

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION

Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa (Phase III)

Contractor: Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR)

Project Partner: Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KA IPTC)

Supported by: Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Austrian Ministry of Defence (MoD)

17 December 2020

Description:	Evaluation Officer for Final Project Evaluation: Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa (Phase III)
Duty Station:	Home-based
Languages:	English and French (proficiency in German is an asset)
Contract type:	Consultancy Services ("Werkvertrag")
Workdays:	Up to 28 Working Days
Starting date:	24 May 2021
Ending date:	10 November 2021
Deadline for application:	23 March 2021
Send to:	mayerhofer@aspr.ac.at with subject line: Evaluation HAWA

The Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution wishes to engage an evaluation consultant to conduct the final evaluation of the "Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa" project. The project is implemented in cooperation with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KA IPTC), financially supported by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA).

We invite you to submit a proposal based on the instructions and the Terms of Reference. Please note that the Terms of Reference form an integral part of the consultant's contract and may be subject to change until the contract is signed. Any possible changes will not modify the nature or amount of work required from the evaluator. Failure to submit a proposal containing all the required information and documentation within the deadline specified may lead to the proposal being rejected.

Scope of Work, Responsibilities and Description of the Proposed Analytical Work

The evaluation officer will conduct the final evaluation in accordance with the Terms of References (further below). The data collection and interviews will be conducted online or by phone. All materials and reports related to this contract will need to be submitted in English.

Requirements for Experience & Qualifications of the Evaluation Consultant

Academic Qualifications

Advanced University degree in a relevant field (social sciences, e.g., sociology, political science, international relations, public policy, international development).

Experience

- At least 7 years of demonstrated experience in evaluation of international development projects and programs.
- Experience with projects focusing on (1) training (for humanitarian assistance) and on (2) peace and security, in particular civil-military cooperation in West Africa.
- Strong knowledge of feminist and gender theory and practice
- Demonstrated experience with applied research, with data collection, analytical skills and ability to structure information.

Competencies

- Excellent interpersonal, communication and interview skills and cultural sensitivity.
- Proficiency in English & French. Ability to review information in German is an asset.

Documents to be included when submitting the Application and Proposal

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information:

1. Cover letter (max 1 page) stating your interest, key qualifications and experience.
2. Curriculum Vitae (no longer than 4 pages)
3. Outline of evaluation approach and methodology (max 2 pages)
4. At least three references who may comment on relevant experiences and qualifications (please include full contact details with email and phone)
5. Overview of relevant evaluation related work (a brief description of previous assignments carried out in the subject areas covered by the contract, indicating the type of evaluation, summary of activities undertaken, date and recipient of the evaluation, client)
6. Financial proposal (for details see below)
7. Up to three own evaluation report/s on a related topic and/or region from the recent past

Please attach the documents listed above under points 1. to 6. as one MS Word or PDF document to your email as well as electronic copies of evaluation reports.

Please send the complete package of documents to Ms. Birgit Mayerhofer, mayerhofer@aspr.ac.at with subject line: Evaluation HAWA KAIPTC

Selected candidate will be asked to submit a signed copy of Code of Conduct and declaration of honor (as in Annex to TOR).

Financial Proposal

Financial proposal needs to be based on the indicative schedule as set out in the Terms of Reference and consist of a breakdown of costs in Euro, in this format:

Days	Activities	Daily Fee
Total in EUR		

The evaluator undertakes to observe any applicable law and to comply with his/her fiscal obligations in conformity with the legislation of the supplier's country of fiscal residence. The evaluator will be responsible for covering costs of needed office space, administrative support, telecommunications, printing of documentation and implementation of data collection instruments. The Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution will facilitate the evaluation to the extent possible, by providing logistical support, contact information, documentation for desk review, reviewing draft report and providing feedback to the evaluators.

Payment Conditions

In return for the provision of services, and subject to their acceptance by Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) and the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), the consultant will receive a lump sum payment in accordance with her/his proposal which shall be paid in two installments, based on an invoice from the evaluator, as follows:

- 40% upon submission of the Evaluation Inception Report.
- 60% upon approval of the Final Evaluation Report.

The lump sum will include the consultant's remuneration, applicable taxes and all other expenses. The consultant shall undertake all necessary measures to arrange for health and social insurance during the entire period of the performance of work under the contract. The consultant acknowledges and accepts in this regard that the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution shall not assume any responsibility for any health and social risks concerning illness, maternity or accident, which might occur during the performance of work under the contract.

