INFORMATION DOCUMENT

Evaluation in the Development Cooperation Activities of MISEREOR and its Partners

MISEREOR
IHR HILFSWERK

Text by: Quality Assurance International Cooperation Department – Evaluation and Consultancy Team, MISEREOR

Place of publication: Aachen
Date: December 2010, second edition 2014, third edition 2017, fourth edition 2020
Translation by Jonathan Phillips and MISEREOR Language Services

Copyright:
This is an originally internal document. Permission must be obtained for any further utilisation including duplication.

Contents

Abbreviations and terms

BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DeGEval	Gesellschaft für Evaluation e. V. (Evaluation Society)
DEval	German Institute for Development Evaluation
DC	Development cooperation
ex-post evaluation	Evaluation of a development project after its completion
Inception Report	Ex-ante report on the design and methodology of the evaluation
KZE	German Catholic Central Agency for Development Aid
MIDOC	MISEREOR Documentation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Introduction

MISEREOR has long viewed evaluation as a subject of fundamental importance and has been conducting evaluations for many years. We commissioned an independent evaluation group to carry out our first evaluations in 1968. At the beginning of the 1990s, the working guide “Evaluations in the Churches’ Development Cooperation” (Evaluierung in der kirchlichen Entwicklungsarbeit) set out the position of German Church-based agencies for international development cooperation (MISEREOR, Bread for the World and the Protestant Association for Cooperation in Development). An evaluation concept was first drawn up in 2006, and it has been updated several times since then.

Throughout this long history of evaluation, MISEREOR has followed a number of specific principles:

- MISEREOR works with autonomous partner organisations in the Global South and values these as equals. MISEREOR takes their interests and concerns seriously and endeavours to form partnerships that support the partners in their own development. This makes an important contribution to strengthening civil society in the Global South.
- At the centre of MISEREOR’s work are the poor with all aspects of their human existence. MISEREOR aims to foster complex and long-term development processes in individuals and communities. The shorter-term project and support logic adopted in our work on the ground which generally lasts three years is, however, necessary for administrative reasons and often helpful in achieving objectives. Nevertheless, wherever this hinders the development of more complex processes, responsible compromises must be sought. In all evaluations, it is important to examine these processes too, and not to rely on a superficial study of the project documentation.
- MISEREOR endeavours to use the scarce resources provided by donors, the state and the Church as effectively as possible. The more money is spent on evaluations, the less is available for project implementation. Funding for evaluations must therefore be allocated such that it contributes to achieving a high level of effectiveness of the projects.

With the current concept, we aim

- to provide staff at MISEREOR with a common understanding of the role of evaluations as a project-support and performance-assessment instrument, and also to communicate this to our partner organisations in the Global South;
- to communicate what is expected of the consultants who are commissioned to conduct evaluations;
- to demonstrate clearly to our donors (individual and institutional, especially BMZ) how MISEREOR/KZE uses evaluations to ensure the effective use of funds and how it maintains an appropriate balance between the costs and benefits of evaluations;

- to establish a basis for discussing the role of evaluations in (Church-based) development cooperation with interested professionals and other development cooperation organisations.

Chapter 1: What is the purpose of evaluations at MISEREOR?

MISEREOR understands evaluations as comprehensive, systematic and intersubjectively verifiable assessments of ongoing or completed development projects, instruments or strategies. They examine the design, implementation and effects of development measures, assess them in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and make specific recommendations. They encourage learning and enhance accountability.

1.1 Evaluations as a learning instrument

At MISEREOR, evaluations have long been used for the purposes of learning and quality development in international cooperation. They help us identify potential for improvement in the implementation of individual projects, in our strategic orientation and in the hands-on cooperation between MISEREOR and its partner organisations.

In terms of the cost-effective use of funding, it is essential that this instrument helps generate positive effects itself and is not confined to examining and documenting them. MISEREOR therefore organises its evaluation work to ensure the maximum benefit for all participants (partner organisations[1], target groups and MISEREOR itself) as learning organisations.

Other expectations, for example aiming for maximum comparability of evaluation results, broad-based cooperation between donors and maximum transparency, are also important but are pursued only in as far as they do not stand in the way of achieving quality improvements in our work.

In order to harness the potential of evaluations to initiate and foster learning processes, MISEREOR has found it especially helpful if the project stakeholders are actively involved. They then have the chance to find out for themselves what needs to be improved and how this can be done; this promotes effective learning. In other words, a good evaluation not only assesses development efforts but also makes a contribution to development.

[1] The term ‘partner organisations’ in this paper refers to organisations in the Global South which, as independent legal entities, plan and implement projects self-reliantly and receive financial support from MISEREOR/KZE for this purpose

1.2 Evaluations as an instrument in the performance assessment and accountability system

In addition to the considerations mentioned above, it is also appropriate that the expectations placed on accountability in development cooperation are high. MISEREOR has therefore structured its evaluation system so that it – and many other instruments – meets performance assessment and accountability requirements. For example:

- There are clear criteria for determining when project evaluations must be conducted (see chapter 3). These evaluations are then commissioned either by the partner organisations or directly by MISEREOR. In both cases, the evaluations are carried out by independent consultants.
- Evaluations commissioned by partner organisations are recorded as part of MISEREOR's evaluation system. Minimum implementation standards are set out in a guideline for partner organisations. As part of this system, regular external quality reviews of these evaluations are carried out in the form of meta-evaluations.
- Evaluations always examine the effects (outcomes and impacts) of project work.
- Regular sector portfolio evaluations examine the strategies and effects across a whole area of promotion - in these evaluations, some projects are randomly selected, and ex-post evaluations are carried out in some cases.
- Since 2005, MISEREOR has published its evaluation results in an annual evaluation report and on its website.

1.3 The individual purposes of evaluation

MISEREOR does not itself implement projects in the Global South, but supports the projects of autonomous and, in most cases, local partner organisations, generally within the framework of three-year project contracts. MISEREOR does, however, operate some individual projects in the area of partner support and capacity building, for example with MISEREOR Dialogue and Partnership Services in a number of countries in the Global South, or as projects for short-term consultants who advise partner organisations on various topics on a needs-driven basis. In addition, some of MISEREOR's domestic activities departments also have their own projects.

