



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL HUMANITARIAN AID AND CIVIL PROTECTION - ECHO

Directorate C - Policy and coordination

**Unit C/1 - General Policy affairs, Relations with donors, Evaluation**

ANNEX I

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**FOR THE REAL TIME EVALUATION OF DG ECHO's RESPONSE TO THE  
HAITI CRISIS AND REVIEW**

CONTRACT N°: ECHO/ADM/BUD/200X/012xx

NAME OF CONSULTANT(S):

FIRM:

## Table of Contents

<b>Mandate and legal basis</b> .....	3
<b>Background/Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>Justification and timing of the evaluation and review</b> .....	4
<b>Purpose, objective and scope</b> .....	4
Purpose and objectives.....	4
Evaluation questions.....	6
Tasks to be accomplished.....	7
<b>Methodology, outputs and schedule</b> .....	7
Briefing in Brussels and documentation study.....	7
Field phase.....	8
Report drafting phase and debriefing in Brussels.....	8
Final report.....	9
Dissemination and follow-up.....	9
<b>Management and supervision of the evaluation and review</b> .....	10
<b>Evaluation and review team</b> .....	10
<b>Timetable</b> .....	10
<b>ANNEX</b> .....	12

## **Mandate and legal basis**

1. Article 7 and Article 18 of [Regulation \(EC\) 1257/96](#) concerning humanitarian aid and Article 27 of the [Council Regulation \(EC, Euratom\) 1605/2002](#), laying down the rules for the establishment and implementation of the general budget of the European Communities, provide for regular evaluations (please see text in Annex of the Terms of Reference).

## **Background/Introduction**

1. Haiti has endured political instability, chronic challenges in governance and the highest levels of poverty in the Western Hemisphere. According to several indexes measuring states' fragility, Haiti performs particularly poorly, ranking twelfth out of 177 countries in the Failed States Index (Fund for Peace 2009) and 129th of 141 countries according to the Index of State Weakness in the Developing World.

2. The European Commission, through its Humanitarian Department, DG ECHO, has been supporting vulnerable populations in Haiti for the last 15 years. This assistance, totalling approximately €81 million, has focused on responding to the emergency needs caused by natural hazards and socio-economic crisis, as well as disaster risk reduction. DG ECHO responded swiftly at the end of the 1990s and in 2004 to social and economic problems caused by political instability, to the 2004 hurricanes and floods in the countryside and Gonaives, and to the three consecutive hurricanes in 2008. In 2008, due to the high level of vulnerability that was identified in the country, DG ECHO re-opened a field office to more closely manage humanitarian operations and step up efforts to identify and address malnutrition and mother-child mortality through a comprehensive multi- sector response.

2. On 12 January 2010 an earthquake of magnitude 7.0 on the Richter scale struck Haiti's capital Port-au-Prince and its surrounding areas. An estimated 230,000 people were killed and more than 2 million people were displaced out of a total population of 9.8 million. The European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO) support to the Haiti EQ crisis amounts for €120 million. Over 70% of the Commission aid is currently being delivered to those in need by non-governmental relief organisations, specialised UN agencies and the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement in the field.

3. The humanitarian international response has allowed avoiding massive epidemics and a potential social crisis in the aftermath of the earthquake. However, despite recent improvement in the construction of transitional shelters and the retrofitting of damaged houses, a significant number of the population living in camps and makeshift settlements will remain highly vulnerable all through the year 2011. The European Commission humanitarian aid will extend its multi-sectoral support to Haiti humanitarian operations throughout the year 2011.

4. The EC has pledged €460 million to reconstruction in Haiti following the earthquake. This includes €280 million of re-programmed resources and €180 million of new funding, key elements of which are:

- €100 million early non-humanitarian package focused on restoring government capacity, including €20 million from the Instrument for Stability (currently ongoing);
- €200 million expected to be reprogrammed from the 10th EDF NIP;
- €100 million as part of the Mid-Term Review of the 10th EDF;

- €60 million added to the B-Envelope for Haiti (10th EDF NIP) to finance unforeseen needs (decision taken).

