

Tool : Preparing Terms of references **with a disability dimension**¹

Completion and Ex-Post Evaluations

Evaluation stage

Key issues to be studied

Relevance

The analysis of relevance would focus on the extent to which the design effectively/appropriately:

- ✓ Analysed the project's coherence with the EC's Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme
- ✓ Analysed the project's coherence with the Partner Government's development policy and sector policies
- ✓ Identified key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis, **disability analysis** and analysis of vulnerable groups ~~such as the disabled~~), assessed institutional capacity issues and effectively promoted local ownership
- ✓ Clearly and accurately identified real problems **and how relevant they are for specific vulnerable groups like persons with disabilities**
- ✓ Analysed lessons learned from past experience and ensured coherence with current/ongoing initiatives
- ✓ Provided a clear analysis of strategy options and justified the recommended implementation strategy. **Clearly and accurately identified exclusion of vulnerable groups like persons with disabilities**
- ✓ Established a clear and logically coherent set of project objectives (Goal, purpose, outputs) and a set of indicative activities for delivering each project output. **Analysed how the outputs benefit vulnerable groups with functional limitations, like persons with disabilities.**
- ✓ Developed a clear and useful Logframe matrix with supporting activity and resource/cost schedules
- ✓ Analysed assumptions/risks
- ✓ Established appropriate management and coordination arrangements
- ✓ Established appropriate and effective monitoring and evaluation Systems which are sensitive to the impact the project has on vulnerable or excluded groups of the population.
- ✓ Provided an analysis of sustainability issues – including the financial and economic sustainability of the proposed measure, environmental impact, benefits to both women and men **and people with disabilities** and the use of appropriate technology issues

Efficiency

¹ Developed from PCM Guidelines – 128-133, 2004

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various **activities** transformed the available resources into the intended outputs (sometimes referred to as results), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

The assessment of Efficiency would therefore focus on such issues as:

- ✓ the quality of day-to-day management, for example in
 - (i) management of the budget (including whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
 - (ii) management of personnel, information, property, etc,
 - (iii) whether management of **risk** was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;
 - (iv) relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
 - (v) respect for deadlines.
- ✓ costs and value-for-money: how far the costs of the project were justified by the benefits - whether or not expressed in monetary terms - in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences;
- ✓ partner country contributions from local institutions and government (e.g offices, experts, reports, tax exemption, as set out in the LogFrame resource schedule), target beneficiaries and other local parties: were they provided as planned, could re-allocation of responsibilities have improved performance, were communications good?
- ✓ Commission HQ/Delegation inputs (e.g. procurement, training, contracting, either direct or via consultants/bureaux): key questions as for local/government inputs (above);
- ✓ technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?
- ✓ quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
- ✓ did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities?

Effectiveness

The effectiveness criterion, in LogFrame terminology, concerns how far the project's outputs were used, and the project purpose realized.

The analysis of Effectiveness would therefore focus on such issues as:

- ✓ whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men, **persons with disabilities** and other specific vulnerable groups ~~such as the disabled~~)
- ✓ in institutional reform projects, whether behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements (e.g. in communications, productivity, ability to generate actions which lead to economic and social development);
- ✓ if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well it was supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ and locally), etc.

- ✓ whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate, which accompanying measures were or should have been taken by the partner authorities, and with what consequences;
- ✓ how unplanned results may have affected the benefits received;
- ✓ whether any shortcomings at this level were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, **disability**, environment and poverty during implementation.

Impact

The term impact, sometimes referred to as outcome, denotes the relationship between the project's purpose and goal, that is the extent to which the benefits received by the target beneficiaries had a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the sector or region or in the country as a whole.

At Impact level the analysis generally examines such aspects as:

- ✓ to what extent the planned goal have been achieved, and how far that was directly due to the project;
- ✓ in institutional reform projects, how far enhanced economic and social development resulted from improved institutional capabilities and communications;
- ✓ in infrastructure-type projects, how far did they also enhance economic and social development beyond the level of their immediate users?
- ✓ if there were unplanned impacts, how they affected the overall impact;
- ✓ where appropriate, all gender-related, **disability-related**, environmental and poverty related impacts were achieved; and
- ✓ how the economic effects were spread between economic growth, salaries and wages, foreign exchange, and budget, and how this relates to the project's overall objectives.

Sustainability

The fifth criterion, sustainability, relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project at purpose level are likely to continue after external funding ends.

An analysis of sustainability would therefore focus on such issues as:

- ✓ **ownership of objectives and achievements**, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and remained in agreement throughout the duration of the project;
- ✓ **policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions**, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy corresponded, and the effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities affected the project positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organizations.
- ✓ **institutional capacity**, e.g. the degree of commitment of all parties involved, such as Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating a new institution, how far good relations with existing institutions were established; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of

benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts were properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;

- ✓ the **adequacy of the project budget** for its purpose;
- ✓ **socio-cultural factors**, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it seeks to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it was based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.
- ✓ **financial sustainability**, e.g. whether the products or services provided were affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding ended; whether enough funds were available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs), and continued to do so after funding ended; and **economic sustainability**, i.e. how well the benefits (returns) compared to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated.
- ✓ **technical (technology) issues**, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies were considered, where there was a choice; and (iii) the intended beneficiaries were able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.
- ✓ wherever relevant, **cross-cutting issues** such as **gender equity**, **disability equity**, **environmental impact** and **good governance**; were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project.