Methodology**

6. This section should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, the corresponding rationale for selection, and how, given time and budget constraints, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that answered the evaluation questions, achieving the evaluation purpose and intended use.

7. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. It should include in particular:

8. It should include in particular:

   - Overall methodological approach(es) used for the different evaluation questions
   - Composition of the evaluation team
• **Sample and sampling frame** - If a sample was used, provide the sample size and characteristics, selection criteria, the process for selecting the sample (random or purposive, e.g.), how comparison and treatment groups were assigned, if applicable, and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population. Discuss limitations of the sample for generalizing results.

• **Data collection methods** – provide the following for each evaluation question (some of this information could be included in an evaluation matrix as appendix of the report):
  
  - Information needs, indicators or sub-questions for each evaluation question: what exactly do we need to know, in order to answer this question?
  
  - Data collection methods, tools and key informants – Methods and tools used to collect data, informants to be interviewed, and analysis of the appropriateness of these methods for the evaluation question, and evidence of their reliability and validity.

• **Stakeholder engagement** — Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

### 1.5 Limitations

9. Major limitations, such as security issues, access to information and data, etc.; should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

---

1 See Annex 4 of the Project Evaluation Manual for an example of Evaluation Matrix.
2. **Background and context of the project**

2.1 **Context of the project**

10. This section should provide the following information:

   i. The name/title of the project evaluated
   ii. Description of the project:
      a. when and how the project/program was initiated
      b. brief description of the different project components
   iii. geographic location and target group / beneficiaries the project is aiming to reach (for the project as a whole and per component)
   iv. project duration and its implementation status within that timeframe
   v. resources: human resources and budget\(^2\), including contributions from FAO, other donors, other funding
   vi. key partners involved in the project, including the implementing agencies and partners, and other key stakeholders.

11. Description of the context (region, country, landscape, where relevant also challenges)

12. How the subject fits into the national priorities; FAO CPF; and FAO SOs, as appropriate. Description of how this evaluation fits within the context of other ongoing and previous evaluations.

2.2 **Theory of change**

13. An analysis of the theory of change of the project. Often the ToC will need to be made explicit, both as a visual as well as a narrative. See also the evaluation question below on assessing appropriateness and relevance of the project/programme design. Generally an initial ToC is developed by the Evaluation Manager (EM) in collaboration with the PTF. The evaluator/evaluation team will need to provide a (more) detailed ToC (original design) in the report.

14. This part includes analysis of programme logic/results chain: Expected Impact, Outcome, Outputs and Activities (reference to the logical framework).

---

\(^2\) Use the ISO Currency Code - breaking space between the abbreviation and the amount, e.g. USD 700 000 rather than US$700,000 and EUR 800 000 rather than €800,000.
3. **Findings**

15. Findings are analyzed and presented according to the evaluation questions. Each evaluation question should have a separate subsection. Crosscutting issues such as gender and other equity issues, human right, indigenous people, partnerships, if possible should be addressed under the evaluation questions. Please note that the questions need to be contextualized to the Theory of Change (ToC) of the project/programme.

### 3.1 Evaluation question 1

**Finding 1. Include findings related to each evaluation question**

16. Main findings must be well substantiated by evidences originating from relevant sources, triangulated, and supported by logical analysis and reasonable judgments.

**Finding 2. Text in bold.**

### 3.2 Evaluation question X

**Finding X. Sample text**
4. **Crosscutting issues (optional)**

*This section should only be included if crosscutting issues are not addressed under the evaluation questions. (Use numbered sections and subsections to describe your findings)*

4.1 **Gender and Human Right; Stakeholder Involvement; etc.**

Finding X. Sample text
5. **Conclusions and Recommendations**

5.1 **Conclusions**

17. Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistence with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues. They should be presented based on the specific evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference and should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

18. Conclusions are not a synthesis of the main findings, but rather conclusive statements based on and substantiated by the key findings. Conclusions will consolidate the assessment of various aspects to judge the value and worth of the project. Conclusive statements for each of the evaluation questions will be provided, for example in relation to the effectiveness of the project, its relevance et cetera.

19. An additional section with general conclusions (not linked to a specific evaluation question) may be added if relevant.

**Conclusion 1. FAO ..................**

20. Conclusions should be numerated

21. Conclusions are in bold and may be followed by an explanation

5.2 **Recommendations**

22. Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, and clearly suggest actions for different stakeholders involved in the project. Depending on whether this is a mid-term evaluation a final evaluation, recommendations can be related to:

- Project implementation /operational issues
- Strategic issues: this can include recommendations for redesigning the project (mid-term evaluation); recommendations for a next phase (final evaluation); recommendations for FAO country or HQ level (e.g. in relation to strategic objectives approaches generally used by FAO);
- Thematic issues.

23. Each recommendation should tackle one set of issues at a time, in particular when different levels in decision-making and action are involved.

24. Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party (ies), i.e. the Government, the resource partner, FAO and the project/programme management. Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible. It is recommended that, if possible, the evaluators work through recommendations
in collaboration with key stakeholders. This will support the development of useful recommendations.