For this reason, we have to distinguish between various evaluation levels and actors. In the following, we will outline the different types of evaluation and group these according to the four evaluation purposes defined by Stockmann – monitoring, accountability, steering and learning[2]. Evaluations do not generally have one single purpose, however, but pursue a mix of all of these with different weightings attached to the individual elements.

a) Partner organisations in the Global South commission consultants to evaluate the projects they are implementing with MISEREOR support.

---

[2] Stockmann, Reinhard (Hg.): Handbuch zur Evaluation. Eine praktische Handlungsanleitung (Handbook on Evaluation – A Practical Guide), Waxmann, Münster (2007, p. 37)

Since 2010, partner organisations have been required to conduct these locally commissioned evaluations as a matter of course; they are documented at MISEREOR and assessed at regular intervals. MISEREOR uses these evaluations primarily for the purposes of monitoring and accountability; for the partner organisations, they are also intended wherever possible to support steering and learning processes.

b) MISEREOR commissions consultants to evaluate projects implemented by autonomous partner organisations with MISEREOR support (individual projects or cross-section evaluations).

These evaluations, which are generally designed together with the partner organisations, form part of MISEREOR's ongoing project support. They are conducted as and when required, for example to gather reliable and independent data as a basis for further flanking support or to examine and to further develop strategies at MISEREOR. In most cases, another aim is to encourage quality development at the project implementing organisation. In individual evaluations, the primary focus is on promoting steering capability and learning at the partner organisation; in cross-section evaluations, the emphasis is on learning at MISEREOR and on accountability, for example with regard to a particular promotional approach.

c) MISEREOR commissions consultants to evaluate its own activities, which can include Dialogue and Partnership Services (DPSs) in the Global South or promotional projects and procedures at Head Office.

These evaluations are a steering tool as well as an instrument for enhancing steering capability, for improving in-house quality and for fulfilling accountability obligations.

Chapter 2: Actors involved in evaluation in MISEREOR’s international cooperation activities and the quality assurance function performed by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team

2.1 How MISEREOR works in international cooperation

Within the framework of its international cooperation activities, MISEREOR provides technical and financial support to autonomous and in most cases local partner organisations in implementing their projects. Flanking support for these measures takes the form of regular correspondence and telephone calls, the examination of narrative and financial reports, and project visits. Moreover, when needed MISEREOR also offers intensive support through consultancy inputs and evaluations.
The flanking support for partners and projects is provided through MISEREOR’s three continental divisions (Africa, Asia and Latin America) by staff with specific regional and sectoral expertise and officers responsible for financial cooperation.
The Evaluation and Consultancy Team a) sets the standards for MISEREOR’s evaluation work, b) ensures compliance with these standards, c) commissions independent consultants to conduct evaluations and provide advisory inputs, and d) helps MISEREOR maintain an effects-based approach in its international cooperation work.

2.2 Actors involved in evaluation in MISEREOR's international cooperation

MISEREOR's continental departments: The continental departments maintain direct contact with partner organisations in the Global South. They call on the partner organisations to conduct their own evaluations, or they initiate joint evaluations. The departments inform the Evaluation and Consultancy Team of the need for evaluation.
In the evaluation process, the continental departments are responsible for communicating with the partner organisations in the Global South, ensuring in particular that the necessary steps are taken to implement evaluation recommendations. In-house learning is an important aspect of these evaluations.

Partner organisations: The projects supported by MISEREOR are implemented by autonomous partner organisations. These are either local legal entities of the Catholic Church (dioceses, orders, bishops' conferences etc.) or non-governmental organisations. As project implementing organisations, they are themselves an object of the evaluations as well as being the party commissioning the evaluation in many cases.

Beneficiaries: The partner organisations work together with the project target groups or beneficiaries. These are either the poor themselves, i.e. those who are ultimately intended to benefit from the project, or intermediaries who are to acquire particular skills, attitudes or perspectives that will benefit the poor. The direct target groups of the project are important participants in evaluations, as they know a great deal about the effects of the project work, and their assessments are crucial to the success of the project.

It follows that there are two aspects to participation: It can mean that the *partner organisation* plays a particular role in the evaluation or that the *target groups* are especially closely integrated. Both forms of participation are encouraged by MISEREOR. In the first case, MISEREOR hopes that the partner organisation firstly gains particular insights into the opportunities and the need for project improvement and secondly develops the ideas and initiative that will help drive this forward. In the second case, the ideal scenario is that the evaluation itself serves as an awareness-raising measure: the poor reflect on what was supposed to change, what actually has changed, and who should contribute what in order to ensure that the intended change comes about. However, experience shows that a high level of target-group participation in the evaluation is only possible when the project has already embraced a highly participatory approach. If this is not the case, the role of the target group is often relegated to that of providing information.[3]

External consultants: Only those evaluations in which independent consultants are involved count as part of MISEREOR's evaluation system. In most cases the consultants have an independent evaluation contract. In some cases, these contracts are for advisory inputs within the framework of assisted self-evaluations, in which the partner

[3] See Annex 1 for information on minimum standards of participation, accuracy and credibility

organisation assumes the main responsibility for collecting and assessing data (see p. 15)[4].

MISEREOR has numerous active consultants and consulting firms in its database. To help find suitable consultants for each evaluation, the database entries include keywords relating to the consultants' training/education, regional and sectoral experience, language and methodological skills. MISEREOR publishes its evaluation plans on its website and invites consultants to submit expressions of interest. The evaluation plans and the consultant database are continuously updated.

The Evaluation and Consultancy Team at MISEREOR is part of the Quality Assurance International Cooperation Department in the International Cooperation Division. It has its own fund for financing consultancy assignments, for example evaluations, advisory inputs and studies.

The Evaluation and Consultancy Team

- develops evaluation policies and guidelines
- draws up annual evaluation plans
- commissions external evaluators
- undertakes the overall steering and coordination of evaluation processes
- provides support for individual project evaluations and designs and implements cross-section evaluations
- documents evaluations internally and for the public, and
- organises learning processes based on evaluation results as and when required.

2.3 Quality assurance tasks undertaken by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team

The Evaluation and Consultancy Team not only provides organisational support for the other participants but also guarantees the quality of the evaluation system. With the focus on evaluations that MISEREOR itself commissions, we include here an explanation using the DAC[5] and DeGEval[6] quality criteria.