Evaluation and Selection of Application/Proposal

The Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution applies a fair and transparent selection process that takes into account both the technical qualification of potential consultants, as well as the financial proposals submitted in support of the applications. The selection criteria weight as follows:

- Technical Evaluation – documents based (40%)
- Technical Evaluation – interview based (40%), only for shortlisted candidates
- Financial Evaluation (20%)

ASPR may contact shortlisted candidates and ask them for an interview.

All candidates will be notified about the results no later than 17 Mai 2021.

Final Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa (Phase III)

Introduction

This document sets out the context, purpose, scope and other modalities of the final evaluation of the Project “Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa” (Phase III), funded by Austrian Development Agency (ADA) and implemented by the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) in cooperation with Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC).

Background

Title	Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in West Africa
Contractor:	Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR)
Partner:	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC)
Total Duration	15.03.2018 – 31.12.2021 (tbc)
Total Budget	EUR 841,243.00
Funded by:	Austrian Development Agency (ADA)
Supported by:	Austrian Ministry of Defence

The project's overall objective is “*strengthened individual capacities in national and regional institutions to respond to humanitarian crises in the ECOWAS region effectively*”. It is fully aligned with the strategic frameworks and guidelines of the UN, the African Union (AU), and ECOWAS, as well as with the strategic, sector and donor policy framework of Austria. Furthermore, achieving the overall objective is a key goal of the KAIPTC Strategic Plan 2019–2023.

The project intends to contribute to the capacities of the relevant West African stakeholders (governmental and non-governmental) for effective crisis management. In particular, the project aims to increase awareness and knowledge of the civil-military co-operation and other important aspects of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations in West Africa.

To this end, the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) in cooperation with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) **offers training courses on humanitarian assistance**, which are integrated into the training infrastructure of KAIPTC and **national Multiplier Modules** in four West African countries.

The **financial support** for the project is provided by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA). The ADA and ASPR cooperate in the framework of the “3C/whole of government approach”¹ closely with the Austrian Federal Ministry of Defence (MoD). The MoD supports the implementation of this project through the deployment of a Course Director to the KAIPTC, outside of the project budget.

This project is a continued third phase and builds upon the “pilot phase” (September 2013 until January 2016) and project phase II (February 2016 until December 2018).

Further information on the organisations and the project is available at www.aspr.ac.at and <http://kaiptc.org/>

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation shall provide an assessment of the overall project progress and achievements against the indicators as mandated by the donor and set out in the project document.

Specifically, the final evaluation aims at evaluating

- the **relevance** and **coherence** of the project design (including its log frame) to meet local and regional requirements and necessities for capacity-building in the area of humanitarian assistance, peace and security
- the **efficiency** of the projects Sars-CoV-2 adaptations
- the short-term results and possible long-term **impact** produced
- the **sustainability** of the project results
- the inclusion of the cross-cutting theme gender equality (**effectiveness**)

and provide recommendations for the improvement of implementation strategies and modifications for activities to be implemented as part of a possible new project phase. The evaluation's primary audience are the project stakeholders ASPR, ADA and the Austrian MoD. Additionally, lessons learnt, and best practices can provide a reference and be valuable for other organizations (e.g. the implementing partners KAIPTC, national host organisations for Multiplier Modules) that engage in capacity-building activities and training for peacekeeping and peacebuilding personnel.

Scope and proposed evaluation approach

The Project Document stipulates a final evaluation of the project. According to the ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluation (2020:11) this evaluation is a partner-led evaluation, managed by ASPR conducted by (an) external, independent evaluator(s). The evaluation will cover activities that have taken place since the beginning of the project (15 March 2018) until the time of the last planned course activity (11 September 2021). For the purpose of this evaluation, the key questions identified by the stakeholders are based upon the OECD DAC evaluation criteria: **relevance**, **coherence**, effectiveness, efficiency, **impact**, and **sustainability**. Furthermore, the evaluation will assess the cross-cutting theme gender equality.

¹ 3C Approach: “A coherent, coordinated and complementary (3C) approach is needed to improve the effectiveness of support to countries and communities affected by conflict and fragility. [...] 3C is understood as collaborative and mutually reinforcing approaches by international actors and partner countries, including civil society, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their support to peace, security and development in situations of conflict and fragility.” Definition of 3C Roadmap 2009.

Proposed evaluation approach

The evaluation approach shall include (but not be limited to): Analysis of documents and appropriate data; (Remote) interviews with the key project stakeholders and partners in Austria and West Africa. The evaluator(s) shall propose an outline of methodology as part of their offer, and a detailed methodology as part of the Evaluation Inception Report.

