Requirements for evaluations of Civil Society Challenge Fund Projects contracted by DFID

26th April 2012

1. Background

The Civil Society Challenge Fund (CSCF) is one of DFID's channels of support for UK based CSO projects. The fund has supported initiatives that empower poor and marginalized groups with a voice and a role in holding their governments and communities to account for providing essential services they need in relation to health, education, livelihoods and social inclusion. The fund will close in March 2015.

2. Evaluation approach

The **outcome/purpose of a CSCF project** should be focused on changes in the *empowerment of the poor and their capacity to demand their rights*, and/or changes in the *access to and quality of services*. The project outcome/purpose is expected to have been achieved by the end of the funding period. Baseline information recorded at the start of the project is therefore vital to measure the impact at the end of the project, and it should be examined and referenced as part of the evaluation.

Project results may not be exactly as planned. However, information regarding impact and change, both intended and unintended, positive and in some cases possibly negative must be recorded in the final evaluation through an honest examination of what <u>actually</u> happened against the planned results.

3. How the final evaluation will be used

Evaluations will be appraised and their findings used to:

- Identify the impact of the project and how this will be sustained.
- Account to local stakeholders and funders for the project's achievements/results against the stated purpose and outputs.
- Record and share lessons that will assist in improving UK support to civil society.
- Assess whether the project represented value for money in its efforts to deliver results.

4. Scope of the evaluation

The main body of the evaluation should cover the areas numbered below and these should be clearly marked in the report:

i) Impact and results:
- What was the project's overall impact in relation to its **outcome/purpose** and how did this compare with what was expected?
- What were the key results against the **outputs** and how did this compare with the targets set in the original logical framework?
- How effective was the project's overall strategy?
- If relevant, in what ways did the project: i) improve global/regional/national/local policy; ii) and/or strengthen legislation and enforcement mechanisms to protect and empower disadvantaged target groups; iii) and/or raising awareness amongst civil society and service deliverers about rights. <u>Provide examples</u>.
- If relevant, in what ways did the project **improve practice** by providing greater access to quality services for disadvantaged groups? <u>Provide examples</u>.

ii) Empowered target groups:
- Who were the direct and indirect beneficiaries? Disaggregate where possible by: location, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and HIV/AIDS status.
- Is there evidence that the project reached the intended target group(s) and specify the numbers actually covered? <u>Provide examples</u>.
- Is there evidence that the project made a difference to the target group(s), particularly in relation to their participation in local and/or national decision-making processes? <u>Include quotes</u> from direct and indirect target beneficiaries and label them accordingly.

iii) Value for money (VfM)[1]:

Evaluate whether the project is implemented according to VfM principles providing supporting evidence or highlighting gaps in relation to the questions below, where relevant.

<u>Effectiveness</u>
- Did the project purpose/outcome remain relevant throughout its duration given changes in context?
- Did the project use DFID funding to leverage other funding for additional activities. If so, explain.
- If the final project purpose/outcome was not achieved or more remains to be done, will activities continue and if so, who will fund them?
- Calculate the project's inputs/results ratio (i.e., total project budget from DFID and other sources divided by the number of direct beneficiaries).

---

1   For   more   information   on   Value   for   Money   principles,   see:
http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/DFID-approach-value-money.pdf;
http://www.bond.org.uk/pages/value-for-money-resources.html

- How did project partners add value?
- How did project partners deliver value for money?
- What percentage of CSCF funding was spent by the partner(s) and what was the added value?

Efficiency
- To what extent were spending decisions guided by VfM principles?
- Consider if the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives.

Economy
- Please explain how your unit costs have increased or decreased during implementation?
- Was the project completed within budget/expected costs? (please detail cost under/over spends)
- What have you done to improve your own procurement capacity and capability?

iv) Innovation[2]
- Are there any innovative aspects of the project identified during the evaluation, if so please describe.

v) Sustainability
- What aspects of the project will continue once funding ends?
- How will these aspects be funded and by whom (e.g., national/local government or other organisation)?
- What aspects of the project will stop and what impact will this have?
- What aspects of the project are replicable elsewhere?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

vi) Additionality
- What might have happened without DFID funding?

vii) Realisation of Risks
- Did the risks identified in the original proposal and annual reports materialise? If so, how did the project deal with risk to minimalize negative impact on project results?

---

2 Examples of innovation may be: an approach applied for the first time in a particular country or countries; new ways of applying/adapting/developing an existing technique or initiative; experimentation, with the risk of failure (as long as lessons are clearly learned and the implications of failure are appropriately considered); an inspirational activity that has dealt with an entrenched problem with fresh eyes; genuine participation of people most affected by a problem to release more energy for ideas; and use of appropriate partnership models; (DFID GPAF 2011).

- If the risks did not materialise, was this as a result of measures put into place by the project? If yes, please explain.

viii) Climate and Environment
- What was the impact of the project (positive and/or negative) on the environment?
- What did the project do to mitigate against negative climate and environment impact?
- What steps did the project take to maximise positive impact? Please detail any potential steps taken to build resilience within the target groups

ix) Contribution to CSCF Objectives
Please fill out the table below and insert the table into the evaluation report.

