

Terms of reference: Evaluation of Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities

1 Background

During the last decade the international development regarding the rights of persons with disabilities has undergone substantial changes. With the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (hereafter: the Convention) these rights have been given a solid international basis and framework. Having signed the Convention, but still in the process of preparing for ratification, Norway has a reputation for being a supporter of the promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities, and was a pioneer in establishing a framework for such support within the development cooperation. On this background it is of special relevance to take a critical look at the results of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities and assess the suitability of the current framework and guidelines for securing these rights within the new international context. The evaluation will provide useful insight into the current Norwegian practice and give advice for future support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities.

2 The international framework on the rights of persons with disabilities

In the last decade we have witnessed major changes in the international framework and approach to the rights of persons with disabilities. The Convention was adopted on 13 December 2006, and entered into force on 3 May 2008. There is also an Optional Protocol to the Convention. A treaty body, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, has been established and there is a UN Special Reporter. The presentation of the Convention on the UN website states that: “The Convention marks a “paradigm shift” in attitudes and approaches to persons with disabilities. It takes to a new height the movement from viewing persons with disabilities as “objects” of charity, medical treatment and social protection towards viewing persons with disabilities as “subjects” with rights, who are capable of claiming those rights and making decisions for their lives based on their free and informed consent as well as being active members of society. The Convention is intended as a human rights instrument with an explicit, social development dimension. It adopts a broad categorisation of persons with disabilities and reaffirms that all persons with all types of disabilities must enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms. It clarifies and qualifies how all categories of rights apply to persons with disabilities and identifies areas where adaptations have to be made for persons with disabilities to effectively exercise their rights and areas where their rights have been violated, and where protection of rights must be reinforced.” (UN Enable - Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities)

The Convention treats obligations related to international cooperation in a separate article. Art. 32 on International cooperation underlines the importance of ensuring that programmes are inclusive and accessible to persons with disabilities, that capacity-building is facilitated and that research, technology transfer and technical assistance of relevance is facilitated and supported.

In relation to the handling of the rights of persons with disabilities on the international scene it should also be mentioned that the UN General Assembly discussed the issue in its 65th session last year in relation to the Millennium Goals (A/65/173: “Keeping the promise: realizing the Millennium Development Goals for persons with disabilities towards 2015 and beyond. Report of the Secretary-General”).

The evaluation will refer to the definition given in the Convention, Article 1 Purpose:

“Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on equal basis with others.”

3 Rational and purpose of the evaluation

Aid to governments as well as organizations that work to improve the lives of persons with disabilities and secure their rights has long been an important element of Norwegian development cooperation. With the basis in a White Paper [St.meld. nr. 8 (1998-99) Om handlingsplan for funksjonshemmede 1998-2001. Deltaking og likestilling] and specifically chapter 7 on Norwegian aid, a plan for working with people with disabilities within Norwegian aid was developed in 1999 (“Plan for arbeidet med mennesker med funksjonshemming i bistanden”, Utenriksdepartementet, 10.11.99). Following this plan Norad developed a plan and practical guidelines for the inclusion of disability in development cooperation. (“The inclusion of disability in Norwegian development co-operation. Planning and monitoring for the inclusion of disability issues in mainstream development activities”, Norad January 2002). On the basis of this plan Norad’s Directors’ Assembly (Direktørmøte) decided on 12.03.02 that disability shall be taken into consideration and integrated in all its work in development cooperation.

With the plan of 2002 Norwegian development cooperation has for a long time had integration of the rights of persons with disabilities as a central concern in its overall policy and guidelines. Not least in the light of the development on the international scene related to the rights of people with disabilities it seems timely to take a closer look at the results obtained and how the Norwegian support to the rights of persons with disabilities is fitting into the international requirements. The evaluation will thus also be an input to the Norwegian authorities’ preparations and plans for follow up of the ratification of the Convention. On this background the *purpose* of the evaluation will be twofold:

- Document and assess the results of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities in development cooperation in the last decade. The evaluation should include, but not be limited to an assessment of the extent to which the support to persons with disabilities has been mainstreamed and the special merits of such an approach within the cooperation.
- On the basis of the plan and guidelines from 2002, considering the recent developments on the international scene, with special reference to the Convention (and Art. 32), propose guidelines appropriate to meet the challenges for Norway related to the support and promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities.

