CTP Evaluation terms of reference template

*Use this table to summarize the information contained in the ToR.*

**Description:**

**Location:**

**Duration and timing:**

**Summary outputs:**

**Evaluation team / profile:**

### A. Background

*Provide an overview of the programme and if relevant, CTP preparedness project as well as any CTP operations that have been conducted by the National Society.*

### B. Purpose

*Provide an overview of the purpose of the evaluation here. Potential areas for examination by the evaluation include:*

* ***Impact*** *– What was the effect of the income on people’s livelihoods? What multiplier effects may have occurred due to the cash? What effect did the project have on local markets for key goods and services? Where and how accessible were the markets where cash was spent? How did households decide how to use the cash and were there tensions between men and women or between different generations? How has the cash project affected traditional community self-help systems? How has the cash project influenced local debt and credit markets?*
* ***Effectiveness*** *- Did people get the right amount of cash? Were distributions timely and efficient? What did people spend the cash on? Was cash delivered and spent safely? What costs were borne by the beneficiary in receiving and using the cash? Did beneficiaries see payment levels as fair and adequate? Was there any corrupt abuse by agency staff, local elites or authorities involved in targeting or distribution? Is there any evidence of anti-social use?*
* ***Efficiency*** *– How efficient has the project been in its approaches? Could the inputs be used more efficiently in the future? How efficient and appropriate were the delivery systems used for disbursements? Did the agency have sufficient skills to manage the project effectively? What were the management costs/requirements in implementing the project? What was the total cost of the project per beneficiary? What were the external costs borne by the beneficiary? What was the total cost of comparable in-kind projects per beneficiary?*
* ***Sustainability*** *– How has the project incorporated efforts to institutionalize CTP and capacity building as part of its approach? How could this be improved to ensure the NS is better prepared for scalable immediate cash based programming? How sustainable are the achievements and what recommendations could be made to improve sustainability?*

### C. Evaluation Criteria

The following OECD DAC criteria[[1]](#footnote-1) should be used to carry out this evaluation:

**Impact[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Efficiency[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Effectiveness[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**Connectedness[[5]](#footnote-5)**

### D. Methodology

Good evaluation methodologies will include a mix of both primary and secondary data collection methods. The evaluation methodology should include secondary data review of key project documents from the operation and from National Society. Key informant interviews should also be held with stakeholders including National Society leadership and focal points, IFRC / ICRC / PNS staff in country and in relevant offices. Other key country partners can be interviewed to gather their perceptions of the programme. An online survey may also be used to solicit anonymous feedback from stakeholders, as well as enable more systematic feedback from those countries not visited during the evaluation.

### E. Evaluation Team – Roles and Responsibilities

*The expected roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team should be laid out here. This includes the number of expected team members and their specific contribution to the evaluation. Generally, this includes a Team Leader as well as any other evaluation team members who will conduct primary or secondary research.*

### F. Timeframe

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Month** | **Number of days** |
| Task |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL DAYS** |  |

### G. Outputs and audiences

*Detail here what outputs you require from the evaluation. The following is just an example of what you may include.*

1. The **evaluation report** should be no more than 20 pages (excluding annexes) and include:
* Executive summary
* Key recommendations (max 10)
* Introduction – scope, purpose, methodology
* Presentation of main findings
* Detailed recommendations for the IFRC and National Society

This evaluation will be shared through the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and with key donors, and will be used to demonstrate progress towards our own and donors objectives.

1. The **case study** can also be provided following the case study template.

This case study is for the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, CaLP and for the wider cash community of practice. As such the tone of this output is expected to differ from the evaluation.

### H. Evaluator Profile

### I. Duration

1. <http://www.alnap.org/pool/files/eha-2006.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Impact looks at the wider effects of the project - social, economic, technical, and environmental - on individuals, gender- and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Effectiveness measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within the criterion of effectiveness is timeliness [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Connectedness refers to the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account. Connectedness has been adapted from the concept of sustainability - the idea that interventions should support longer-term goals, and eventually be managed without donor input [↑](#footnote-ref-5)