The DAC evaluation principles are impartiality and independence, credibility, usefulness, and participation of donors and recipients. The DeGEval standards are organised into four groups: utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy.

---

[4] Self-evaluations (conducted without any involvement of an external consultant) are also valued and supported by MISEREOR as a steering and learning instrument. As they are of only limited benefit in terms of accountability and monitoring, they are employed in the context of ongoing flanking support but are not included in MISEREOR's evaluation system

[5] Development Assistance Committee of the OECD

[6] Gesellschaft für Evaluation e. V. (Evaluation Society)

Impartiality and independence

- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team operates independently of content-related and financial project processing at MISEREOR, and it has direct access to the Board of Directors. It maintains its own budget for implementing independent evaluations.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that independent consultants are commissioned to conduct evaluations. For this purpose, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team maintains a consultant database. As a matter of principle, persons who have already worked in an advisory capacity in a project will not be given evaluation assignments in the same project. In order to avoid dependencies, MISEREOR does not commission external consultants to undertake more than 100 days of work per year.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team coordinates the overall evaluation process and ensures, for example in the preparatory and debriefing discussions, that no influence is brought to bear on the evaluation results.
- With regard to evaluations commissioned by partner organisations, guidelines produced by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team set out how to ensure the independence of consultants.

Credibility and accuracy

- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that consultants have the necessary technical and methodological know-how, country knowledge, and the requisite language and soft skills.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability) are taken into account in the terms of reference for evaluations.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team discusses the methodological approach with the consultants and examines the quality of the evaluation report. A set of guidelines informs consultants about minimum methodological and reporting standards.[7]
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures the transparency of the evaluation processes and results through systematic documentation as well as the publication of its evaluation concept, its evaluation plans and the annual evaluation report.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team regularly commissions meta-evaluations in which evaluation quality is externally monitored, and it reports on the results of these meta-evaluations.

Usefulness and feasibility

- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that individual terms of reference are produced for each evaluation. These must take adequate account of the need for information on the part of the participants – especially MISEREOR/KZE as donor and the partner organisations as project implementing organisations.

---

[7] See Annex 1

- In each individual case, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team clarifies the methodological approach and the evaluation timeframe in order to ensure that the questions set out in the terms of reference can be adequately addressed and that the costs of the evaluation are commensurate with the development tasks under review.
- Evaluation reports are produced in the language of project communication between MISEREOR and the partner organisation. Where necessary, they are translated into the national language in order to enable those responsible for the project to reap the full benefits of the report. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that the evaluation reports are produced promptly and are accessible to all stakeholders.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that partner organisations are integrated into the evaluation, at least to an extent that enables them to understand and utilise the evaluation results. One aspect here is the joint elaboration of the terms of reference with the partner organisation. In addition, the project stakeholders take part in introductory and debriefing workshops at the beginning and end of the on-site evaluation work.
- Evaluations are generally conducted during the project implementation phase so that the recommendations for improving project work can be immediately applied.

Participation and propriety

- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that the partner organisations contribute to drawing up the terms of reference, that the consultants select a suitable participatory procedure, and that the evaluation report is in line with the propriety principle, i.e. that the strengths and weaknesses are presented in a balanced way and that various perspectives are considered.
- The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that the rights of individuals are protected and that the evaluation results are treated confidentially if the partner organisation so desires.
- After completion of the evaluation, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team always asks the partner organisation to provide feedback on the evaluation process.

The quality assurance instruments for evaluations commissioned by the partners consist of the binding *Guide for MISEREOR partner organisations on commissioning external evaluations locally*, the above-mentioned meta-evaluations and training courses offered in some regions to partner organisations and local consultants.

Chapter 3: The evaluation system in MISEREOR's work in the field of international cooperation

MISEREOR/KZE's evaluation system for its international cooperation activities includes all evaluations utilised by the International Cooperation Division to promote quality development and to meet accountability obligations. Evaluations in the Domestic Activities Division and Internal Services Division are not presented here. In individual cases, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team supports these divisions in evaluating specific tasks or projects implemented in Germany.

The evaluation system in MISEREOR's work in the field of international cooperation

	Individual project evaluations	Overarching evaluations
Commissioned by MISEREOR/ Evaluation and Consultancy Team	Individual project evaluations commissioned by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team (incl. assisted self-evaluations) Bundled evaluations[8]	Cross-section evaluations Instrument evaluations Sector portfolio evaluations
Commissioned by others	External, locally commissioned evaluations (incl. assisted self-evaluations) Evaluations of cofinanced projects commissioned by other donors	Inclusion of MISEREOR (projects) in BMZ or DEval sectoral, regional, or instrument evaluations

Within the framework of this evaluation system, evaluations are carried out each year on at least 10% of the projects supported through public funding and at least 10% of the projects in excess of EUR 100,000 funded through donations.

3.1 Individual project evaluations

At MISEREOR, individual projects are evaluated in accordance with standard rules and also when there is a particular need for information. In the case of projects financed with public funds and donor-financed projects with grant approvals in excess of EUR 100,000, an evaluation is to be scheduled during the project funding period if one of the following criteria applies:

- The project is approved with a funding period of five years or more.
- Project support remains essentially unchanged for a third funding period.
- A grant of more than EUR 1,000,000 is approved in the phase under review.
- The measure is an individual project of special significance, e.g.
  - an innovative project, a pilot or model project
  - a project with particularly broad impact (especially trans-continental projects)
  - a project being implemented in a clearly risk-prone environment

[8] At MISEREOR, we use the term bundled evaluations (as opposed to cross-section evaluations) when several evaluations, for organisational reasons, are conducted by the same evaluation team, possibly as part of the same mission without addressing overarching questions

In addition, within the framework of ongoing project support, it is from time to time expedient to discuss the strategic orientation of the project work, the effectiveness of the selected approaches or the quality of implementation activities. This may apply, for example, after a lengthy and continuous period of support, if underlying conditions have changed, or if there have been personnel changes. In these situations, evaluations provide a reliable and shared informational basis for realigning the partner's project work and the support provided by MISEREOR.