25. Although it is not possible to identify a ‘correct’ number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should focus its recommendations on those aspects that in its view, will make a substantial and real difference to the project/programme and/or to FAO’s work. It is not advisable to have more than 8 recommendations

**Recommendation 1. Text in bold.**

26. Each recommendation should be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

27. The recommendation can be followed by some suggested actions or intervention to implement the recommendation.
6. **Lessons Learned**

28. Not all evaluations generate lessons. Lessons should only be drawn if they represent original contributions to general knowledge. ‘Lessons learned are knowledge generated by reflecting on experience that has the potential to improve future actions. A lesson learned summarises knowledge at a point in time, while learning is an ongoing process.

29. Where this is the case, the evaluation will identify lessons and good practices on substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which could be relevant to the design, implementation and evaluation of similar projects or programmes. Such lessons/practices must have been innovative, demonstrated success, had an impact, and be replicable.
7. Appendices

[The appendices form part of the report and should include any material that is essential in understanding the main report and directly referred to in the report (e.g. an evaluation matrix, a list of projects, a short summary of field research)]

Appendix 1. List of people interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Institution/Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. List of documents consulted

[The List of Documents Consulted should be written as in a real publication; therefore, internal documents as project documents should not to be included in this list. If reference is made to any internal document, include reference in text by inserting a footnote. See sample list below.]


8. **List of Annexes**

Annex 1. Terms of reference for the evaluation

Annex 2. Portfolio analysis/ Evaluation Matrix

Annex 3. Standalone case studies, surveys, field studies, context analysis, etc.

(Annexes follow the same style as the report)
PROJECT EVALUATION MANUAL FOR DECENTRALIZED OFFICES

ANNEX 4

Evaluation Matrix Template
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions/Indicators</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Methods/Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Approach/Design (examples of sub-headings)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Results: Outcome level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Results, Output level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Sub-Questions/Indicators</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Methods/Informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equity/Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5

Note recording Template

This template is to be used to record the notes of all meeting undertaken by the evaluation team during the evaluation period.
Final Evaluation of [Name of Project]
Project code XXX / XXX

Meeting Notes

Table of Content

1 Meeting notes Planning mission (date) ................................................................. 3
  1.1 FAOR .............................................................. Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.
  1.2 Assistant FAOR ...................................................... Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.
  1.3 Project team meeting .................................................................................. 3
  1.4 Ministry of Agriculture .................................................................................. 3

2 Meeting notes Main mission (date) ................................................................. 3
  1.5 FAOR .............................................................. Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.
  1.6 Assistant FAOR ...................................................... Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.
1  Meeting notes Planning mission (dates)

1.1  Project LTO

Name :
Institution :
Location :
Date :

[Insert text here]

1.2  Project BH

Name :
Institution :
Location :
Date :

[Insert text here]

1.3  Project team meeting

Participants :
Institution: FAO
Location :
Date :

[Insert text here]

1.4  Ministry of Agriculture

Participants :
Institution: FAO
Location :
Date :

[Insert text here]

2  Meeting notes Main mission (dates)

1.5  FAOR and AFAOR

Names :

[Insert text here]
Institution:
Location:
Date:

[Insert text here]

1.6 Village x

Name:
Institution:
Location:
Date:
ANNEX 6

Comments matrix
Template matrix for comments to evaluation reports

(insert name of project)

1. FAO Evaluations aim at high levels of transparency throughout all evaluation process. Thus, evaluation managers share main deliverables in draft format, in advanced final reports, with FAO internal and external stakeholders as appropriate and feasible, for comments and suggestions.

2. For the sake of transparency, it is important that comments formulated are available to all concerned and that the evaluation team expresses openly its own intentions about each comment, be this acceptance and integration, or rejection.

3. Please enter your comments in the matrix below, indicating the section/paragraph in the report they refer to. The evaluation team will provide its own response, as appropriate.

General comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Paragraph / Chapter</th>
<th>Comment (synthesis)</th>
<th>Evaluation team’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample project evaluation budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission: travel and DSA</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Units (Days)</th>
<th>Unit Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfare Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare Team Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Team Leader Country 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Team Leader Country 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Team Leader Country 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport - data collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultant Honorarium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Leader</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Units (Days)</th>
<th>Unit Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>24000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National consultant - country 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National consultant - country 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National consultant - country 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis workshop*

| lumpsum | 1 | 1 | 3000 | 3000 |

### Other related fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation to English**</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OED backstopping fees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*3 day team work to jointly analyse data, develop findings and present preliminary conclusions

** Only if necessary and report is not in English. For GEF evaluations, reporting/ translating in English is mandatory.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-staff expenditures</td>
<td>35100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant honorarium + OED fees</td>
<td>61400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Breakdown of days for Team Leader:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prep work + inception report</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and data collection</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Field + Home based</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report drafting</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address comments + debriefing + workshop</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># days per expert</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Breakdown of days for national expert:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prep work (tools)</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and data collection</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Field + Home based</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report drafting</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of stakeholder comments</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># days per expert</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OED Quality assessment form for project evaluation reports


