1. The present Guidelines for Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) form part of a common set of ITC Evaluation Guidelines that operationalize the ITC Evaluation Policy. Evaluation Guidelines are separate documents containing more detailed explanations of the process and methodologies to be used for conducting evaluations. They set evaluation standards for planning, conducting and using evaluations, developing and disseminating methodology and establishing the institutional mechanism for their implementation.

2. The Guidelines for Evaluation TOR are intended to assist evaluation managers (program/project manager, evaluation officer or the person who is in charge of the evaluation and monitoring function for the program/project) in writing clear and detailed TOR for the evaluation of projects/programmes and of other objects that are not supported by a Logframe. The TOR should respect and follow the “Key Principles” as they are defined in the ITC Evaluation Policy.

3. TOR are the starting point of the evaluation exercise. They reflect the understanding of the parties to the object being evaluated on the framework for evaluation. They constitute the basic agreement on the purpose of the evaluation. They sum up available knowledge and specify the scope of the evaluation. They give an overview of management’s requirements and expectations for the evaluation. TOR should include clear and detailed information on why and for whom the evaluation is being done and what it intends to accomplish.

4. TOR define the work that must be carried out by the Evaluation Team. They suggest an evaluation method and delineate the procedures, which will be followed. They form an integral part of the contract with the evaluators. TOR guide the evaluation process until the submission of the Evaluation Report. In particular, they should define how the evaluation will be accomplished, who will be involved in the evaluation and when the main requirements will be met.

5. Evaluation managers should use the TOR format given. Major headings should be retained but sub-headings may be added reflecting particular requirements and expectations for the evaluation.

6. Attached is the standard format for Evaluation TOR, starting with a sample cover page. The TOR document should not exceed 10 pages. Supporting and relevant information should be placed in annexes. The layout and order of contents should follow those in the guidelines. It should be typed in 1 1/2 spacing, using Arial font 11 and in the A-4 format. The TOR should be submitted in electronic format. Pages should be numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. The numbers should appear, on the right side, at the top of the page. Paragraphs should be numbered.

---

1 As defined in the ITC Evaluation Policy, evaluation objects include projects and programmes and also other objects that are not supported by a Logframe such as ITC tools, methodologies, policies, strategies work in specific countries and regions and critical internal processes.
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1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section provides information on why, when and how the object being evaluated was established, including information on the concept, design and budget. The background should reflect any amendments or revisions of the original document(s) establishing the object being evaluated. The purpose and main objectives and expected results must be clearly stated. (The same applies to the corresponding performance indicators in the case of programmes / projects. The findings of the evaluation should be clearly compared to the expected results of the object being evaluated.) Finally, this section provides information on the authority and mandate that established the object being evaluated (decisions of the SMC, Executive Director, or others).

The background should also explicitly state that the “UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”\(^2\) apply to the conduct of the evaluation in the ITC in general and to the present evaluation in particular.

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

Why is the evaluation being undertaken? The purpose of evaluation is to measure achievements, outcomes and impacts both positive and negative. In general, the overall purpose for the evaluation is to learn from the implementation of the object being evaluated so that lessons can be drawn that can be the basis for instituting improvements to the planning, design and management of the object in question, or of similar objects.

The following questions should be considered when preparing this section:
- Who initiated the evaluation?\(^3\)
- Why is the evaluation being undertaken, and why is it being undertaken now?
- What will the evaluation seek to accomplish?
- Who are the main stakeholders of the evaluation?

TOR need to be specific about the purpose of the evaluation to ensure that evaluation serves the needs of the intended users and to enable its actual use through the systematic follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations that will have been accepted.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This section is the core of the TOR. It describes what the evaluation will focus on and clearly states what should be evaluated. It contextualizes the evaluation exercise by explicitly identifying what are considered crucial and strategic issues at the time. The scope should never loose the ITC overall corporate development perspective. It should systematically request the assessment if, and how much, the object being evaluated contributes to a priority area or comparative advantage for the ITC. It also includes the timeframe to be covered by the evaluation, its geographical coverage and the thematic coverage.


\(^3\) The evaluation might have been foreseen in the project document, or may have been requested by a donor. It may also have been inserted into the Evaluation Annual Plan by the Executive Director, or identified for strategic reasons by EMU, etc.
The scope details the issues to be covered and the corresponding evaluation criteria to assess performance. It includes a list of specific and targeted evaluation questions that substantiate the focus of the evaluation. The evaluation questions guide the Evaluation Team in its task to produce the relevant findings, lessons learned and recommendations. To enable due quality, it is fundamental that the number of evaluation questions is limited and proportionate to the resources available for conducting the evaluation. The Evaluation Report will clearly address the evaluation questions.

Typically, the scope will build on a combination of the following evaluation questions:

**Relevance** – Whether the object being evaluated addresses the identified needs / problems? Is the evaluation object concept and design the appropriate solution to these needs / problems? Were the objectives\(^4\) of the evaluation object attainable? Are they still relevant? What is the value of the object in relation to other priority needs and efforts? Are problems addressed still major problems?