3.1.1 Joint evaluations undertaken by partner organisations and MISEREOR

The initial impetus for joint evaluations is generally provided by MISEREOR, but sometimes also by partner organisations that would like to have a joint assessment of the progress achieved to date. Upcoming obligatory evaluations are often taken as an opportunity for undertaking such a joint evaluation. The continental departments report the need for such evaluations to the Evaluation and Consultancy Team.

The terms of reference are drawn up for each specific case and agreed between MISEREOR and the partner organisation. This is intended to ensure that the need for information on both sides is adequately taken into account. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team ensures that the DAC evaluation criteria are observed and, in particular, that the effects of previous project work are kept in view (see Annex 2, Recommended Structure for the Terms of Reference of Evaluations).

As a rule, an evaluation team of two persons is assigned in such cases. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team generally commissions a consultant who lives in Germany or Europe; the partner organisation generally commissions a consultant from the country in which the project is implemented. The two work as a team and should complement each other in terms of areas of expertise and their individual perspectives. If possible, the team should comprise one woman and one man. The consultant commissioned by MISEREOR is responsible for reporting. For such evaluations, an inception report[9] is to be provided only if the methodology is especially sophisticated, e.g. in the field of effects assessments.

Joint evaluations generally begin with preliminary talks and a study of the files/documentation at head office by the consultant commissioned by MISEREOR. At the same time, the local consultant can review the documentation kept by the partner organisation. The joint field phase, which generally takes between two and three weeks, commences with a kick-off workshop with the partner organisation. Data is sourced from the on-site documentation as well as from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and on-site visits etc. In many cases, participatory methods and tools are employed. The consultant team undertakes the initial data analysis and makes preliminary recommendations on site. In a concluding workshop, the results and recommendations are presented to and checked for plausibility with the partner organisation. In most cases, initial ideas on implementing the recommendations are also discussed at this stage. The consultant commissioned by MISEREOR generally draws up the evaluation report on completion of the field phase. The local consultant contributes individual chapters as agreed. The evaluation report is always produced in

[9] Ex-ante report on the design and methodology of the evaluation

the language of communication between the partner organisation and MISEROER, and, if necessary, translated into the local language so that the partner can use the findings to improve the quality of its own work.

The European consultant takes part in a final debriefing meeting at MISEREOR at which unresolved issues are clarified, the report is accepted and possible follow-up activities are explored. This meeting is also attended by regional and possibly sectoral officers from the continental departments and the responsible officer from the Evaluation and Consultancy Team.

The Evaluation and Consultancy Team then records, examines and assesses the report and, if appropriate, records the lessons learned in MISEREOR's electronic project administration system. The responsible officers in the continental departments forward the final report to the partner organisation and then discuss with this organisation how to implement the recommendations. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team asks the partner organisation for feedback on the evaluation process and requests approval to make the evaluation report available to externals.

These evaluations are financed out of the evaluation and consulting fund managed by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team and from the project funds made available to the partner organisation.

A joint evaluation can also be conducted in the form of an assisted self-evaluation. In this case, the consultants act as facilitators and advisors: they provide methodological support, ensure that critical reflection takes place and contribute their external perspective. Such self-evaluation processes are especially valuable because of their potential for improving quality. Weaknesses in project implementation are often pinpointed with greater acuity by staff rather than through external evaluations. These self-evaluations are recognised as part of MISEREOR's evaluation system provided they include a separate section drafted independently by the external consultant.

3.1.2 External, locally commissioned evaluations

If the above-mentioned criteria for a project are met and an evaluation is therefore required, this can be commissioned jointly or locally. In the latter case, the partner organisation is required under the terms of the project contract to undertake an external evaluation during the project funding period and in so doing must observe the *Guide for MISEREOR partner organisations on commissioning external evaluations locally* (https://www.misereor.org/cooperation-service/evaluation-focus-on-effects/). This explains, for example, how to ensure the independence of the evaluators and what questions the evaluation is to address (in particular the DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability).

Here, it is the task of the continental departments at MISEREOR to check that the evaluation takes place and that MISEREOR receives the evaluation report. This is then recorded in the electronic projects administration system. The results of the evaluations are channelled into the routine project communication between MISEREOR and the project partner.

Locally commissioned evaluations are financed out of the project funding made available to the partner organisation.

3.1.3 Joint evaluations undertaken by several donors

In projects that are cofinanced by other aid organisations, evaluations are sometimes jointly organised. If MISEREOR is coordinating the evaluation, it adopts the procedure described in section 3.1.1 in consultation with the other donors. If one of the other aid organisations is responsible for coordination, MISEREOR participates in drawing up the terms of reference and in selecting the consultants; in most cases the cofinancing is also arranged through the fund managed by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team. These evaluations are also recorded in the electronic project administration system.

3.2 Overarching evaluations

3.2.1 Overarching evaluations conducted as and when required

Apart from individual evaluations, MISEREOR also organises cross-section evaluations on specific sectors and themes when there is a need for cross-cutting knowledge and information, for example as a basis for examining the strategic orientation of project work. In such cases, the terms of reference are often drawn up without the participation of the partner, as the need for information lies primarily with MISEREOR[10]. Depending on the particular need for information, the projects can be hand-picked (projects with particular characteristics about which one would like to know more), selected randomly (possibly using stratified sampling techniques), or selected on the basis of a restricted population (e.g. vocational training projects in country x).

As a rule, cross-section evaluations are undertaken by a consultant team of two or more persons, at least one of whom should be from the country in which the evaluation is being conducted. Here, MISEREOR generally commissions the local consultants as well. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team also organises, commissions and finances these evaluations. It is standard practice in these cases to produce an inception report. As a rule, after the completion of cross-section evaluations, follow-up sessions are held at MISEREOR to promote the process of learning from the evaluation results; if requested, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team will organise this.

[10] Or the terms of reference contain a general section drawn up by MISEREOR and an individual section drawn up in consultation with the respective partner organisations.

3.2.2 Instrument evaluations

Examinations of the instruments of promotion[11] used by MISEREOR are undertaken either to meet specific needs or when required in accordance with the criteria listed in section 3.1. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team draws up the terms of reference in consultation with the other stakeholders, commissions the consultants and supports the data collection process at MISEREOR, for example by organising workshops and coordinating interview appointments. The Evaluation and Consultancy Team is responsible for the acceptance of the report, generally in consultation with management staff at MISEREOR, and it organises follow-up discussions and change processes if needed.