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item n.</th>
<th>Question/Issue</th>
<th>Item included</th>
<th>Scoring*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The structure of the report is clear, follows the logic of the evaluation,</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adequately covers the main evaluation questions, and minimizes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Executive Summary is about 10% in length of the whole report excluding</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the annexes and includes: key information on the evaluation;</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>key findings and conclusions; and main recommendations.</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The report includes a section on methodology, complemented as required by</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>annexes containing the main evaluation tools used.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The methodology section includes an overview of the contextualized evaluation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questions, a description of how these were answered through data collection</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efforts; and a fair discussion of methodological limitations.</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The evaluation process included adequate consultation with stakeholders at</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all appropriate levels (institutional, countries, ultimate beneficiaries,</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partners, etc.)</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Findings are well substantiated by evidence originating from relevant and</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangulated sources, including both qualitative and quantitative data as</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate.</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The report provides a convincing picture of results achieved, based on</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant beneficiary feedback</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The report uses clear and appropriate language, without ambiguity,</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subjectivity or bias, and distinguishes between facts and opinions, each</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being properly referenced</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The report includes a cogent, fact-based examination of relevant equity issues</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. gender mainstreaming, attention to youth, inclusiveness of vulnerable</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups, etc.)</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The gender assessment is well-articulated, provides fact-based analysis and</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clear findings of the results related to gender equality issues</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Conclusions build upon the findings in a coherent way, respond to the</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation purpose, build on a careful examination of underlying</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance factors, and reflect reasonable performance expectations.</td>
<td>NA/NR#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=below average; 4= above average; 5=good; 6=excellent; NA=Not Applicable/Not relevant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item n.</th>
<th>Question/issue</th>
<th>Item included</th>
<th>Scoring*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NA/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Recommendations address the main findings and conclusions; they are realistic and actionable, clear on whom they are addressed to, important to the success of the enterprise, and are not trite, trivial, over-prescriptive,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whenever appropriate, the main findings and conclusions related to gender equality and other equity issues are reflected in the recommendations and are realistic, actionable and strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lessons learnt, if any, are innovative and clearly replicable/generalizable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=below average; 4=above average; 5=good; 6=excellent; NA=Not Applicable/Not relevant
ANNEX 9

Stakeholder analysis
In line with internationally agreed evaluation standards, including UNEG standard 4.6 (see box 1), it is essential to involve stakeholders directly affected by the intervention or topic under throughout the evaluation process and from its earliest stages. Engaging stakeholders allows buttressing the ownership of evaluation stakeholders, and enhancing the relevance and eventual use of the evaluation. For instance, consulting with immediate implementers of an intervention will provide an opportunity to acquire their views on the objectives and key issues that the evaluation should seek to address.

To understand how best to engage various stakeholders (ranging from implementers to partners and beneficiaries) in an evaluation, the evaluation manager must identify who are those key stakeholders, in the early phase of the evaluation, and then analyze the presumed stakes that each may likely have related to the evaluand and the evaluation itself.

A stakeholder analysis is the process whereby the evaluation manager decides whom to involve in the evaluation process, when and in what ways, based on a clear understanding of each stakeholder’s interests. It helps prevent positive bias in evaluations, by avoiding to exclusively rely on direct stakeholders’ perceptions, which may not help capture gaps and negative externalities on more indirect stakeholders. It also facilitates the general appropriate engagement of stakeholders, to safeguard the evaluation’s relevance, utility and use.

**Box 1: UNEG STANDARD 4.6 Stakeholder engagement and reference groups**

“Inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations is critical to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of evaluation. Reference groups and other stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be designed for this purpose.

Processes should be in place to secure the participation of individuals or parties who may be affected by the evaluation, are able to influence the implementation of recommendations or who would be affected in the long term. Stakeholders should be consulted in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations.

A variety of mechanisms can be used to consult with a broad range of stakeholders (e.g. consultation meetings on evaluation design, validation workshops on preliminary findings and post-evaluation learning workshops). In addition, different types of stakeholder groups could be formed for their continued engagement (reference groups, learning groups, steering groups and advisory groups).

**Reference groups**: Reference groups are composed of core groups of stakeholders of the evaluation subject who can provide different perspectives and knowledge on the subject. The reference groups should be consulted on the evaluation design in order to enhance its relevance; on the preliminary findings to enhance their validity; on the recommendations to enhance their feasibility, acceptability and ownership; and at any point during the evaluation process when needed. The use of reference groups enhances the relevance, quality and credibility of evaluation processes.

**Learning groups**: Learning groups could be established with stakeholders to focus on the use of evaluation. Learning groups generally have a smaller role in quality enhancement or validation of findings than reference groups.
Steering groups: When appropriate, some key stakeholders could be given a stronger role as members of the steering group to ensure better ownership. Steering groups not only advise, but also provide guidance to evaluations.