	Tick the relevant boxes and provide an explanation e.g. what were the key highlights.	☐ Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in local decision-making processes Your explanation and comments...
		☐ Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in national decision making processes Your explanation and comments...
		☐ Global advocacy Your explanation and comments...
		☐ Innovative service delivery Your explanation and comments...
		☐ Service delivery in difficult environments Your explanation and comments...

x) Contribution to the Millennium Development Goals (insert the table below into the evaluation report)

Only list an MDG if it was the focus of the project outcome/purpose.	
MDG	**Brief Justification**
☐ Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger	
☐ Achieve universal primary education	
☐ Promote gender equality and empower women	
☐ Reduce child mortality	
☐ Improve Maternal Health	
☐ Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases	
☐ Ensure environmental sustainability	
☐ Develop a global partnership for development	
☐ None of the above	

xi) Lesson Learning

There are four lesson learning areas outlined below. Outline the project's important lessons. *Note you do not have to provide lessons under each area.*

Area 1: Approaches to Empowerment and Advocacy
What lessons are identified in relation to empowering individuals and/or communities to negotiate and advocate for better underlineoutcomes with decision-makers and service providers? For example: Tell us about improvements made as a result of advocacy to: service delivery (quality and access), political participation, economic participation and household decision-making. If something has worked particularly well, why and how has this learning been applied in the project?

Area 2: Equity
What lessons have you learned regarding strategies to engage marginalised and excluded groups in project activities or benefits? What has worked particularly well and why? If something has not worked well, why was this? How has this learning been applied in your project?

Area 3: Capacity building
Which approaches to building the capacity of local partners and community groups have achieved results?
Did the project have a successful capacity building approach that helped women take a leadership role?
If an approach has not worked well, why was this, and how has this learning been applied in the project?

Area 4: Monitoring & Evaluation
What tools and methods have been most useful and practical in measuring and demonstrating evidence of results, including the disaggregation of data?
If something has not worked well, why was this?
How has this learning been applied in your project?

xii) Recommendations

Please specify 5 key recommendations or more if relevant.

5. Report format

The evaluator(s) will produce a report of **no more than 30 pages** plus appendices, in Microsoft Word using Arial font 12. It will include:

a. Contents Page
b. Abbreviations and acronyms page
c. Basic Information (1 A4 page maximum)
   (*Project title, Agency name, CSCF number, Country, Name of local partner(s), Total project budget (1 figure); Total DFID budget (1 figure); Name of person who compiled the evaluation report, including summary of role/contribution of others in the team and the Period during which the evaluation was undertaken*)
d. Executive Summary (2 A4 page maximum)
e. The main report (covering the issues outlined in section 4 above)
f. Achievement Rating Scale. *Note that the overall achievement rating should have a score and a brief comment regarding the supporting evidence.* 5 x A4 pages maximum (see template in Annex A).
g. Annexes: Include the original and the final logical framework; evaluation terms of reference; names and contact details of the evaluators along with a signed declaration of their independence from the project team; evaluation schedule; people met; documents consulted; statistical data on baseline; end of project survey.

6. The evaluation process

The terms of reference for the evaluation include the expertise required and the methodology including the documents to be consulted, specific visits and people to meet, the timing and deadlines for reporting. Specify who the evaluation team reports to and how responsibilities for planning the logistics of the exercise are to be shared e.g. organising interviews with key people, arranging transport and booking accommodation, etc.

The evaluation team would always comprise independent, external consultants. One of the team should be the designated Team Leader. Consultants may be subject area specialists, consultants with local knowledge, or organisational management specialists.

The grant holder should recruit the evaluation team and organise key dates and deadlines for the evaluation before the project end date to ensure that the findings of the evaluation feed into the Project Completion Report and important lessons are captured while key staff are still in place.

At the start of the evaluation process, the project staff should meet and hold a briefing session with the evaluators to agree the overall evaluation methodology and highlight any key issues to be addressed. Appropriate site visits and key interviews should be arranged, in advance if necessary, to minimise the logistical difficulties.

Evaluation tasks should include:

- A desk review of project information including the key documents listed in these terms of reference.
- Interviews with project managers and partners to collect information on achievements and impact and difficulties faced by the project including the management aspects of work.
- Interviews with key project stakeholders to include questions on the degree to which project has had the intended impact; and what could have been done differently or better, so that the lessons can be learned.
- Evaluators would normally present a preliminary overview of their findings to the project team in-country and receive comments from stakeholders before preparing the draft evaluation report.
- Evaluators should submit the draft report to the project team for written comment before finalising the report, to minimise the chance of inaccuracies and to maximise ownership of the findings.

7. Documents to share with the evaluators

- The approved project proposal document.

- The original project logframe and any subsequent amended logframes with the rationale for the changes.
- Annual Project Reports, including financial information.
- Any case studies submitted to DFID.
- Examples of lessons learned and shared during the lifetime of the project.
- Original baseline study and any subsequent studies to show impact.
- Other evidence of impact that the project team thinks is important. This could include anecdotes of decisions taken, policies or programmes that have changed or communication material that may have had an impact on decision-making.

Annex A: Achievement Rating Scale

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
5 = not achieved

	Achievement Rating for whole project period	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for indicators	Progress against the indicators	Comments on changes over the whole project period, including unintended impacts
Outcome/Purpose (state below, then rate and comment)					
Outputs (list the **main** outputs below, rate against **each**, **and then** give an overall rating): 1. 2. 3. etc.					
Activities Please comment on the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the activities overall					