Evaluation Questions (based on the revised OECD DAC evaluation criteria 2019)

Relevance:

1. Do the capacity development activities address the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and actors in humanitarian assistance in the context of West African countries, the ECOWAS and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)?
2. Are the project's objectives sufficiently aligned with the Austrian development policy and other Austrian national strategies and policies? Were the relevant normative and strategic frameworks reflected in the project document?

Coherence:

3. Is the project design, its objectives, purpose, and expected results articulated in a coherent way? What are the lessons learnt and best practices regarding design, planning, implementation and management of the project?
4. To what extent is the project complementary to other capacity building (training) offers in the peace and security and humanitarian sector in West Africa? Are there synergies?
5. Is the core course content equitably targeted to the practical requirements of different groups of participants (I-NGOs, military, police, governmental actors) and to gender specific (training) needs?

Effectiveness:

6. To what extent does the project comply to the OECD DAC gender marker 1? Is the conception and implementation of the project gender mainstreamed? Is course content gender responsive? Have measures for women's empowerment been undertaken? Which approaches towards gender equality have been applied?
7. What is the comparative advantage of ASPR and its partners (e.g. KAIPTC, WANEP Senegal, ISRI) in designing and implementing this project?
8. What is the comparative advantage of the Austrian 3C/whole of government approach in implementing this project?

Efficiency:

9. How well has the project been adjusted in response to the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic?
10. Could the activities and outputs have been delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity?

Impact:

11. To what extent have the project objectives been met?
12. Are there unintended positive and/or negative effects/impacts which can be possibly be attributed to the project/programme?
13. Which institutions have benefitted from the project/programme and how? What has changed for whom (immediate impact)? Are there any other important aspects regarding impact?

Sustainability:

14. How was the project supported by national and regional institutions in ECOWAS, West Africa and Ghana?
15. What is the likelihood that the benefits from the project will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time following the end of the project?

Forward looking insights:

16. In case of a possible follow-up project, what interventions should ASPR focus on?
17. What did the stakeholders and beneficiaries consider as the most necessary approaches/areas of future projects on capacity building for humanitarian assistance and civil-military cooperation and coordination in Africa?

The final set of evaluation questions will be agreed in the inception report.

Timetable and Deliverables

The evaluator has to deliver the following reports in line with the requirements of the ADA Guidelines for Programme and Project Evaluations (2020) within the timeframe proposed below.

- **Evaluation Inception Report including an Evaluation Matrix** (template see annex 5)
- **Draft Evaluation Report**, including ADA Results-Assessment Form (RAF) for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews in excel format
- **Final Evaluation Report including ADA Results-Assessment Form** for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

The reports shall meet the Quality Assurance standards (as listed in the Checklists, see Annexes to this document).

The evaluator shall submit the deliverables in English, making them reader-friendly by including tables, boxes and graphs when appropriate. The recommendations shall be concrete, specific and addressed to clearly identified recipients.

Indicative schedule of evaluation activities²:

Date	Phase	Responsible
23 March 2021	Selection of evaluator, announcement of contract award	ASPR
At the latest 15 April 2021	Signature of Contract for Evaluation Services & Kick-off meeting	ASPR
Up to 5 days until 09 June 2021	Desk study: Inception phase (review of documents, preparation of data collection)	Evaluator
10 June 2021	Deadline submission Inception Report	Evaluator
16 June 2021	Feedback of ASPR & ADA on Inception Report	ASPR/ADA
Up to 8 days between 19 June – 13 September 2021	Data collection , interviews and initial analysis	Evaluator
Up to 6 days between 16– 29 September 2021	Drafting of Evaluation Report and Results-Assessment Form	Evaluator
30 September 2021	Deadline submission of Draft Evaluation Report and ADA Results-Assessment Form (RAF) to ASPR for feedback and quality assurance	Evaluator
15 October 2021	ADA & ASPR provide (preliminary) feedback to the evaluator	ASPR/ADA
Up to 5 days	Revision of Draft Evaluation Report and RAF	Evaluator
08 November 2021	Evaluator sends back final version of the report and the ADA RAF with incorporated feedback, Final Draft validated by ASPR	Evaluator
Subsequently	Dissemination of final evaluation report	ASPR/ADA

² An updated and detailed schedule of evaluation activities will be part of the inception report.