Advisory groups: Advisory groups are composed of experts on evaluation or the subject matter. Because group members generally do not have a direct stake in the subject matter to be evaluated, they can provide objective advice to evaluations. Using these groups can enhance the relevance, quality and credibility of evaluation processes through guidance, advice, validation of findings and use of the knowledge.

Source: UNEG Norms and Standards 2016

The degree and level of stakeholder participation in an evaluation process varies in particular depending on budgetary and time constraints, and the evaluation manager will need to weigh the level of stakeholder participation against the benefits and constraints. Useful guidance can be found in UNEG’s handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (Box 2).

Box 2. Determining the degree of stakeholder participation

The following questions should be considered when deciding the degree of participation by stakeholders:

- Beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers can be involved in the process with varying degrees of intensity. What will be the implications in terms of effort, timeline and budget?
- Should all stakeholders be consulted together or separately? If consulted together, would this create dangers for any members of the groups involved? What will be the process for ensuring all perspectives are fairly heard, avoiding bias because some may be more reticent than others for a variety of reasons (power differences, literacy levels, confidence levels, etc.), mediating differences, building agreement, and making decisions where differences cannot be reconciled?
- How can the envisaged level of participation by the evaluation process be ensured, even if the reality is that the intervention to be evaluated had limited participation so far? How can the evaluation generate lessons for the intervention to overcome participation challenges?
- Is there a clear communication strategy with all stakeholders regarding who will participate, who will be consulted and who will make decisions when there are differences of opinion?
- Do the evaluators have the appropriate level of commitment to, understanding of, facilitation skills and experience with the level of participation decided on?
- Have the gains in credibility of the evaluation results by a particular level of participation been considered?
- Has sufficient consideration been given to participation to ensure the credibility of evaluation results?

Source: Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance

The most commonly used tool used to support a stakeholder analysis comes in the form of a matrix, which guides the evaluation manager’s collection of information about stakeholders and analysis towards capturing key aspects related to their interests and how these will be managed throughout
the evaluation, including by engaging them at various phases and in different ways. Below is a proposed template for the stakeholder analysis matrix can support the analysis, to be adapted to the context of the evaluation.

**Stakeholder analysis matrix template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS (disaggregated as appropriate)</th>
<th>What role related to the Intervention / evaluand?</th>
<th>How will they use the evaluation?</th>
<th>What might they gain or lose from the Evaluation?</th>
<th>How and when they should be involved in the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write names if known, or be as specific as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active stakeholders with the authority to make decisions related to the evaluand. Ex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ FAO project staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Governmental entities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Funding agency/donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active stakeholders with direct responsibility for the evaluand. Ex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Funding agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ FAO staff (backstopping officers, technical advisers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Implementation partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Other governmental entities or authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Other FAO staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at the grassroots level who directly or indirectly benefit from the intervention. (Possibly disaggregated between women, men, girls, boys; other as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at the grassroots level, who do not benefit from the intervention. (Possibly disaggregated between women, men, girls, boys; other as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other interest groups who are not directly participating in the intervention: - other development agencies working in the area - civil society organizations - other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 10

Inception report guidance
This Annex provides some guidance for the preparation of the inception report for an evaluation. Inception reports are mandatory for both decentralized and OED-managed evaluations. It does not require official clearance from the Project Evaluation Team (PET) of FAO’s Office of Evaluation (OED).

Inception reports should be submitted to the EM before the field mission, or maximum one week after the start of the field mission.

The inception report complements the terms of references, and clarifies the whole approach to the evaluation. Together with the TORs, they are the main reference tools for guiding the evaluation and checking its progress. The Inception report helps establish clarity and mutual understanding between parties involved in the evaluation, clarifying how the work will be organized, who will do what and when. It is an internal FAO document and is therefore not published. The evaluation team leader is responsible for the preparation of the inception report.

It should include the following:

1. Brief background on the project and its objectives, with a draft Theory of Change (ToC)
2. A stakeholder analysis, including who, why and how they will be involved (see Annex X for guidance)
3. The evaluation approach and methodology: detailed information about the proposed approaches that will be used to undertake the evaluation and the methods selected for data collection and analysis
4. The Evaluation Matrix – this is the most critical part of the report: it sets out how the methodology will be operationalised by the evaluation team
5. The site mapping and sampling: information about how sites have been selected for field visits
6. Limitations and risks, timeline and deliverables updated from the TOR.

The inception report should be:

- Informed by the analysis of the documentation provided and the technical briefings/inception meetings held
- Technically sound – with a robust methodology
- Feasible and realistic
- Concise: the length of the report should be between 5 and 10 pages (with the ToC narrative and graphic given as an annex)
Theory of Change for the project

1. Stakeholder analysis

Building on the preliminary stakeholder information from the TOR, provide a stakeholder analysis, including:

- Identification of the different groups to be involved in the evaluation, with reference to specific agencies or individuals;
- Rationale for the selection of the target groups (role in project, etc.);
- How they will be involved in the evaluation, with consideration of the most appropriate method to ensure effective participation of each group;
- The importance and expected use of the evaluation results to the different stakeholder groups.