The following *objectives* will guide the evaluation:

- Document the support given during the last decade to persons with disabilities across geographical areas, sectors, channels and partners, if feasible classifying types of disabilities.
- Ascertain and assess output, outcome and to the extent possible impact of the Norwegian engagement for different groups of persons with disabilities and work done under guidance of the existing plan, including the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the efforts made so far, and including a discussion on the implementation and merits of the mainstreaming approach.

- Provide findings, conclusions and recommendations to inform the continuation of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities through the various channels, modalities and partners provided by the Norwegian development cooperation.

4 Scope

Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities has been on a relatively high and stable level during the last decade. Although reliable statistics on the support are not easily found (no OECD-DAC codes directly covering the support), a *tentative overview* can be established of the support based on a Norad specific “target group marker: physical disabled”, which unfortunately only gives us figures until 2008, when this target group was abandoned. Estimating a support on approximately the same level for the years 2009-2010 this gives a total amount approaching 3 billion NOK in support for persons with disabilities for the period 2000-2010. Added to the general caution of the reliability of the statistics mentioned above, another issue should also be mentioned. The Norwegian support to persons with disabilities covers support to mine victims, but it has not been verified whether this kind of support, from the specific budget on “humanitarian disarmament”, is covered in the overview. The figure given should thus be regarded as an *estimate*. The evaluation will have as one of its objectives to give a more qualified view on the total Norwegian support to persons with disabilities in the last decade.

A considerable amount of the support to persons with disabilities is channeled through Norad and funding through civil society organizations. Among these the support to the umbrella organization the Atlas-alliance is of special importance, with a total annual support of approximately 79 million NOK. The Atlas-alliance has a basis in organizations of persons with disabilities and covers the interests of 18 organizations, 10 of which have projects supported through the Atlas-alliance agreement. The Alliance was submitted to a Norad organizational review in 2009.

The evaluation will cover the Norwegian support to persons with disabilities through different channels, modalities and partners in the period 2000 – 2010. In-depth studies of the support, both targeted and mainstreaming approaches, in three countries will be included: Uganda, Palestinian Areas and Malawi. The study of mainstreaming of the rights of persons with disabilities will be facilitated in the evaluation by a special thematic focus on support within the education sector. Another thematic focus in the evaluation is related to the humanitarian sector, where victim assistance from landmines has been chosen to be looked at where relevant.

The rights based approach is central to the evaluation and the work of advocacy and capacity building of Norwegian organizations with their partner organizations in the case countries will be of special interest in the evaluation.

Evaluation issues and questions:

The evaluation shall cover but is not necessarily limited to the issues and questions below:

- Provide an overview of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities in the period 2000 – 2010 across channels, sectors, geographical areas and partners, classifying types of disabilities where possible. The mapping should cover the countries chosen for case studies in some detail, and on a more general level for

the total Norwegian support. Data permitting, it should indicate the main areas for which the money has been used.

- Based on the mapping of the support and the results of the case studies give a synthesized assessment of the Norwegian engagement for persons with disabilities in the last decade.
- What have been the “program theory” or program logic and underlying assumptions for the Norwegian support? Where relevant, differentiate according to context.
- What have been the results (or contribution to results) at local and national level of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities? At project level, assess results, and outline reasons for success and failures.
- Document and assess the support to persons with disabilities as a mainstreaming factor in the Norwegian development cooperation and humanitarian support.
- Identify to what extent risk factors have been taken into account, and to what extent the support has been culture and conflict sensitive.
- Discuss in general the socio-cultural context of the major types of disabilities and the support given to the different groups, assessing the relevance and effectiveness of the support according to contextual factors and types of disabilities. Gender differences should be given due consideration. Conducive as well as hindering factors, cultural, social and economic, for improving the lives and supporting the rights of persons with disabilities should be pointed at.
- With a specific focus on securing the integration of persons with disabilities in education, assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Norwegian support. Gender differences should be given due consideration.
- With a specific focus on victims’ assistance in humanitarian disarmament and their integration into the community, assess the relevance and effectiveness of the Norwegian support. Gender differences should be given due consideration.
- Assess the coherence of the Norwegian support to persons with disabilities, with the recipient countries’ plans and other support of relevance to improve the lives of the disabled.
- Assess the coordination of the support to persons with disabilities through different channels in the countries studied.
- Assess the extent to which Norwegian support has been facilitating and supporting advocacy and capacity building of organizations working for the promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities in the countries studied, making the disabled to “subjects” not only “objects”.