Meta-evaluations play a specific role in the context of instrument evaluations. As MISEREOR has decided to include evaluations commissioned by the partner organisations in its evaluation system, the quality of these external, locally commissioned evaluations as well as the evaluations commissioned by MISEREOR are externally examined on a regular basis through meta-evaluations.

3.2.3 Sector portfolio evaluations

Sector portfolio evaluations are a special form of overarching evaluations. They are agreed between the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the relevant Church-based development agencies[12] as part of the performance assessment of Church-based development cooperation. Here, the three participants involved agree on the sector portfolio to be evaluated and the terms of reference.

In contrast to all other evaluations, which are generally conducted during project implementation, at least part of these sector portfolio evaluations are to be conducted at MISEREOR as ex-post evaluations. Inception reports are also standard practice in this case.

Here, a statistical population, which may encompass several hundred projects, is examined in a desk phase. This examination draws on external evaluation reports already available as well as internal project assessments. The results of the desk phase are triangulated in a field phase, which is carried out in individual countries, and more detailed questions are examined. The overarching results and conclusions for the sector portfolio are presented in a synthesis report.

---

[11] Such as the short-term consultants programme or MISEREOR Dialogue and Partnership Services in individual developing countries

[12] The Protestant Association for Cooperation in Development at Bread for the World/EED (Church Development Service of the Protestant Church) and the German Catholic Central Agency for Development Aid (KZE), which is based at MISEREOR

3.3 Evaluations initiated by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) or the German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval)

In addition to the types of evaluation described so far, BMZ, which is the most important donor for MISEREOR/KZE projects, can at any time initiate evaluations of projects supported with public funds or can include the KZE in overarching assessments, for example in the system's review of evaluation in German development cooperation[13]. This also applies to the German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval). In all these cases, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team coordinates MISEREOR's contributions.

Chapter 4: Learning from evaluations

4.1 Learning at partner organisations

Provided they are integrated into the evaluation process, the partner organisations of the evaluated projects learn during the course of the evaluation itself. They will see the evaluation results and examine the consultants' recommendations at the latest during the obligatory on-site concluding workshop.

In the following period, it is also MISEREOR's task to ensure that this learning process translates into concrete improvements in project work. This happens in the follow-up process, in which implementation measures are discussed and agreed with the partner organisation and then monitored.
If required, a special form can be provided to help monitor the implementation steps. The officers responsible for the partner dialogue are required to ensure that the evaluation follow-up process is adequately documented.

4.2 Learning at MISEREOR

Learning from individual projects: In individual evaluations, MISEREOR learns firstly through the evaluation report and the debriefing meeting. Apart from the consultant commissioned by MISEREOR, the following persons are also required to attend these meetings: the officers in the continental departments responsible for the specific region and/or sector in which the project operates and one member of staff from the Evaluation and Consultancy Team. The participants discuss the evaluation results and recommendations in detail; the consultants are welcome to add further observations.

Overarching learning from individual project evaluations: Once a year, the Evaluation and Consultancy Team presents the overarching findings from the individual project evaluations to the management of international cooperation at MISEREOR. This is generally based on the general overview produced for the annual evaluation report.

---

[13] Axel Borrmann, Reinhard Stockmann, Evaluation in German Development Cooperation, Waxmann, Münster, 2009

Occasionally, desk studies or synthesis evaluations on individual topics or issues are commissioned and the results fed back to management. Consideration of these topics can lead to adaptations to project support and funding policy, should this be required.

Methodological learning first takes place in the Evaluation and Consultancy Team: the lessons learned from individual evaluations are regularly shared within the team. To promote learning on methodology, it has sometimes proven expedient to organise learning exchanges on particular issues with the evaluators commissioned by MISEREOR[14].

Learning from cross-section evaluations, especially sector portfolio evaluations: The results of cross-section evaluations and evaluations of MISEREOR's instruments and procedures are generally presented to many in-house stakeholders; the consequences are discussed jointly. Sector portfolio evaluations often lead to the (further) development of orientation frameworks in the respective subject area. These processes are generally organised and moderated by the Evaluation and Consultancy Team; evaluators are frequently invited to attend.
In cross-section evaluations on specific themes, it is important to set up learning loops with the partner organisations in order to improve the effectiveness of on-site work. As a rule, the first step is to hold a joint workshop on the evaluation results. This is frequently followed by an advisory process that supports the implementation of the recommendations, as is sometimes the case in individual project evaluations.

4.3 Learning for externals

In the evaluation debate, we often hear calls for reports to be published so that external parties can also benefit. In aiming for concrete quality improvements in individual projects, MISEREOR's prime concern is to support learning processes for the participating organisations and to ensure that these processes are as comprehensive and as open as possible. Apart from their obvious data protection needs, organisations also need a protected space in which to reflect on strengths and weaknesses, i.e. they must be sure that the results of the process are not made available verbatim to the general public. For this reason, it is not standard practice at MISEREOR to publish evaluation reports of individual projects. Instead, MISEREOR presents short anonymised descriptions of evaluations together with relevant follow-up information on its website on a yearly basis.

Furthermore, after each evaluation MISEREOR seeks the approval of the respective partner organisation before handing out the report to externals on request. If the partner organisation agrees, MISEREOR makes the evaluation report accessible to external parties via its library and documentation section (MIDOC).

Third parties are likely to be more interested in cross-section evaluations and sector portfolio evaluations than in evaluations of individual projects. We therefore make anonymised versions of these evaluations available to a broader public in the internet – also in MISEREOR's usual business languages.

[14] In recent years, workshops have been held with consultants on approaches to cross-section evaluations, assessing performance in development cooperation, evaluation methods and target-group differentiation.