See Annex 9 of the Project Evaluation Manual for guidance on the stakeholder analysis

Length: 1-2 pages

2. Evaluation approach and methodology

Provide detailed information about the overall methodological approach that will be used to undertake the evaluation and the methods selected for data collection and analysis. Ensure a comprehensive and systematic description, which is sufficient to generate trust in the credibility of the evaluation as well as its independence and impartiality.

Include information about:

- Evaluation questions: building on the questions identified in the TOR, refine/clarify them, and define sub-questions when needed
- The conceptual and methodological approach, and the data collection methods and tools that will be applied (see below) - specify the use of a mixed-methods approach if relevant.
- How this approach will minimize threats to validity and ensure reliability and credibility of the evaluation
- The data collection methods that will be applied – specify the use of quantitative or qualitative approaches, and specific modalities therein.
- How the evaluation methodology will be responsive to gender and minority groups, including any data collection method employed to seek information on gender issues and ensure women and marginalised groups are able to fully participate in the evaluation (see Annex 12 on Gender Evaluation framework).

Data Collection Methods and Tools:

Include a description of the data collection and analysis methods to be applied in the evaluation. Specify both qualitative and quantitative methods as appropriate, including participatory approaches to be adopted. Explain their specific application within the evaluation matrix, particularly in relation to the data sources available.

Describe:
• The nature of data/information collection methods. Highlight their comparative advantage, inherent constraints and solutions to address them.

• The chosen methods should be explicitly linked to the Evaluation Matrix and be informed by the stakeholder analysis as well as by an analysis of the reliability and completeness of the data collected during the design and inception phases (secondary data, M&E information, previous evaluations, etc.)

• The data collection tools (actual tools should be presented in annexes)

• How data collection activities will be undertaken in a gender-sensitive manner.

• How the validity and reliability of data collection and analysis will be ensured, including methods for triangulation.

• How data will be checked and cleaned, where relevant

Length: maximum 3-4 pages

3. Evaluation matrix

See Annex 4 of the Project Evaluation Manual

4. Site mapping and sampling

Include the geographic coverage of the intervention (include maps where appropriate and if available) and explain the criteria and sampling procedures for selecting the areas and field sites to be visited.

Provide information about the approximate number of beneficiaries and key partners or stakeholders to be interviewed in each site.

Information on how men, women, boys and girls are to be adequately represented in the sample of field sites to should also be included.

Length: maximum 1 page

5. Limitations and risks

This may include limitations/risks anticipated in the evaluation due to availability of data, timing of field visits, etc. Provide an explanation of how the evaluation team will manage and mitigate within these limitations/risks and/or their implications for the evaluation process and evidence gathering.

Include any limitations with regards to the gender-responsiveness of the chosen approach.

Length: 1 or 2 paragraphs
6. **Timeline and deliverables**

Include the most recent and realistic timeline for the various phases of the evaluation, and for the deliverables as listed in the evaluation TORs.

*Length: 1 or 2 paragraphs*
ANNEX 11

Theory of Change
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1. The overview presented below is intended to provide a brief introduction to using Theories of Change (TOC) as a tool for evaluation.

2. In OED, there is no desire to propose a standard model fitting all evaluation cases, but to offer models including elements identified as essential, which can be used as part of a toolbox, depending on the context and need. This guidance note therefore intends to present the elements that are useful to consider in using TOCs, and integrates the need for flexibility in using TOCs. An important purpose for this guidance is to provide clarity over concepts and definitions, whereas it is understood that the form or process leading to formulating TOC will diverge from one evaluation to another. TOCs can be different based on evaluation context and purpose.

3. As this guidance note is purposely kept synthetic, it includes a useful resources that can assist evaluators in the design and use of TOC.
2. **DEFINITION**

4. Practitioners use different terms to describe what a TOC is, each with their own nuances. For OED, a TOC describes the *causal relationship* between a series of *outcomes* that culminates with achieving a *desired change* (goal).

**Box 1: DEFINITIONS OF THEORY OF CHANGE THAT ARE IN LINE WITH OED’s VIEW**

- *Theories of change* are the ideas and hypotheses (‘theories’) people and organisations have about how change happens. These theories can be conscious or unconscious and are based on personal beliefs, assumptions and a necessarily limited, personal perception of reality. (Hivos, theory of change thinking in practice: a stepwise approach, 2015)

- Every programme is packed with beliefs, assumptions and hypotheses about how change happens – about the way humans work, or organisations, or political systems, or ecosystems. Theory of change is about articulating these many underlying assumptions about how change will happen in a programme. (Patricia Rogers, in ’Review of the use of ‘Theory of Change’ in international development’, Isabel Vogel, 2012)

2.1 **What a TOC is**

5. For OED, a TOC presents the following **elements** as core features:

- **A cause-to-effect relationship between outcomes**
  Different to a log frame, a TOC acknowledges the breadth of vertical and horizontal relationships that an intervention logic assumes. It makes the intended causal relation between an intervention’s outputs and its ultimate impact explicit, thereby embracing the complexity of the reality it aims at altering.