- Assess the extent to which Norwegian support has been supporting relevant research and research institutions in the countries studied.
- Within available resources, and where relevant, compare the merits of the Norwegian support with other countries' support to persons with disabilities in the countries studied.
- Assess the sustainability of the Norwegian support, and if possible the impact of the support on the lives of persons with disabilities. Gender differences should be given due consideration.
- Assess to what extent the support has been guided by the existing guidelines, and if so, the suitability of these guidelines for the context in question. The question of indicators should be included in the discussion, as well as contributing factors and factors of hindrance.
- Against the requirements in the Convention assess the merits of the current guidelines for Norwegian support to persons with disabilities and advice for future approach and guidelines.

Cross-cutting issues of gender, age, environment, conflict sensitivity and corruption shall be covered by the evaluation when relevant.

5 Approach and methodology

The approach of the study seeks to combine the need to obtain a general overview of the initiatives undertaken and to research in more depth, looking more closely at separate projects and agreements in selected countries. The evaluation should be able to give a picture of the situation of the lives of different groups of persons with disabilities, and the effect of the Norwegian support for the improvement of their situation and the promotion of their rights. The evaluation should both look at general agreements and follow projects down at country level. Various methods should be used to capture the results of the Norwegian support, quantitative and qualitative, including desk studies and document reviews, interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and country case studies.

Attention should be given to qualitative methods, including generating primary data on the classification and mapping of the situation of different groups of persons with disabilities. It could be of interest for this evaluation to look at national surveys and work done on living conditions of the disabled in Southern African countries. These national mappings are results of a collaborative effort between The Southern Africa Federation of the Disabled (SAFOD), the Norwegian Federation of Organizations of Disabled People, and other relevant organizations, and conducted under the responsibility of SINTEF Health Research, funded under the Atlas agreement with Norad. Malawi was covered in 2004.

The evaluation covers both targeted and mainstreaming approaches, and the methodology should be elaborated accordingly to assess the value of each of these approaches. In order to facilitate the assessment of mainstreaming in the support to persons with disabilities, we suggest that the evaluation take a closer look at this factor within the “social sector” in the selected countries. However, in order to delimit the task, it is suggested that the team focus on education and go into less depth for health.

The rights based approach being central to the evaluation, the consultant should include methodology to assess how Norwegian organizations work with and to what degree they succeed in supporting advocacy and capacity building of partners..

The evaluation will include country case studies in the following countries: Uganda, the Palestinian Areas, and Malawi. The selection of country cases are based on the following criteria: size of Norwegian support, including coverage within education and to some degree to mine victims; range of partners; national government's promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities and the relationship with NGOs; some context, geographical differentiation. The evaluation should have an overall view on the program theory or logic and assumptions behind the support to persons with disabilities, and the evaluation team should examine how program theory has been implemented in practice through projects.

The evaluation will refer to the DAC criteria on evaluation of international development cooperation, with an emphasis on relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. The consultant should clarify the use of the criteria. Where relevant other evaluation criteria established for a specific field (ref. humanitarian) should also be taken into consideration. Reports will be assessed against the DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, and the consultant must thus adhere to these standards.

The consultant will be responsible for developing a detailed methodological framework for the evaluation. The consultant is free to suggest methods that have not been indicated above. New and little known methods should be duly explained. If the consultant leaves some of the detailed elaboration of the methodology to the inception report, the methodological design should be sufficiently developed in the tender for the client to be able to make a proper assessment of the offer. The evaluation report shall describe the evaluation method and process and discuss validity and reliability. Limitations and shortcomings should be explained.

6 Organization and evaluation team

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent team of consultants contracted by the Evaluation Department of Norad. Evaluation management will be carried out by the Evaluation Department and the team will report to the Department. The team is entitled to consult widely with stakeholders pertinent to the assignment. The inception report, the field visit reports, the draft evaluation report and all other reports are subject to approval by the Evaluation Department based upon quality criteria. The Evaluation Department will identify key stakeholders who will be invited to comment on the evaluation process and the quality of the products.

The evaluation team is expected to have the following qualifications:

Team leader:

- Higher academic degree within a relevant field.
- Proven successful team leading; the team leader must document relevant experience with managing and leading complex evaluations.
- Advanced knowledge and experience in evaluation principles and standards in the context of international development.