Annexes

Annex 1: Quality Criteria for an Appropriate Evaluation Methodology

Annex 2: Recommended Structure for the Terms of Reference of Evaluations

Annex 3: Minimum requirements to be met by evaluation reports for projects funded by MISEREOR/German Catholic Agency for Development Aid (KZE)

Please refer to the following download documents on MISEREOR's English website:

https://www.misereor.org/cooperation-service/evaluation-focus-on-effects/

Documents available include:

- Guide for MISEREOR partner organisations on commissioning external evaluations locally
- Policy Document: Assessing the Effects of Development Cooperation – MISEREOR's Conception and Approach
- Synthesis reports of sector portfolio evaluations
- Reports on cross-section evaluations and other documents

Annex 1:

Quality Criteria for an Appropriate Evaluation Methodology – Information for Consultants

A. Participation and independence

Preliminary remarks: Participation can be understood as the involvement of the evaluated organisation or the participation of the project target groups. For us, participation means more than simple requests for information. MISEREOR recommends that evaluations are participatory in design, firstly because both parties can provide important information and contribute to an appropriate interpretation of the data, and secondly because participation in both cases is more likely to lead to impulses for change and ideally to a strengthening of the partner's own evaluation expertise. Accordingly, the independence of the consultant team should be evident not so much in terms of maximum distance to the project participants, but rather in terms of the independent organisation of data collection as well as independent analysis and assessment.

- Partner organisations are involved in specifying the methodological approach (generally during the kick-off workshop). The consultant team ensures that the project areas to be evaluated (regions, groups etc.) and the key providers of information are selected impartially. For example, it is important to visit not only those groups with whom cooperation functions best.
- The (monitoring) data collected by the partner organisation are used wherever expedient; if necessary comments are added to the data.
- Whenever expedient, the partner organisation is involved in the learning process in the course of the evaluation, i.e. the consultant team informs the partner of their observations, and presents and discusses their interpretations and assessment benchmarks.
- The (preliminary) evaluation results are presented to and discussed with the partner organisation at the end of the on-site mission.
- Any clearly divergent assessments on the part of the partner organisation are documented in the report.
- The target-group perspective is firmly integrated into the evaluation through the information collected in interviews and/or participatory surveys. The heterogeneity of the target groups is to be taken into account (ethnicity, sex, age, social groups etc.).
- The presence of project staff during the target-group interviews can engender confidence among the target groups and trigger important learning processes among the project staff taking part. However, it may also encourage interviewees to provide answers that are in line with (their perception of) the expectations of those present, and it may also inhibit criticism. Here the consultant team must be particularly careful not only to ensure the participation of project staff, but also to provide a suitable framework in which the target groups can participate without being subject to external influence. Part of the discussions should therefore be conducted without project staff (except in the case of assisted self-evaluations).

- If there are language barriers, it is important to consider whether an interpreter should be recruited for a limited period.

B. Accuracy and credibility

- Data and observations are validated using triangulation techniques. This is done by obtaining various perspectives and applying different methods. Unsubstantiated statements are labelled as such in the report.
- Interview partners are selected so as to ensure a diversity of perspectives; perspectives from outside the project are also included.
- Samples are selected so as to minimise bias, e.g. by ensuring that random samples are sufficiently large, or by consciously selecting stronger, average and weaker elements in a statistical population. The selection criteria and processes are set out clearly in the evaluation report.
- Both quantitative and qualitative data are collected.
- Whenever possible statements are quantified (not “The women say...”, but “Three out of five of the groups interviewed...” or “60% of interviewees...”).
- The methods applied, the interviewee numbers and selection criteria, and the sample size and selection criteria are clearly described in a chapter on methodology or in the annex. The limits of informational relevance are stated.

C. Effects assessment

- If not already available, effects hypotheses, a set of cause and effect correlations or a theory of change are elaborated on the basis of the document analysis and discussed on site (e.g. in the kick-off workshop).
- In order to record all the important effects of the project, it makes sense firstly to conduct a broad-based and open effects assessment and then to a) retroactively establish links to the set of cause and effect correlations and b) analyse the effectiveness of the project based on the objectives and the corresponding indicators.
- Effects are differentiated in line with the heterogeneous nature of the target groups.
- The consultant must examine (and document in the report) whether the observed changes can be plausibly attributed to the project by considering the contrafactual case: What would have happened without the project? (What changes can be attributed to the project?) Possible methods include an influence matrix, interviews with key players, interviews with non-participants in a similar situation or interviews with reference groups.
- It is important to look not only at the achievement of objectives/intended effects, but also at unintended effects (positive and negative). This involves looking at aspects of the lives of the target groups that are not directly addressed by the project. Such additional fields of observation may emerge from the joint development of cause-and-effect correlations, or through the cross-cutting themes addressed by the organisation/MISEREOR.
- It is important to examine whether further indirect effects can be observed (e.g. copy-cat effects/broad-scale impact).

Annex 2:

Recommended Structure for the Terms of Reference of Evaluations

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) outline the requirements and conditions that underpin the work of the consultant team. They set out the objectives and questions to be addressed by the evaluation, and are agreed between all parties involved in the task to be performed by the evaluation team. In order to ensure that the evaluation fulfils the expectations of all stakeholders, it is necessary that the ToRs are formulated as clearly and precisely as possible. The following information and explanations may be of help in this task.
The Terms of Reference are to be formulated ***individually for each evaluation*** *in order to ensure that they are appropriate to the individual project setting and the evaluation objectives.*

---

1. Introduction and background

This section should briefly describe the project to be evaluated and explain how the evaluation came about.

- How long has MISEREOR been supporting the project? When was it last evaluated?
- What are the key activity areas of the project? Who are the target groups? What strategy is the project pursuing in order to bring about changes?
- Who initiated the evaluation?
- Why was it initiated?
- What time frame does the evaluation cover (e.g. the current project or one or more forerunner projects)?
- What is the subject of observation? (Is the project supported by MISEREOR the sole focus? Alternatively, is it expedient and is there a desire to take a broader look at other aspects of the work of the organisation?)

If necessary:

- General background information on the region and sector.

2. Objectives of the evaluation

MISEREOR takes a learning-oriented approach to evaluations. An evaluation is intended to provide impetus for learning and improvement. Of course, external evaluations also serve as an instrument of accountability. In order to clarify the expectations made of the evaluation, it is important in this section to describe as accurately as possible the objectives you want the evaluation to achieve. This is especially important for the evaluation team, as the evaluation objectives critically affect exactly what information is collected and the collection methods applied.

- What exactly is the purpose of the evaluation (e.g. upcoming strategy development, planning of the next project phase, feedback on an innovative approach ...)?