Evaluation Management

The evaluation is managed by Ms Birgit Mayerhofer, HAWA Project Manager and supervised by Ms Gudrun Kramer, Director of the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution.

Logistics of the evaluation assignment

At the beginning of the assignment, ASPR provides the Evaluator with an evaluation dossier containing the relevant documents. Additional documents may be requested by the evaluator as appropriate.

The evaluator will be provided with background documents on the Austrian development cooperation and foreign policy, and information about KAIPTC and ASPR and all relevant documents of the project. In particular, the Project Document, Budget plan (original and revised), Logframe Matrix, Performance Monitoring Framework, operational planning, Project Progress reports, Project Deliverables, OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria for the HAWA Project, Multiplier Module Reports, Evaluation Report of Phase II.

Annexes

1. Quality assurance Checklist for Inception Report
 2. Quality Assurance Checklist for Final Report
 3. Declaration of honour
 4. Code of conduct for evaluators
-

Annex 1: Quality Assurance Checklist – Inception Report (IR)

Evaluation Title:	
1. Evaluation Purpose	– IR specifies the purpose and use of evaluation, describes why and for whom the evaluation is undertaken
2. Evaluation Objective	– IR stipulates clearly defined, relevant & feasible objectives
3. Evaluation Context	– IR includes sufficient & relevant contextual information
4. Evaluation Scope	– IR includes scope of evaluation
5. Evaluation Criteria	
The IR specifies the criteria that will be utilised to guide the evaluation.	
	IR specifies the guiding evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
	IR spells out additional criteria of relevance and/or cross-cutting issues to the particular type of evaluation being undertaken, such as visibility, human rights, gender and partnerships and coordination.
	The scope of the evaluation is feasible given resources and time considerations.
6. Evaluation Questions	
The IR includes a comprehensive and tailored set of evaluation questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria.	
	The set of evaluation questions are directly related to both the objectives of the evaluation and the criteria against which the subject will be assessed.
	The set of evaluation questions adds further detail to the objectives and contributes to further defining the scope.
	The set of evaluation questions is comprehensive enough that they raise the most pertinent evaluation questions, while at the same time being concise enough to provide users with a clear overview of the evaluation's objectives.
	Factoring in the information that will be collected and the context of the evaluation, evidence backed answers to the set of evaluation questions is achievable.
7. Methodology	
The IR specifies the methodological design and methods for data collection.	
	IR specifies the overall methodological design and contains a clear and accessible methodological plan. Preferably, a standalone section, such as an Evaluation Matrix that is attached to the annex.
	IR specifies the methods for data collection and analysis.

	IR states the overall methodological approach and design for the evaluation. Examples of approaches include participatory, utilization-focused, theory-based and gender and human rights responsive. Examples of overall design include non- experimental, quasi-experimental and experimental.	
	IR specifies how cross-cutting themes, such as gender and human rights will be incorporated in the evaluation design.	
	IR specifies an evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods that are human rights based and gender sensitive and for evaluation data to be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, etc.	
	The data collection and analysis methods in the IR are sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of the evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment. For example, there will be sufficient data to address all evaluation questions.	
	The evaluation methodology includes multiple methods (triangulation); preferably with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and with all stakeholders covered by the data collection methods.	
	Logical and explicit linkages are provided between data sources, data collection methods and analysis methods. For example, sampling plans are included.	
	The evaluation methodology takes into account the overall purpose of the evaluation, as well as the needs of the users and other stakeholders.	
	The evaluation methodology explicitly and clearly states the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods.	
8. Evaluation Work Plan		
	The work plan states the outputs that will be delivered by the evaluator/evaluation team, including information on the degree to which the evaluation report will be accessible to stakeholders (incl. the public).	
	The work plan describes the key stages of the evaluation process and the project time line.	
	The work plan establishes clear roles and responsibilities for evaluator/evaluation team members, the managing organization and others.	
	The work plan describes the evaluation quality assurance process.	
	The work plan describes the process, if applicable, for obtaining and incorporating comments on a draft evaluation report.	
	The work plan includes an evaluation project budget.	