Team as a whole:

- A team of international experts with complementary competences and expertise in relevant fields, including social science, education, development cooperation, humanitarian issues, evaluation principles, methods and standards in general, including outcome and impact evaluations, as well as project and program evaluation.
- Expertise and understanding of the global framework and architecture related to the rights of persons with disabilities.
- Knowledge and experience regarding cooperation with countries in the South.
- Country/regional knowledge and preferably experience from Uganda, the Palestine Areas/Middle East and Malawi.
- One or more members of the team shall have a good knowledge of Norwegian development cooperation policy and instruments.
- At least one of the members of the team should have a PhD degree or equivalent competence and experience within one of the areas listed under the first bullet point for the team as a whole.
- The team should include/be complemented by local/regional experts. The tender shall document the extent to which consultants from developing countries will be employed, and in what capacity.
- It is desirable that the composition of the evaluation team and its local experts presents an approximate gender balance.
- Languages: All team members shall be able to read and speak English. Ability in one or more persons within the team to read Norwegian, Swedish or Danish is required. It is also required that one or more persons within the team are able to read and speak national/local language in countries chosen.
- A system of quality assurance shall be in force, with ability to control both the formal and the substantial aspects of the evaluation reports. The system shall be carefully described in the tender, with a clear indication of the number of person days that will be allotted to the quality assurance function.

The tendering firm:

- Expected to have experience with delivering multi-disciplinary evaluations contracted preferably through competitive procurement procedures during the last three years.

7 Budget, work plan and reporting

Budget: The evaluation is budgeted with a maximum input of 60 person weeks. The tender shall present a total budget with stipulated expenses for field works planned and other expenses envisaged. The responsibilities of the team members should be clearly described and budgeted. There shall be room in the budget for seminars, including debriefings for

interviewed stakeholders in case countries, and for presentation of the final evaluation report in Oslo. Two key members of the evaluation team shall be available in Norway for Norwegian stakeholders during two full working days at the end of the evaluation to discuss ideas for its follow-up with them individually.

Tentative work plan and deadlines:

ACTIVITY	DEADLINE
Announcement of tender	15 March- 2011
Submission of tenders	2 May 2011
Contract signature	23 May 2011
Inception report	23 June 2011
Field visit reports	3 October 2011
Draft final evaluation report	15 November 2011
Final evaluation report	10 January 2012
Dissemination/seminar	February 2012

The Consultant shall submit the following reports:

An inception report: providing an overview of the Norwegian support to persons with disabilities in general and in some more detail for the countries selected, and a detailed description of the methodology. The inception report will be subject to comments by the Evaluation Department and stakeholders.

Field visit reports: from the case countries selected.

A draft final evaluation report: presenting findings, conclusions and recommendations on a synthesized level based on the case studies and the mapping, with a draft executive summary. Principal stakeholders will be invited to comment in writing, and feedback will be provided to the team by the Evaluation Department. The feedback will refer to the Terms of Reference and may include comments on structure, facts, content, methodology, conclusions and recommendations.

A final evaluation report shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the Evaluation Department. Upon approval the evaluation report will be published in the series of the Evaluation Department and must be presented in a way that directly enables publication.

All reports shall be written in English. The consultant is responsible for editing and for quality control of language.

The budget and the final work plan must allow sufficient time for feedback and presentation of conclusions and recommendations, including preliminary findings to relevant stakeholders in the countries visited and presentation of the final evaluation report in Oslo.

Part 3: ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 Specifications for Preparing Technical Proposal

Technical proposal *not exceeding 15 pages* should provide the following information:

Competence - Qualifications and Technical Competence

The technical proposal should provide:

- Information about the experience and technical competence of the tenderer firm, its sub contractors (where relevant), and the evaluation/study team to demonstrate that they satisfy the qualification and competence requirements specified in the ToR for this evaluation/study.
- A summary of the competencies of the team members shall be provided in a tabular form as follows:

	Evaluation/study Team				
	Leader	Member	Member	Member	Member
Name					
Affiliation (Main employer)					
Country of residence and of nationality					
Competence					
Academic level					
Discipline(s)					
Evaluation principles, methods and standards					
Relevant Sector(s)					
Int. framework - disability					
International development cooperation					
Norwegian development cooperation					
Humanitarian issues					
Country/region:					
Malawi					
Palestinian areas/Middle East					
Uganda					
Other					
Language fluency:					
English					
Norwegian/Swedish/Danish					
Other					

- Detailed CVs not exceeding 5 pages shall be attached in the annex to the tender.