3. Questions to be answered by the evaluation

We recommend that the key issues to be addressed in the evaluation are formulated as specific questions.

When drawing up these questions, the DAC criteria[15] for evaluations are to be taken into account: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The following table includes a description/explanation of each criterion with example questions. These key questions should be tailored to the requirements of the individual evaluation (i. e. they can be modified, formulated more precisely, added to, or omitted). The order of the DAC criteria can be changed if necessary. Equally, emphasis can be placed on one or more criteria.

We recommend firstly that open discussions are held with staff and target groups etc. to decide what questions the evaluation is to provide answers to. In the next step, the most important questions are selected and aligned as far as possible with the DAC criteria set out below. If the sample questions below are also included, it is important to adapt these to the individual evaluation. The Terms of Reference should provide a clear picture of the questions the evaluation is to focus on.

It is possible that some important questions do not match up with the DAC criteria. In this case, additional headings can be added to the six DAC criteria (e.g. on organisational structure or other topics).

- What questions is the evaluation to provide answers to?
- What questions are important with regard to the individual DAC criteria?

Relevance: The extent to which project objectives and design respond to the needs, priorities and policies of the target groups and of the organisation responsible for the project and its partner organisations, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

Examples of questions that can be included under the heading relevance:

- What direct and indirect target groups does the project address and why were they selected? Do they belong to particularly disadvantaged population groups?
- To what extent is the intervention important for the target groups (for example, does it focus on an important problem/bottleneck)?
- Is the project approach appropriate with a view to improving – either directly or indirectly – the life situation of particularly disadvantaged groups?
- What framework conditions are important for the project? To what extent have they been taken into account?
- Is the project strategy convincing and likely to be successful with a view to achieving the planned project objectives?
- To what extent are the initial objectives and the design of the project still appropriate?

[15] See: http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

Coherence: The compatibility of the project with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.

Examples of questions that can be introduced under the heading coherence:

- Internal: What synergies and links exist between the project and other interventions implemented by the same institution?
- Internal: Does the project comply with the norms and standards that are the basis for the work of the project executing agency?
- External: In what respects is the project consistent with the interventions of other actors in the same context?
- External: Where appropriate, are activities harmonised and coordinated with those of other actors and do they complement each other? To what extent does the project create added-value and at the same time avoid the duplication of work activities?

Effectiveness: The extent to which a project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives (as laid out in the Project Contract) and outputs, including differential results across target groups.

Examples of questions that can be included under the heading effectiveness:

- To what extent were the objectives achieved or are they likely to be achieved? Does this apply to the same extent to different social groups? What information is available in this respect with regard to the agreed indicators? What other information is available with regard to the achievement of objectives?
- Which activities and outputs made a particularly important contribution to the achievement of objectives and which were not so important?
- How many people were reached through the project and how does this compare with the planned number?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and outputs?
- Were the initial objectives realistic? Are the objectives formulated as outcomes (i.e. direct effects?)

Efficiency: The extent to which the project delivers or is likely to deliver results in an economic and timely way.

Examples of questions that can be included under the heading efficiency:

- What evidence is there to indicate that the project was implemented with due regard to economic efficiency under the given circumstances? Was the project implemented economically and cost-consciously?
- On what parameters is this assessment based (e.g. costs per project output: costs per training course or trainee, per hectare of agricultural land converted to ecological farming, per beneficiary, etc.)? Are any benchmarks for these parameters available from other projects or institutions?
- Were the results achieved within an appropriate timeframe? Were adjustments made, e.g. due to changed conditions?
- How well does the organisation perform? Possible areas to consider may include management and administration systems, communication structures, an appropriate PME system, regional and thematic breadth or concentration.
- What is the relation between the observed effects and the resources used?

Effects (outcomes and impacts[16]): The positive and negative changes produced by a project at a higher level. The evaluation should focus on both intended and unintended outcomes and impacts. Examples of questions that can be included under the heading effects: • What exactly has changed for the beneficiaries as a result of the project? The focus here should be on social, economic, political, cultural and environmental changes with consideration given to gender aspects and other relevant social differentiations. • Which external factors contributed to the changes, and to what extent can the changes be attributed to the project activities (plausibility)? • Did the effects logic adopted in the project plans prove effective? If not, where are there deviations?
Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the project continue, or are likely to continue. Benefits are intended to be socially, environmentally, economically and technologically sustainable. The review is also intended to include institutional aspects. Examples of questions that can be included under the heading sustainability: • To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue at various levels? • What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project? • What role do risks, potential conflicts of interest and resilience (e.g. of target groups and partners) play in this context?

If there are any cross-cutting themes relevant to the context and project, we recommend that that corresponding questions are included in the evaluation. This may include, for example, questions on gender aspects, human rights, citizens' participation, peace-building and civic conflict transformation, good governance, civil-society participation, HIV/Aids, health or environmental protection.

4. Methodology

It is important that a methodological approach is drawn up for each evaluation individually. Generally, the commissioning organisation presents some preliminary considerations before the consultant team draws up the detailed methodological approach. As a minimum, the Terms of Reference should therefore refer to the following questions:

- What is important for us with regard to methodology?
- Which people is it essential to speak to, and which locations is it essential to visit?

Below are some general tips on the methodological procedure; these may help to determine more precisely what is important in each case:

It is important to bear in mind that the project does not only affect a single homogeneous target group, but various groups with different interests and perspectives (e.g. women and men, the young and the elderly, various ethnic groups, agricultural and livestock farmers, large and small landowners etc.). The social differentiation of the groups the project works with should therefore be analysed, and the perspectives of these groups taken into account.