## **Justification and timing and scope of the evaluation and of the review**

2. A real time evaluation is defined as an evaluation carried out at the early implementation stages of a humanitarian operation which almost simultaneously feeds back findings for immediate use, particularly at the field level<sup>1</sup>. Eight months after the earthquake, DG ECHO would like to assess its overall action in the Haitian crisis with a special focus on the earthquake response, to provide recommendations on DG ECHO immediate strategy in the country and in the years to come.

3. Article 18 Council Regulation (EC) 1257/96 on humanitarian aid states: “The Commission shall regularly assess aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of subsequent operations”.

4. As mentioned, the scope of the multi-sectoral evaluation will cover the implementation of DG ECHO's response to the Haiti crisis with a special focus on the earthquake disaster. Furthermore it will focus on the following components of the overall action: shelter, water and sanitation, health, food assistance (notably cash-transfer), and coordination (LRRD and external).

## **Purpose, objective and scope**

### Purpose and objectives

5. Lesson learning and accountability in view of improving performance are the main purposes of these evaluation and review.

6. The specific purposes of the evaluation are:

- To analyse the appropriateness and effectiveness of DG ECHO's action in response to the Haitian crisis with a special focus on the earthquake response, in accordance with DG ECHO mandate, in order to establish whether it is achieving its objectives and with a view to produce recommendations for improving performance of current and future operations in Haiti;

- To assess the current situation of DG ECHO's action in Haiti, in order to identify relevant opportunities, challenges and threats to help improve the performance of its current action and also to assist DG ECHO to plan for future planning;

- Taking into account the broad scope of this exercise, focused not only on DG ECHO's action in response to the earthquake but on the overall Haitian crisis, the consultants will provide recommendations within a larger comprehensive strategic framework based on the various decisions implemented during the last years in Haiti: the 2009 Global Plan

---

<sup>1</sup> IA-RTE of the Humanitarian response to the Haiti earthquake (09/04/10).

focusing on malnutrition, the DIPECHO operations in Haiti, the response to the earthquake through three specific decisions (primary emergency, emergency and ad hoc decisions) and refer to previous evaluations conducted in the country such as the DIPECHO evaluation<sup>2</sup>.

- To assess the effectiveness of DG ECHO's coordination with the different stakeholders of the crisis (Member States, UN agencies, other donors, partners, etc) at different levels (strategic and operational), whilst taking stock of the main lessons learnt with a view to improve strategy for future actions in similar crises (earthquake response).

- From a LRRD perspective, the consultants will analyse the coherence and complementarity of DG ECHO funded actions with present and future interventions of other EC services assessing the level of coordination and hand-over with the EC development actors, in order to produce practical recommendations and tools to improve this coordination (separate deliverable)<sup>3</sup>.

7. To avoid duplication of efforts and 'evaluation overload effect'<sup>4</sup>, whenever possible the consultants will take into account recent joint evaluation efforts and extensive literature carried out in the region<sup>5</sup>.

8. The main objective of this evaluation is to have an independent structured evaluation of the results of DG ECHO's response to the 2010 earthquake in Haiti in line with DG ECHO legal basis 1257/96 and a review. In accordance with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, whenever feasible/applicable to the specific humanitarian situation, the evaluation will analyze the relevance/appropriateness, connectedness, coherence, coverage, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of this action.<sup>6</sup> The evaluation should also refer to the 3Cs - **complementarity, coordination and coherence** -, cross-cutting issues<sup>7</sup> and the objective of LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development)<sup>8</sup>. Specifically relevant criteria for this evaluation should be identified at the briefing phase in Brussels.

9. The evaluation should contain conclusions and recommendations at both strategic and operational levels.

10. The specific purposes of the review are:

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/budget\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/budget_en.htm)

<sup>3</sup> See §24 of this Terms of Reference.

<sup>4</sup> The high-profile and highly funded crisis saw an evaluative effort that was in some ways as fragmented as the response itself. Report: "Haiti earthquake response: Context Analysis" (July, 2010- ALNAP, DAC, UNEG)

<sup>5</sup> More information at <http://www.alnap.org/current/Haitilearningportal.aspx>

<sup>6</sup> For further explanation of these evaluative criteria consultants are advised to refer to the ALNAP guide "Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC Criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies", ODI, 2006. Consultants should also refer to the "Evaluation of humanitarian aid by and for NGOs. A guide with ideas to consider when designing your own evaluation activities", Prolog Consult, 2007 ([http://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/thematic\\_en.htm#eval\\_guide](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/thematic_en.htm#eval_guide)).