Approach and Methodology

- The tenderer's understanding of the purpose, role and subject matter of the assignment
- The proposed design for the study, methodological choices, strategy with respect to concretisation of the issues, and as far as possible indicators and data sources to be used to answer the main questions posed in this assignment.
- Tenderers are invited to make well founded comments or alternative suggestions where relevant to methodological specifications, issues and questions outlined in the ToR.

Quality Assurance System

- A description of the tenderer's quality assurance system to ensure that the assignment will be performed in accordance with the technical proposal and plans outlined in the tender. The description should outline the tenderer's policy concerning control of scientific quality of the deliverables, together with routines with respect to document control, , auditing of inputs, reporting of deviations from agreed plans and corrections thereof and communication with the client.

Price

The tenderer shall quote a **total price** for the assignment **including** travel and subsistence costs related to field work involving case project/programme visits.

A break-down of the total price shall be provided. The break-down shall specify:

- **Name**, hourly **rate** and number of **hours**, for **each member** of the staff proposed for the assignment.
- Travel and subsistence costs **including** field-work travel costs
- Other costs if any

All fees and costs shall be quoted in Norwegian Kroner NOK, exclusive of VAT.

Availability

The technical proposal should include a tentative *work-plan* that also gives a specification of the time set out for each member of the team for the fulfilment of the assignment. The division of work between the team members should be in line with the competencies of the individual team members. The tentative work-plan should reflect timely completion of the deliverables in the assignment.

The time-schedule for the project is fixed as given in *Part I, Section 2 Administrative Conditions* of this document. Tenderers may however, propose a revised time-schedule for project deliverables. Maximum acceptable delay in project completion is 2 months. Tenders offering delivery within the specified time- scheduled will be credited according to the availability criterion as specified in *Part I Section 4- Award criteria* in this document.

ANNEX 2

Specifications for preparing the tender

Tenders shall be structured as follows:

Part A. Covering Letter and Declarations

A covering letter for the tender (with the signature of an authorised person on the front page) declaring that:

- the tenderer accepts all the conditions specified in this tender document. Reservations if any to any of the conditions must be explicitly stated in the declaration, specifying the relevant condition and the terms of the reservation
- that neither the tenderer, nor any of the members of the evaluation/study team have any existing, or potential conflict of interest in undertaking the tendered assignment.

Part B. Technical Proposal

Prepared according to the specification in *Part 3, Annex 1* of this document.

Annexes

All the documentation specified in *Part 1 Tender specification, Section 3 Qualification requirements* of this document must be enclosed.

ANNEX 3 Guidelines for Reports and Field Work

3.1 Guidelines for Inception Report and Field Work

The inception report shall give a detailed description of the research strategy and methodology, data collection and sources, the analytical approach and indicator framework, preferably with a prototype of the analysis to be performed in the study. The report will also give a summary of the information collected to date. Information gaps will be identified and strategy to fill the gaps, including (if relevant), the plans for the **field-work** will be outlined. The inception report will specify the list of informants to be contacted in the case countries, the methods to be used to collect required information, preliminary draft of the questions to be asked of the informants, and itinerary for the field visit.

A detailed **work plan**, specifying the roles and responsibilities for each evaluation/study team member, and a **preliminary outline of the final report** format will be included as an appendix in the inception report.

It is the obligation of the selected firm and the team-leader to ensure that ethical standards are maintained in conduct of the field-work, and data collection is conducted under free and informed consent of the key informants.

3.2 Guidelines for Final Report

The final report shall normally not exceed 60 pages, excluding the annexes. The final report shall be developed in two phases: a draft version, and the final version. The draft version shall contain all the main elements and major arguments, findings, conclusions and recommendations that are to appear in the final report. The final report shall be prepared subsequent to the approval of the draft version by EVAL.

The report shall convey insights in an informative, clear and concise manner. Use of abbreviations and acronyms, footnotes and professional terminology shall be limited to the minimum, and explanations shall be given for all such terms used in the report. The structure of the reports shall be as follows:

- **Front page/title page**

The front page shall contain the title of the evaluation/study.

- **Preface**

A blank page to be written by the Director, EVAL, Norad.