[16] In MISEREOR terminology, the term 'effects' includes 'outcomes' (direct effects achieved by the end of the project funding period) and 'impacts' (long-term and possibly indirect developmental effects). Cf. https://www.misereor.org/fileadmin//user_upload/misereor_org/Cooperation___Service/englisch/compilation-introduction-of-effect-orientation-into-pme-systems.pdf

Generally, a set of varied and adapted methods is applied (usually taking a gender-sensitive approach) that focuses on quantitative and qualitative aspects in the following steps of the evaluation:

- Prior to field work: document review, preparation of interview guidelines, assessment of the available regional and technical analyses and data, preparation or implementation of quantitative surveys designed by the project team where this seems appropriate ...
- During field work: kick-off workshop, document review, participant observation, quantitative surveys, qualitative interviews (open, semi-structured), focus group discussions, participatory methods e.g. from PRA or the NGO-IDEAs 'Impact Toolbox', context analyses, interviews with key persons, debriefing workshop ...
- The debriefing workshop is an important element for the triangulation / validation of the data collected, critical discussion of conclusions and elaboration of practical recommendations. As far as possible, it should be based on a solid analysis of the data collected and involve the participation of the key project stakeholders (incl. target groups whenever possible). In addition, the debriefing workshop should be used to start the processes of reflection on the results of the evaluation and of learning from the evaluation. The willingness of the participants at this stage to enter into detailed discussions should be taken into consideration when deciding on the length of the workshop.

5. Organisation of the mission

This section includes details of:

- the members of the evaluation team, the required expertise, their methodological skills and their roles;
- support provided to the evaluation by the organisation being evaluated (logistics, contact persons for the evaluation team ...);
- the schedule:
    - duration of preparatory activities,
    - dates of the mission (including kick-off workshop),
    - date of the debriefing workshop at the project location, which should provide the organisation being evaluated with an opportunity to give feedback on the preliminary results of the evaluation team,
    - deadline for submission of the (draft) report, and further procedure for submission and acceptance of the report (including time slot for debriefing at MISEREOR Head Office).

6. Report

Evaluation reports submitted to MISEREOR should meet a number of requirements. Some of these are binding; others can be adapted to the corresponding situation. These requirements are listed in the document "Minimum requirements to be met by evaluation reports for projects funded by MISEREOR/German Catholic Agency for Development Aid (KZE)".

The following questions should be clarified in the Terms of Reference:

- Who will write the report? Who will have overall responsibility?
- How long is the report expected to be?
- What should be included in the report?
- What are the requirements with respect to the reporting format?

Annex 3:

Minimum requirements to be met by evaluation reports for projects funded by MISEREOR/German Catholic Agency for Development Aid (KZE)

Evaluation reports are generally between 25 and 40 pages in length (excluding annexes) and must include the following components:

1. **Cover page** with following details:
    - *Name and location of the project to be evaluated*
    - *Name of the project executing agency*
    - *Project number (under which the project is managed at MISEREOR)*
    - *Evaluation number - in the case of evaluation by MISEREOR/Evaluation and Consultancy Team*
    - *Names of all members of the evaluation team, name of person responsible for the report*
    - *Date of creation of the report (with the addition: draft/final version)*

2. **List of abbreviations**

3. **Contents (clearly structured, with subchapters and page numbers)**

4. **Summary, around 2-3 pages with following contents:**
    - *Brief description of the project that was evaluated*
    - *Purpose and objectives of the evaluation*
    - *Important results with reference to the main evaluation questions in line with the terms of reference and an overall assessment of the work performed (conclusions)*
    - *Important recommendations*

5. **Description of the evaluated project, the project context and the reason for and objectives of the evaluation**
    - *Project context and framework conditions*
    - *Project target groups*
    - *Project objectives and intervention logic: What does the project aim to achieve and how?*
    - *Structure and management of the organisation implementing the project*
    - *Nature and scope of cooperation with MISEREOR (and also – if applicable and relevant – with other organisations, e.g. in the case of cofinancing)*
    - *Reason for and objectives of the evaluation*

6. Chapter on methods with following contents:

- *Description of the data collection methods employed*
- *Description of the sample: Who, how many (subdivided according to gender and possibly other characteristics, such as ethnicity, age, etc.) and what criteria were used in the selection?*

Good practice:

- *Provide an insight into the practical approach in an annex on methods, e.g.: Who collected the information or gathered the data and how? How were the evaluation methods put together and - circumstances permitting - tested (pretest) prior to implementation? How was the collected information evaluated (in particular if quantitative methods/surveys were employed)?*
- *Mention any major restrictions/limitations with respect to the evaluation (e.g. restrictions on ability to travel in the project region due to the security situation, limited number of villages visited due to tight schedule, etc.)*
- *Explain the limits on the informational value of the methodological approach: How reliable and compelling were the methods employed in this evaluation?*
- *Explain any resulting limitations on the ability to interpret the data.*

7. Presenting the results of data collection and evaluation

Back up your descriptions with quantitative evidence and differentiate by group (male/female, ethnicity, age, level of poverty, etc.) whenever possible; separate the description and facts from the assessment.

Good practice:

- *Present the cause and effect correlations drawn up together with the partners*
- *Provide a separate summary of the data, including financial monitoring data, collected in the project monitoring activities*
- *Indicate data sources, workshop documents, etc. in the annex*
- *Present selected results using diagrams or tables, use maps if appropriate (e.g. to illustrate regional distributions and differences)*
- *Incorporate illuminating examples or quotes (transcripts/recordings taken from the interviews)*

8. Assessment of the information collected

- *Based on the evaluation questions*
- *Based on DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability*

Good practice:

- *In a separate chapter/section, identify and outline the lessons learned that apply to the whole sector or to the strategy of the projects in the sector in general*

9. Overarching conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions are to be presented in the form of a compact synthesis that builds on the answers to the evaluation questions and goes a step further in the assessment – not an abridged version of the facts as presented.
Recommendations should focus on the essentials in order to give the follow-up a realistic chance (learning evaluation).

Good practice:

- *Show clearly how the conclusions were derived from the collected data*
- *Prioritise recommendations: Which are most important?*
- *Address recommendations to specific actors as far as possible: Who should do what?*
- *Discuss recommendations in advance in the debriefing workshop and examine their suitability for implementation*

10. Annexes (minimum):

- *Terms of reference*
- *Timetable: evaluation programme (table with date, details of location, persons affected/interviewed)*
- *List of interviewees*[17]
- *List of documents referred to in the report*
- *Documentation of the introductory and final workshop*

Good practice:

- *Documentation of the survey instruments employed (e.g. questionnaires, interview guidelines)*
- *Photos or transcripts of flip charts, visual records, etc.*
- *Detailed evidence to back up arguments in the main section (e.g. detailed quantitative data overviews)*

Evaluation and Consultancy Team 2020

[17] It is important to observe any confidentiality and data protection regulations relevant to the particular case and the country context.