<sup>7</sup> For example: gender, children HIV-AIDS, environment, protection, climate change etc.

<sup>8</sup> A communication from the European Commission to the European Council and European Parliament on LRRD policy can be found at: [http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COM\\_LRRD\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COM_LRRD_en.pdf)

- The review will give a summary overview of the most relevant actions and coordination initiatives undertaken by other major humanitarian donors, agencies and stakeholders. As mentioned above, the consultant team will take into account the extensive literature and recent joint evaluation efforts to avoid duplication of efforts.

- Considering the massive deployment of assistance in Haiti, both humanitarian and developmental, the review will provide guidance on the positioning of DG ECHO towards the future humanitarian response in coordination with other donors, as well as with other reconstruction stakeholders such as the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission.

- The review will highlight the obstacles and constraints encountered by stakeholders during the implementation of the interventions supported by DG ECHO and other international actors, including respect for the principle of 'do no harm', identifying the lessons to be learnt of the sudden-onset crisis in this specific urban setting.

11. The key users of the evaluation report include inter alia DG ECHO staff at HQ, regional and field level, the implementing partners, other EC services, Member States and other stakeholders with an interest in the evaluation findings (other humanitarian donors, agencies and evaluation networks such as ALNAP, etc).

### Evaluation questions

12. The evaluation will be based on a set of key questions. These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the evaluation criteria and to articulate the key issues, thus optimising the focus and utility of the evaluation.

13. The evaluation questions will be further discussed and validated at the briefing phase (other questions may be added at that stage).

14. The evaluation will address, among other, the following questions:

1) Evaluation of DG ECHO's overall response strategy: How adequately have the priorities been set in terms of sectors and geographical coverage? Did the operational strategy allow for the adjustment of the priorities to the evolving environment? Have relevant and appropriate actions been developed in a timely way?

2) Targeting beneficiaries: How effectively have DG ECHO funded actions been identified and addressed the most urgent needs of the population? Was the right balance maintained between interventions in urban and rural regions?

3) Implementation and Quality of the Aid: How timely and successful was DG ECHO action in delivering against planned objectives/indicators? Have the choice of partners been adequate? Were implementers responsive, flexible and willing to participate in coordination structures? Was the aid funded by DG ECHO visible?

4) DG ECHO external coordination: What was the role played by DG ECHO in the decision making process and coordination of the humanitarian response with the international community? Have the tools developed and distributed by DG ECHO (notes, situation reports, etc) had the impact and influence intended? Taking into account DG ECHO's role in the international humanitarian community and the role of the national government, what should be DG ECHO's position in the remaining phases of the crisis?

5) DG ECHO-EU internal coordination: What was the role played by DG ECHO in the decision making process and coordination within the EC general response and with the Member States? To what extent is DG ECHO assistance coordinated and complementary with other EC services, notably DG RELEX and DG AIDCO? How could LRRD be improved in the context of the Haiti crisis?

6) 2011-2012 Strategic planning: What would be the priority sectors and intervention modalities? How can the coordination amongst the different pillars of DG ECHO response (DRR, nutrition, earthquake response, etc) be improved?

7) Cross-cutting issues: How effectively have cross-cutting issues been addressed in DG ECHO's response and more particularly DRR, protection, HIV/AIDS, disability and gender issues? Were cross cutting issues effectively mainstreamed?

#### Tasks to be accomplished

15. The consultants shall accomplish the following tasks as a basis for their reports:

- to carry out a (comparative) analysis of evaluation reports, related reports, reviews;
- to carry out interviews of officials, partners, other donors, beneficiaries;
- to carry out a field mission to Haiti;
- to assess the coordination mechanisms between DG ECHO and other actors;
- to highlight obstacles and problems encountered by DG ECHO and other donors and stakeholders both during the implementation and the strategic aid coordination.