- **Evidence** that can demonstrate the relationship between outcomes
  A TOC also needs to identify the concrete evidence that can indicate the effective achievement of each outcome presented. These indicators can be quantitative or qualitative in nature.

- **Assumptions** underlying the cause-effect relationships
  A TOC also spells out the underlying assumptions expected for the cause-effect relationships to occur. These can be partly in control of the programme or outside
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of its control, and they are important to identify and test, as they may affect the achievement of the logical chain of results.

An inclusive process to reach a common understanding on the evaluand

- The process leading to constructing a TOC needs to integrate the views of main stakeholders of the evaluand. This allows reaching an agreed view on the evaluand’s logic.

6. A TOC is a type of logic model\(^1\). Logic models come in different shapes and forms and include LogFrames, problem trees, organizational charts etc. Like all logic models, a TOC describes the relationships between the elements contained in the model, often depicted by some type of graphic illustration. In the case of a TOC, it depicts the causal relationship between outcomes, expressed as preconditions. It is good practice for a TOC to be accompanied by a narrative description in order to expand on what is illustrated.

7. Taplin et al state that “At its heart, Theory of Change spells out initiative or program logic. It defines long-term goals and then maps backward to identify changes that need to happen earlier (preconditions). The identified changes are mapped graphically in causal pathways of outcomes, showing each outcome in logical relationship to all the others.”\(^2\)

2.2 What a TOC is NOT

8. **It is not just a nice graph.** It can be (is often) presented in the form of a graph, and there are many possible forms to it, but it also requires narrative elements attached to it, e.g. to explain the rationale connecting outcomes, the evidence that can be used to measure this connection, or the underlying assumptions existing behind them.

9. **It is not a “Contribution map”,** that is a comprehensive mapping of all factors at play around the intervention. The latter could be also useful, e.g. for judging of the positioning of an intervention within its context, or analysing the appropriateness of partnerships, but it is not a TOC.

10. **It is not a logframe:** TOCs allow for representing the evaluand reality in a more detailed way, making it complexity explicit. Some difference between the two are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LogFrame</th>
<th>Theory of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies inputs, activities and outputs that supposedly will “deliver” the outcomes</td>
<td>Emphasises the mapping of outcomes in order to explain why the expected change will occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Logic model, as used here, means a graphical/tabular illustration that aims to concisely communicate the relationship between the elements therein.

Requires identification of program components, but does not establish a causal relationship between the outcomes that are expected to achieve the goal | Usually starts with a goal before deciding on program components (design stage); thus presenting a causal outcome pathway
---|---
Indicators at the output and outcome level are reflected | Emphasis on outcomes that can then be the basis for the LogFrame. Outcome indicators take precedence over the other ones
Very useful as an input for project implementation (plans, budgeting etc.) | Can provide justification for LogFrame components
Useful for designing an M&E plan | Useful for designing an evaluation.

### Figure 1: Developing a TOC in the context of an evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING THE EVALUAND</th>
<th>ENHANCING OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>SUPPORT EVALUATION DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logic mapping /modelling</td>
<td>Engagement of stakeholders</td>
<td>(evaluation questions, results...)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Set a common language**
- **Grasp elements beyond control**
- **Increase evaluation credibility**

11. A TOC can be used for designing and implementing a project or programme. This guidance focuses on its uses for evaluation.

12. As a process, a **TOC is useful to enhance the evaluand’s ownership and acceptance** of the evaluation. Dedicating time to an exchange with stakeholders before decision are made demonstrates that their voices count to determine what is a fundamental piece for the evaluation. This helps build mutual trust and respect, which is conducive to constructive dialogue during the evaluation process, and increases the probabilities that stakeholders will use the evaluation. It is also a means to manage expectations from both sides.

**As a product, it is useful to:**

1. **Facilitate a common understanding of the evaluand between evaluators and stakeholders;**
   
   Often it is necessary to **articulate the ‘missing middle’,** i.e. the different levels of outcomes that need to happen for impact to occur, based on the proposed intervention. Unpacking realities that are often complex and the intended impact pathways of an intervention into a simple visual, allows making the implicit explicit, and ensuring everyone shares the same understanding of the intention.

2. **Underpin the evaluation design**
   
   Clarifying the cause-to-effect relationships and the evidence to show it, provides a basis to identify what to evaluate and what evaluation questions should underpin the exercise, i.e.
what to measure to judge of the actual results of an intervention. This will in turn determine the entire evaluation approach.

A TOC is also a basis to define evaluation scope: it shows where and how the programme intends to have influence and is a starting point to identify the necessary data needed by the evaluation to make an informed assessment.