Annex 2: Quality Assurance Checklist – Final Report

Evaluation Title:	
1. Report Structure The report is well structured, logical, clear, concise and complete.	
	The report uses gender sensitive and appropriate language and terms throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.
	Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence, e.g. sections separated by subheadings. The proposed structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Executive Summary - Introduction, Background to the Project - Purpose and scope of the evaluation (what is the intended use of the evaluation? For whom?) - Evaluation methodology (incl. limitations and difficulties encountered during the evaluation) - Findings related to each evaluation question and related to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations - Lessons learnt for similar and follow-up projects - Appendices (specified lists of interviews and of documents reviewed, interview formats, etc.)
	Title page and opening pages provide key basic information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Name of the evaluation object; - Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; - Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object; - Names and/or organizations of evaluator/s; - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation; - Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes; - List of acronyms.
	Executive Summary is max. 10 pages that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overview of the evaluation object; - Evaluation objectives and intended audience; - Overview of Evaluation methodology; - Most important findings and conclusions; - Main recommendations.
	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TOR; - List of persons interviewed; - List of documents consulted; - More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition; - Evaluation matrix; - Results framework. 	
2. Object of Evaluation		
The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.		
	The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and expected results) of the project is/are clearly described.	
	The social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional contexts that have a direct bearing on the object are described, e.g. government strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's /organization's corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.	
	<p>The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of components, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly; - The geographic context and boundaries (such as the region, country, and/or landscape) and challenges where relevant; - The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the project; - The total resources from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions). 	
	The key stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in the project implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
	The report identifies the implementation status of the object , including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.	
3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.		
	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	
	The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover.	
	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluator/s.	
	As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address cross-cutting issues of gender, human rights, visibility, partnerships and cooperation (if applicable).	
4. Evaluation methodology		

	The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.	
	The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.	
	The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.	
	The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.	
	The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	
	The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.	
	The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are responsive to issues such as gender equality, visibility, partnership and cooperation and human rights.	
	The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools, etc.)	
5. Findings		
	Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.	
	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) and other questions (regarding issues such as gender, human rights etc.) defined in the evaluation scope.	
	Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence.	
	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.	
	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence (use of graphs, tables etc.)	

6. Conclusions	
	Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.
	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.
	Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.
	Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users.
	Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the project, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of the stakeholders.
7. Lessons learnt and best practices	
	Lessons learnt are specific and relevant to the topic of the evaluation
	Lessons learnt and best practices are clearly linked to specific findings
	Lessons learnt and best practices are tied to clearly identified external factors
	Lessons learnt and best practices are replicable in the organizational context
8. Recommendations	
	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.
	The connection between findings, conclusions and recommendations is demonstrated through graphic means.
	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.
	Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.
	Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.
	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.
	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.
	Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender equality, visibility, human rights and other cross-cutting aspects.
	Recommendations are supplemented with suggested modalities of implementation and opportunities for improvement.

Annex 3:
**Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of
conflict of interest**

Final Evaluation of Project:
**Enhancing Human Security through Capacity Building in Humanitarian Assistance in
West Africa (HAWA III)**

The undersigned (name of the signatory of this form)

- in his/her own name (*if the economic operator is a natural person or in case of own declaration of a director or person with powers of representation, decision making or control over the economic operator*)

or

- representing (*if the economic operator is a legal person*)

official name in full (*only for legal person*):

official legal form (*only for legal person*):

official address in full:

VAT registration number:

declares that the company or organisation that he/she represents:

- a) is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not entered into an arrangement with creditors, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, and is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- b) has not been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of *res judicata*;
- c) has not been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authorities can justify;
- d) has fulfilled all its obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions and the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established, with those of the country of the contracting authority and those of the country where the contract is to be carried out;
- e) has not been the subject of a judgement which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity;

- f) is not a subject of the administrative penalty for being guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by the contracting authority as a condition of participation in the procurement procedure or failing to supply information, or being declared to be in serious breach of his obligation under contract covered by the budget.

In addition, the undersigned declares on his/her honour:

- g) that he/she has no conflict of interest in connection with the contract. A conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest;
- h) that he/she will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest;
- i) that the information provided to the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution within the context of this invitation to tender is accurate, sincere and complete.

Date

Place

Full Name

Signature

Annex 4:

Code of Conduct for Evaluations managed by the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolutionⁱ

To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in ASPR, evaluation consultants working for the ASPR are required to commit themselves in writing to the following obligations:

- Independence: Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- Impartiality: Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.
- Conflict of Interest: Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).
- Honesty and Integrity: Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.
- Competence: Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.
- Accountability: Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost-effective manner.
- Obligations to participants: Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

- Confidentiality: Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.
- Avoidance of Harm: Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.
- Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability: Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.
- Transparency: Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.
- Omissions and wrongdoing: Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

I confirm that I have received, understood and will abide by the ASRPR Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Date:

Place:

Name:

Signature:

ⁱ Based on UNEG Code of Conduct.