### **Methodology, outputs and schedule**

#### Briefing in Brussels and documentation study

16. The **briefing** will take place at DG ECHO headquarters with the relevant DG ECHO staff during which further documents available for the mission and necessary clarifications will be provided by the requesting service and other services of the Commission. The consultants will carry out a documentation study to examine and analyse available documents to allow careful planning of the activities/visits to be undertaken in the field (the documentation study is considered to be an on-going effort throughout the evaluation and should start before the briefing, i.e. upon signature of the contract).

17. The briefing will deal with the finalisation of the itinerary and schedule, the planning of the reports and the consolidation of the Terms of Reference (that shall be considered indicative throughout the evaluation, i.e. whenever necessary the consulting firm shall endeavour to accommodate DG ECHO's requests that may arise during the evaluation such as travel adjustments, etc.).

18. At the end (on the last day) of the briefing phase an **inception note of maximum 2 pages** based on the briefing, reviews and interviews conducted will be produced. This inception note should demonstrate the consultants' clear understanding of the Terms of Reference and of the deliverables required and contain detailed proposals in terms of work processes, as well as a clear description of the scope and methodology of the evaluation and review. The inception note must be submitted by the consultants to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector and shall be formally approved by the Evaluation Sector.

#### Field phase

19. Following the formal approval of the inception note, the consultants shall undertake **field visits** to evaluate relevant projects and to discuss with relevant stakeholders. The list of projects to be visited will be established jointly by DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, the responsible desk and the consultants. The consultants must work in co-operation with the relevant EU Delegation, DG ECHO experts, DG ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations and other donors.

20. If, during the course of the field phase, any significant change from the agreed methodology or scheduled work plan is considered necessary, this should be explained to and agreed with DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, in consultation with the responsible desk.

21. The NGOs/IOs evaluated during the field phase should have received the results of the technical appreciation (see Annexes III and IV of the call for tender) before the evaluators leave the field. The consultants are required to share their findings with the NGOs/IOs evaluated to allow them to comment upon these findings. The evaluators may adapt the format of the technical appreciation in consultation with the operational desk and technical assistant concerned. The purpose of the document is to promote dialogue, mutual learning and ownership and to build capacity of DG ECHO's partners.

22. At the end of each field trip the team leader should ensure that a **summary record ('aide mémoire') of maximum 5 pages** is drawn up and transmitted to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector. It should cover the main findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations of the mission.

23. The consultants will organise **two final workshops** before leaving the field: one focused on the **preliminary findings on LRRD** with the participation of the EU Delegation and DG ECHO representatives; and a **general one** with the partners, EU delegation and DG ECHO representatives to share the preliminary findings of the evaluation and review.

#### Report drafting phase and debriefing in Brussels

24. A first deliverable (maximum 15 pages) will be produced containing the practical recommendations and suggested tools for the LRRD/transition not later than two weeks after the consultants' return from the field. The consultants may be asked to make a **specific presentation** of this deliverable in a meeting organised to that end with relevant stakeholders in Brussels.

25. The first **draft reports (maximum 30 pages for the evaluation and 20 pages for the review)** in accordance with the format given in point 5 of the annex of the Terms of



Reference shall be submitted by electronic transmission to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector not later than 3 weeks after the consultants' return from the field.

26. If applicable a preliminary *technical* debriefing may be organized with relevant stakeholders, after the submission of the first draft reports and prior to the submission of the final draft reports.

27. A **debriefing** will be organised in Brussels after the submission of the first draft reports. The consultants shall make a PowerPoint presentation to DG ECHO management and key staff of main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation and review. The starting date for this debriefing will be decided by DG ECHO Evaluation Sector in agreement with the consulting firm and the relevant desk(s).

28. Prior to the meeting, DG ECHO Evaluation Sector will have provided consolidated written comments on the first draft reports to the consultants within 10 calendar days from the receipt of the draft reports.

29. On the basis of the results of the debriefing and taking into due account the comments received before and during the meeting, the **draft final reports (maximum 30 pages for the evaluation and 20 pages for the review)** will be submitted to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector not later than 10 calendar days after the debriefing. DG ECHO Evaluation Sector should mark its agreement within 10 calendar days or request further amendments.