3- **Serve as a useful tool for programme stakeholders**

The explicit identification of the outcomes, the relationships that connect them and the evidence that can inform on them, can be used by programmes stakeholders in subsequent interventions, with the same benefits as identified in 1).
3. **PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR TOCs DEVELOPMENT**

13. First, it is important to note that TOCs are not necessarily useful for all evaluations, and that the benefit of designing an evaluation based on a TOC should be clearly identified before taking any decision to use this tool or not.

14. Also important to note is that the evaluation context and the purpose for which evaluators may choose to use a TOC are two essential variables defining the way a TOC will be developed and used, and what it will look like. Some elements are highlighted below to illustrate how the context may influence the TOC process or product.

3.1 **Process: OED- led or engaging stakeholder?**

15. As highlighted above, a TOC needs to be in any case discussed and validated by the stakeholders at a certain point and early enough to allow for taking their inputs into account.

16. Then, the degree to which stakeholders will be engaged can vary depending on the context, as highlighted below:

   1. Contexts in which participation of stakeholders in TOC development could be useful: When there is a need for establishing dialogue with / building ownership of stakeholders. *Add examples*

   2. Contexts in which OED could develop the TOC without an initial engagement of stakeholders: When the reality is so complex that it requires a preliminary work to be done (e.g. strategic evaluand?)

3.2 **Process: when to do it?**

17. In some contexts, evaluation managers develop the TOC during the evaluation preparatory phase (alone or with stakeholders) leading to the TOR. This does not mean that the evaluation team cannot then have an opportunity to comment on it, and suggest adjustments, once on-board. The TOC then helps define the evaluation scope, questions, and possibly the approach, and therefore it is logical that it precedes the TORs.

18. For other evaluations, managers may prefer engaging the evaluation team into the TOC development process. This usually applies when the evaluation includes an inception phase, which allows for an additional step in the evaluation design process, whereby the evaluation external team members take ownership of the evaluation approach.
3.3 **Product: what should be the scope of a TOC?**

19. A TOC can focus narrowly on the evaluanad, but often extends beyond it, to represent some of the relevant elements of the universe in which the evaluanad is set. There are no predefined TOC boundaries; a ToC can be “high-level” (broad & shallow), “highly-focused” (narrow & deep) or any combination thereof. Still, there is a need to compromise between a comprehensive mapping of a complex reality starting from a high-level goal, and a narrow focus on an intervention starting from its activities.

20. Reflecting on the following elements may help define the scope of a ToC:

1. Define an **appropriate scale**: Drawing a TOC that represents the interventions into its wide context bears the risk of losing sign of the intervention’s internal dynamics. On the other hand, including some contextual elements (such as partner institutions, external influences) offers a useful representation of how the intervention is positioned in respect to its context, which is often examined in an evaluation. Often, “wide” TOCs representations find it helpful to then circle where the evaluation will focus its attention within this representation. Some find it useful to outline a sphere of influence and a sphere of control of the evaluanad. Another practice is to develop several TOC levels.

2. Set a **"reasonable level of complexity"**: On the one hand, over-simplifying a complex reality will not help grasp the relationships to the extent necessary; on the other hand over-articulating the TOC building blocks may lead to excessive complexity.

3. **Not all should appear on a graph**: although the most attractive part of a TOC is usually the one presented in the form of a graph, a key feature of its clarifying value, a TOC is way more than just a graph. As a TOC is meant to explicit outcomes and their indicators, underlying assumptions explaining causal relationships between them, and possibly can include contextual elements, there is no way all these can fit into a legible graph. This is why a narrative should always complement the graph, to explain and provide depth to it.

4. **Engaging stakeholders** may help collectively define or adjust the scope of the TOC.
3.4  **Principles on how to build a TOC:**

21. In its most basic, graphical form, a TOC is a series of outcome statements linked by some rationale, resulting in a causal pathway (depicted as arrows).

A TOC is “read” by using an **IF-THEN** sequence:

```
IF Outcome 1 THEN → IF Outcome 2 THEN → IF Outcome 3 THEN → GOAL
```

22. Obviously, reality is much more complex than a TOC could ever hope to capture. The purpose should therefore be to try to capture a level of detail and breadth that the circumstances require.

23. After the causal pathways are agreed upon, other layers of information are added, including indicators for the outcomes, interventions (strategies or activities that produce each outcome) and assumptions underlying the TOC. Reviewing a project or programme’s LogFrame will yield many of these elements. It will be the case, more often than not, that the LogFrame will only contain some of the outcomes identified in a TOC. This ‘finding’ is one of the ways that a TOC can prove useful to evaluators as they seek to gain a better understanding of the evaluand and how the exercise should be designed.

24. There are many ways to develop a TOC, dictated by the particular circumstances faced. Ideally, a project would have a TOC before an evaluation but this is often not the case. Even when a TOC is available, the manner in which it is represented may not be user-friendly or in the format described above. The key is to engage stakeholders (project management/implementers) in a participatory fashion in articulating the TOC, going through various iterations until they validate the product. Although a TOC is not a static model (since it can change/evolve through time), the representation that the evaluation team uses has to reflect the causal pathways that are guiding the evaluand at the time of the exercise.