**Effectiveness** – Is the evaluation object achieving satisfactory progress toward its stated objectives? Have the results\(^5\) have been achieved, and if not, whether there has been some progress made towards their achievement? Have the anticipated activities\(^6\) and outputs\(^7\) being delivered on time and according to specifications? What were the problems and constraints encountered during implementation?

**Efficiency** – Are the effects\(^8\) being achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives? This will usually include an analysis of how efficiently planning and implementation are carried out and an assessment to which extent organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanism used by ITC supports the object being evaluated.

**Impact** – How useful were the results and outcomes\(^9\)? What is the assessment of ITC’s contribution to human and institutional capacity building in terms of knowledge and competencies? What difference has the evaluation object made to beneficiaries / clients / stakeholders? What are the trade, economic, social, technical, environmental, and other effects on individuals, communities, and institutions – either short-, medium-, or long-term; intended or unintended; positive and negative; on a micro- or macro-level?

**Sustainability** – Will the results continue after funding? Has ITC’s capacity building led to a change in the behaviour of beneficiaries? Are they willing / able to continue? Are the beneficiary institutions developing the capacity and motivation to use / deliver new competences? Can this become self-sustaining financially?

---

\(^4\) **Objectives**: “Intended impact contributing to physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other benefits to a society, community or group of people via one or more development interventions”. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based management, OECD-DAC, 2002.

\(^5\) **Results**: “The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive or negative) of a development intervention”. Idem

\(^6\) **Activities**: “Actions taken or work performed through which inputs,…are mobilized to produce specific outputs”. Idem

\(^7\) **Outputs**: “The products and services which result from the completion of activities within a development intervention.” UNDG Results-Based Management Terminology, [http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?p=224](http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?p=224).

\(^8\) **Effects**: “Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.”. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based management, OECD-DAC, 2002.

\(^9\) **Outcomes**: “The intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs…. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.” Idem.
4. Evaluation Methods

This part suggests the key elements of the methodology to be used by the Evaluation Team. Methodology is the approach used to identify information sources and collect information during an evaluation, and to analyze those data. The quality of the evaluation very much depends on the methods used. They have to ensure that evaluation findings and the corresponding recommendations are based on robust and reliable data and information. Evaluation methods also have to be consistent with answering the evaluation questions, the required skills and competencies for the Evaluation Team and time and budget constraints.

Evaluation methods may include:
- Document review, this will include all major documents such as the project document and its revisions, progress and monitoring reports, terminal reports, self-evaluations etc (desk study);
- Interviews with all key informants and key players;
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participation of partners and stakeholders;
- Benchmarking.

In general, based on the TOR and in consultation with EMU, the Evaluation Team takes the final decision about the evaluation methods that are the most appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation. The TOR must clearly state that the Evaluation Team should present a detailed statement of evaluation methods including the description of data collection instruments and procedures, information sources and procedures for analyzing the data.

5. Evaluation Team Composition

Based on the character of the object being evaluated and the purpose of the evaluation this section details the number of evaluators in the Evaluation Team and their areas of expertise. The required qualifications should be consistent with the suggested evaluation methods and the requested deliverables.

The Section also suggests a division of labour between them. An evaluation expert normally nominated by EMU should lead the team, while other team members could be specialists in their respective area. The team leader suggests specialist team members according to the overall purpose of the evaluation.

While in some cases, evaluators may be nominated by other stakeholders it should be made clear in the TOR that evaluators shall have no past connection with the object of the evaluation, that they will not act as representatives of any party and will remain independent and impartial so that conflicts of interest are avoided and the credibility of the evaluation process and product is not undermined.
6. **Planning and Implementation Arrangements**

This Section elaborates on a detailed programme of the planning for evaluation. It explains how the evaluation is going to be carried out and details the main phases of the evaluation exercise.

**Managements Arrangements** – They describe who does what in the evaluation process, the roles and responsibilities of all the parties involved in conducting the evaluation (the Evaluation Team, EMU and other concerned parties (the donor(s), for instance)) should be clearly stated.

**Timeframe for the evaluation process** – The programme of the evaluation should be detailed with a precise timeframe. A table summarizing the timeframe for the evaluation process should be used.

**Resources required and logistical support** – This section provides information on budget requirements to undertake the evaluation. Evaluations have to be financially feasible. It means that expectations have to be achievable given the amount of available resources. This section should clearly show the balance between the required “level of effort” and the assigned costs. Levels of effort and costs are planned on a per diem, weekly, monthly basis or with lump sum, depending on the agreed basis for payment. The following tables might be used as templates to describe planned costs and level of effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of days/weeks/months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type(^{10})</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "How to Perform Evaluations – Model TOR", CIDA.

This section also identifies the main types of administrative and logistical support to the Evaluation Team and points out the roles and responsibilities in providing such kinds of support.

**Expected deliverables of the evaluation** – Finally, the TOR list the requested deliverables with the corresponding target dates. One or more deliverables may be requested to evaluator(s) at the end of each phase. Examples of deliverables are the evaluation workplan and the Evaluation Report.
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\(^{10}\) Common types of cost are Personnel, Travel, and out-of-pocket expenses (supplies, equipments and materials, communication, etc.).