#### Final reports

30. On the basis of the comments made by the DG ECHO, the consultants shall make appropriate amendments and submit the **final reports** within 10 calendar days. If consultants reject any of the comments they shall explain and substantiate the reasons why they do so in writing.

31. The evaluation will result in the drawing up of a two separate reports with annexes. The evaluation report shall strictly reflect the structure outlined in the Annex of the ToR under point 5.

32. While correcting the reports and its annexes, the consultants will always highlight changes (using track changes) and modifications introduced as resulting from the debriefing and the comments received from DG ECHO Evaluation Sector.

#### Dissemination and follow-up

33. The reports are an extremely important working tool for DG ECHO. The report is the primary output of the consultants and once finalised the **executive summary and/or the entire final report** will be placed in the public domain on the Internet. The reports are to promote accountability and learning. Its use is intended for DG ECHO's operational and policy personnel, Humanitarian beneficiaries, EU Member States and citizens, other donors and humanitarian actors. Whenever applicable, the executive summary and/or the final reports shall be translated into relevant languages for dissemination purposes.

34. Following the approval of the final reports, DG ECHO Evaluation Sector will proceed to the dissemination of the results (conclusions and recommendations) of the evaluation and review. Therefore, whenever applicable the consultants shall provide a dissemination plan.

### **Management and supervision of the evaluation and review**

35. DG ECHO Evaluation Sector bears the responsibility for the management and the monitoring of the evaluation, in consultation with the responsible desk. DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, and in particular the internal manager assigned to the evaluation, should therefore always be kept informed and consulted by the consultants and copied on all correspondence with other DG ECHO staff.

36. The DG ECHO Evaluation manager is the contact person for the consulting team and shall assist the team during their mission in tasks such as providing documents and facilitating contacts. The travel and accommodation arrangements, the organisation of meetings and facilitating the obtainment of visas remain the sole responsibility of the consulting company.

### **Evaluation and review team**

This evaluation will be carried out by **a team of minimum 2 experts** (this is an indicative number) with experience both in the humanitarian field and its evaluation. If possible, the team shall be gender balanced. These experts must agree to work in high-risk areas. Solid experience in relevant fields of work to the evaluation and in the geographic areas where the evaluation takes place is also required. It is therefore recommended that the team should include national consultants whenever possible.

37. Proficiency in English and French is obligatory. Knowledge of Creole would be an advantage.

38. The consultants' profiles should include knowledge and experience in:

- (1) Very good knowledge of strategic and operational management of humanitarian operations, preferably in natural disasters;
- (2) Shelter
- (3) Health;
- (4) Food assistance;
- (5) Water and sanitation.
- (6) Very good knowledge of the EC development policies, especially from a LRRD perspective.

39. Guidelines for the evaluation team are provided in point 4 of the annex of the Terms of Reference.

### **Timetable**

40. The tasks under these evaluation and review will be undertaken in a period of working days that will be proposed by the consulting firm, ending no later than 28/02/2011 with the acceptance of the final report.

41. The work starts at the actual signature of the contract and by no means any contact and/or expense may occur before it. The largest part of relevant documents will be provided after the signature of the contract and before the briefing phase.

42. The following is an indicative schedule:

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Phases and Stages</b>	<b>Meetings</b>	<b>Notes and Reports</b>
End September	Call for Tender		
November	Starting Stage (signature of contract)		
November	Documentation Phase	Briefing	Inception note
December	Field Phase	Workshops	'Aide mémoire'
January	Report writing phase	LRRD presentation	LRRD deliverable
Mid January			Draft report
End January		Debriefing	Draft final report
February			Final Report
February	Dissemination		

## **ANNEX**

### **Guidelines for the consultants**

#### **1. Regulatory basis**

The Regulatory basis for the evaluation of the aid provided by DG ECHO is established in Article 18 of Regulation (EC) 1257/96 concerning humanitarian aid, which states "*the Commission shall regularly assess humanitarian aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of subsequent operations*".