**Additional tips:**

- Work backwards from the goal, identifying the preconditions (outcomes) necessary for it to be achieved. Repeat the backward mapping for each subsequent outcome until reaching a point that generally resembles the state of affairs (condition) that were present at the beginning of the project/programme;
• Ensure that each outcome is clearly written, trying to avoid drafting statements with conjunctions (‘and’). Outcomes are the actual change that takes place because of the activities/intervention (e.g. output(s) has been used). The outcome statement must reflect change in a person, group of people, organizations, state of affairs, places or environmental conditions. The statements must not be project actions or interventions per se (i.e. project activity descriptions, outputs);
  
  o Examples of outcome statements:
    ▪ Agricultural research partnerships operational.
    ▪ Increased community awareness about climate change.
    ▪ Legislation on land tenure adopted.
    ▪ Parents apply nutritional guidelines.
    ▪ Farmers use best practices.

**Box 2: Example**

The example that follows is a Theory of Change on Building resilience of vulnerable small scale farming households to climate-related events as part of an OED evaluation of the 2016/17 El Niño response in Southern Africa. In this example, only the causal pathways are shown. The other components (assumptions, interventions, indicators etc.) have not been included in the illustration in order to make it reader-friendly; however, these can be developed in the narrative.

**Figure 2: El Nino evaluation If-THEN logic**
TOC Narrative text

The evaluation team decided it would be useful to develop a Theory of Change on Building resilience of vulnerable small scale farming households to climate-related events. The underlying question was: What are the sequences of outcomes that will ensure that vulnerable small-scale farming households will be able to cope with drought and other extreme climate events that negatively impact their agricultural livelihoods? This constituted capturing the domain of FAO’s interventions, as well as other partners (such as government). Mapping of the partners interventions were useful to initiate discussions on what external agencies (such as local institutions and development actors) could do to strengthen the resilience capacity of the households and the communities, as well as what the development actors could do to strengthen the capacity of local institutions in their support to households and communities. Box 3 presents the developed TOC, which maps the preconditions (expressed as outcome statements in each box), that lead sequentially (from bottom-up) to the overall outcome (higher-level). The arrows represent the cause and effect relationship of outcomes, namely the “if-then” logic. The outcomes are divided into four levels (and one higher-level impact outcome). The bottom level is constructed around the capacities and the access of households to inputs, assets, resources and knowledge. The next level assumes that if households have all of the above, they are able to choose and make informed decisions on how to manage their assets and resources. By making informed decisions they will be able to protect their asset base and implement positive coping strategies that will ultimately strengthen their capacities to anticipate, adapt and transform during crises events in the short term and longer terms. Once the TOC was developed, the specific FAO interventions were nested under the priorities and domains of mandate/influence. In Box 3, the letters in the bottom line are the mapped FAO activities that are assumed to contribute to the first outcome level. These are:

A. Infrastructure rehabilitation and construction: boreholes, irrigation
B. Input Provision: seed kits for home gardens, planting materials, staple crops seeds, chickens, goats, feed, and vaccines.
C. Cash + voucher transfers: seed fairs, vouchers for fertilizers.
D. Training of farmers on: water harvesting, climate smart agriculture technologies, soil and water conservation, soil land management, nutrition, restocking, marketing skills.
E. Training of institutions (extension workers, teachers) + service providers: nutrition, GIS, disease surveillance, agro dealer’s seed quality.
F. Generation of information for policy support + decision-making + coordination: needs assessment (surge), seeds systems assessments
Figure 3: El Nino evaluation If-THEN logic

Building Resilience of Vulnerable Small Scale Farming Households to Climate Related Events

Farming Households (HH) are resilient to climate-related events (drought + floods)

- Households have & consume enough diversified food
- Households feel safe & safeguard their asset base & social networks
- Households have stable incomes, they are able to sell excess produce

- HH have sufficient & stable food production or livelihood sources.
- HH have healthy & economically useful livestock
- HH have sufficient liquidity & discretion to make decisions

HH are able to make rational decisions on crop production

A + D
HH have access to adequate irrigation + water harvesting + infrastructure.
HH have access to seed & timely inputs.

B + C
HH have access to seed & timely inputs.

D + E
HH have access to quality breeds, livestock feed & water.
This also applies to aquaculture

B + E
HH have access to quality breeds, livestock feed & water.
HH have access to veterinary support.

B + D + E
HH have access to animal health related information & use correct practices.

A + B + D
HH are able to earn cash through provision of labour, access to markets or Cash/Family transfers.

D
HH are able to appropriately manage & responsibly exploit natural resources.

C + D
Specialised institutions produce climate-related information & disseminate it to farmers timely & at micro-level

Indigenous Knowledge is refined & codified

HH have access to ongoing training, extension and sharing of best practices