Furthermore, Article 7 states:

*“When determining a non-governmental organization's suitability for Community funding, account shall be taken of the following factors:*

- a) its administrative and financial management capacities;*
- b) its technical and logistical capacity in relation to the planned operation;*
- c) its experience in the field of humanitarian aid;*
- d) the results of previous operations carried out by the organization concerned, and in particular those financed by the Community;*
- e) its readiness to take part, if need be, in the coordination system set up for a humanitarian operation;*
- f) its ability and readiness to work with humanitarian agencies and the basic communities in the third countries concerned;*
- g) its impartiality in the implementation of humanitarian aid;*
- h) where appropriate, its previous experience in the third country involved in the humanitarian operation concerned.”*

Article 27 of the [Council Regulation \(EC, Euratom\) 1605/2002](#) laying down the rules for the establishment and implementation of the general budget of the European Communities states that : "*In order to improve decision-making, institutions shall undertake both ex ante and ex post evaluations in line with guidance provided by the Commission. Such evaluations shall be applied to all programmes and activities which entail significant spending and evaluation results disseminated to spending, legislative and budgetary authorities*".

#### **2. Terms of Reference**

The Terms of Reference set out the scope of the evaluator's mission, the issues to be considered and the evaluation timetable. They allow those commissioning the evaluation and/or the review to express their needs (guidance function) while providing the consultant(s) with a clear idea of what is expected from them (control function).

#### **3. Scope of the evaluation and topics of study**

In addition to the initial information contained in the ToR, the first briefing session in Brussels provides everyone involved in the evaluation (DG ECHO requesting service and particularly the responsible desk, DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, the consultants and other Commission services) with the opportunity to discuss the contents of the ToR and to establish priorities for the evaluation. This meeting should also allow the consultants to clarify any

doubts they might have about the scope of their mission. Any important remark or comment on the content of the ToR at this stage will be considered an **integral** part of these and will be set out by the team leader in the inception note that must be submitted to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector at the end of the briefing session, and before the team's departure to other locations in Europe and elsewhere.

During the process of the evaluation the consultants must try to follow all the items listed in the Terms of Reference. Their treatment, the importance given to them and their coverage in the final reports will depend, however, on the consultants' own opinion as a result of the information found, both during the documentation phase and in the field. Any decision not to cover one or more of the main task assignments described in the ToR will have to be justified in the text of the reports, if inappropriately justified DG ECHO may choose to not accept the final report.

#### **4. The evaluation team**

Each team member is jointly responsible for the final accomplishment of the tasks; however, the separate elements of work necessary for the accomplishment of the tasks may be allocated between the consultants. The members of the team must work in close co-ordination.

A team leader shall be named who shall have the added responsibility of the overall co-ordination of the tasks to be completed, of the elaboration of Executive Summary and of the final coherence of the report and other works both in terms of content and presentation.

If possible/advisable, at least one of the team members shall be a woman.

The consultants are required to carry out their work in accordance with international standards of good practice in approach and method. All conclusions must be substantiated with adequate data.

In the conduct of their work the consultants should use a multi-method approach and triangulate between different sources of information. These information sources should include i.e. non-beneficiaries, primary stakeholders (specifically humanitarian beneficiaries, members of the host communities), local government (or equivalent such as group/tribal leaders), international agency staff, partners (both expatriate and local employees of partners), DG ECHO experts, EU Delegation and main actors - other donors and humanitarian agencies, etc.

In order to substantiate evaluation findings the numbers, sex, ethnicity etc of primary stakeholders should be noted, as well as ways in which confidentiality and dignity have been assured in the interview process. In this consultation, the evaluation team is encouraged to use participatory techniques.

In carrying out their work, the consultants should be vigilant as to any non-respect of international humanitarian law and principles, standards and conventions, UN protocols, Red Cross codes, and declarations, such as the Madrid declaration. The consultants should report any non-respect of such matters by DG ECHO-financed entities to DG ECHO in a duly substantiated form.

During the contract, consultants shall refrain from any conduct that would adversely reflect on the European Commission or DG ECHO and shall not engage in any activity that is

incompatible with the discharge of their duties. Consultants are required to exercise the utmost discretion in all matters during their mission.

The consultants' individual profiles should have a mixture of institutional and NGO experience. In the event that one member of the team proposed has an exclusive background with NGOs then this should be counter-balanced with the profiles of the other team members.

## **5. The report**

By commissioning an independent evaluation and/or review DG ECHO expects to obtain an objective, critical, readable and transparent analysis of its policy. This analysis should contain policy recommendations on future courses of action. Above all, the report should be a document that can function as a learning tool. Therefore, while writing it, the consultants should always bear in mind why the report is done, for whom, and how the results will be used.

Furthermore, the report is a working tool of value to DG ECHO only as long as it is feasible and pragmatic (keeping in mind DG ECHO's mandate constraints) and it clearly reflects the consultant's independent view. DG ECHO's concern is to respect this independence.

The evaluation methods should be clearly outlined in the report and their appropriateness, focus and users should be explained pointing out strengths and weaknesses of the methods. The report should briefly outline the nature (e.g. external or mixed) and make up of the team (e.g. sectoral expertise, local knowledge, gender balance) and its appropriateness for the evaluation. It should also briefly outline the evaluators' biases and/or constraints that might have affected the evaluation and how these have been counteracted (past experiences, background, etc.).

The report shall be written in a straightforward manner in English with an Executive Summary at the beginning of the document. Final editing shall be provided by the consulting firm. The report should be in the font Time Roman 12, have single line spacing and be fully justified. Paragraphs must be sequentially numbered.

The final report should contain:

- An Executive Summary of maximum **5 pages**.
- The main report.
- Technical annexes, including individual appraisals of NGOs/IOs & a summary table of results (confidential).
- Other annexes as necessary.

This report format should be strictly adhered to:

- *Cover page* (a template is provided at the end of this annex)
  - title of the evaluation report;
  - date of the evaluation;
  - name of the consultant(s) and the company;
  - cost of the report in €and as a percentage of the budget evaluated;
  - the contract number

- indication that “the report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only”,
- *Table of contents*
- *Executive Summary*  
A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing **Executive Summary is an essential element**. It should be short, **no more than 5 pages**. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main points of the analysis, and contain a **matrix made of three columns clearly indicating the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations**. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text. EU Member States receive each Executive Summary, which is also published on DG ECHO website. The consultant should take this into account when drafting this part of the report.
- *Main body of the report*  
The report should have separate sections for the evaluation work in each of the regions visited. The main body of the report shall elaborate the points listed in the Executive Summary. It would include references to the methodology used for the evaluation and the context of the Global/Intervention Plan. In particular, it should clearly demonstrate how each recommendation relates to the findings and conclusions. Conclusions should be fully substantiated. For the evaluation of global/intervention plans these conclusions should refer to the main evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues identified by the consultants. Recommendations should be prioritised, directed at specific users and where appropriate include an indicative timeframe. **Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take into careful account the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the Global/Intervention Plan, and of the resources available to implement it both locally and at the Commission level.**
- *Annexes of the report:*
  - Annex A: Technical appraisals of NGOs/IOs (confidential);
  - Annex B: Summary table of results (confidential);
  - Annex C: Terms of Reference;
  - Annex D: List of persons interviewed and sites visited;
  - Annex E: Map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the action;
  - Annex F: Abbreviations and Acronyms.

All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex. The consultants are to be particularly aware that any risk of libel is to be avoided. Where necessary the name of any partner that is criticised should be replaced with an anonymous title.

Each report shall be drawn up in five paper copies and transmitted to DG ECHO - To the attention of DG ECHO 01/Evaluation sector, AN88 03/01, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

An electronic copy of the report (CD-ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) including all its annexes must be submitted to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, together with the hard copies.

The final report should be sent by email to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector in three separate documents in PDF format each containing: the executive summary, the report without its annexes and the report with its annexes.




**TEMPLATE FOR COVER PAGE**

NAME AND LOGO OF THE CONSULTING COMPANY

(EVENTUAL INSERTION OF PICTURE/DRAWING/MAP)

TITLE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT;  
DATE OF THE EVALUATION;  
NAME OF THE CONSULTANT(S);  
COST OF THE REPORT IN € AND AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE BUDGET EVALUATED.  
THE CONTRACT NUMBER (ECHO/ADM/BUD/200./...)

 <p>EUROPEAN COMMISSION Humanitarian Aid</p>	<p>The report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only</p>
---	--