- **Acknowledgements**

This page shall provide the following information

- Name of the firm(s) responsible for the report
- Name of the team leader and the team members
- Division of work between the team members
- Reference group (stakeholders) members where relevant
- A declaration stating “

“This report is the product of its authors, and responsibility for the accuracy of data included in this report rests with the authors. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of EVAL”.

- **Table of Contents**
- **Acronyms and abbreviations**
- **Executive Summary**

The executive summary shall be a maximum of one tenth of the length of the main report excluding its annexes. The overall objective shall be to convey the main points to a non-technical reader. The summary shall function as an independent excerpt free of references to other parts of the report. Use of acronyms, abbreviations, and technical terms shall be minimised in the summary. The executive summary shall consist of four sections; namely introduction, findings, conclusions and recommendations. A separate paragraph shall be used to present each main finding, conclusion and recommendation. The paragraph shall start with a simple declarative sentence in bold font that presents the subject matter in the paragraph. Supporting or explanatory sentences shall be included where necessary. The main findings, conclusions and recommendations shall be presented *in the same order as they appear in the report*. Limitations of the analysis shall be clearly identified wherever relevant.

- **Chapter 1. Introduction or Background**

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide information which is important for the reader to understand the report. The introduction shall state the purpose, objectives, main questions, scope, and main users of the evaluation/study. This shall be followed by a presentation of the object of evaluation/study. Included herein *is* the background information related to chronology, stakeholders, organisation, budgets, and policy documents. The chapter shall conclude with a brief literature review of the relevant project and program cycle documents related to the object of evaluation/study.

- **Chapter 2 Methodology and analytical framework**

This chapter should provide a detailed description of the research strategy, method and indicator framework used in the evaluation/study. All data and survey instruments shall be provided in annex 1 of the report. EVAL is committed to making its evaluation/studies publicly available and it is important that the details provided in this chapter and annex 1, are sufficient to enable the replication and extension of results by other researchers.

- **Chapters presenting findings**

Findings: A body paragraph shall be allocated for each finding. The finding shall be presented as a clear topic sentence. This shall be followed by presentation of the relevant data, quotations, references, and analysis that shows how and why the evidence presented supports the position taken in the topic sentence. Included herein is also the presentation of the comparisons with other studies, significant trends if any, *uncertainties, and limitations* relevant for the analysis presented.

- **Chapter presenting conclusions and recommendations**

The chapter shall consist of two sections:

Conclusions: A body paragraph shall be allocated for each conclusion. The conclusion shall be presented as a clear and direct topic sentence. This shall be followed by supporting sentences that clearly show how the conclusion has been deduced, and which findings are relevant in deriving the conclusion.

Recommendations: A body paragraph shall be allocated for each recommendation. The recommendation shall clearly outline the directions and actions that should be taken keeping in view the findings and the conclusions. It is essential that the actions suggested follow from the findings and conclusions presented in the report. As far as possible the recommendations should reflect on the implementation issues related to the concerned recommendation.

- **Annexes**

- Annex 1: Definitions, data and survey instruments
- Annex 2 : Other information on need basis
- Annex 3: Details of the field work elaborating the itinerary and the list of informants consulted
- Annex 4: Terms of Reference (TOR)

- **References**

The references shall preferably follow Oxford's Manual of Style: In the text, the last name of the author, followed by the year of publishing, shall be presented in parenthesis. At the very end of the report, the references shall be presented in alphabetical order, according to the author's name and year of publishing as referred to in the text.

3.3 Guidelines for quality assurance of the report

The final report shall normally not exceed 60 pages, excluding the annexes. The text shall preferably be written in Microsoft Word. The font of the body matter shall be Times New Roman 12 points or equal. The margins shall be 2.5 cm. The report shall be delivered edited, language vetted, and proofread and ready for publication. The reports shall be submitted to the Evaluation Department electronically.

It is the obligation of the selected firm and the quality assurance personnel proposed for the assignment to ensure:

- Table of contents is complete
- All acronyms are explained
- Executive summary is accessible to the non technical reader
- Method
 - Clear statement of the analytical framework
 - All assumptions and limitations clearly stated
- Data
 - Clear documentation of the data collection procedures
 - All relevant data presented and summarised
 - All calculations clearly documented and checked
 - All data sources clearly referenced
 - All biographical references complete
- Analysis
 - All conclusions supported by well documented data and evidence
 - Clear and complete statement of the limitations
 - Sensitivity of the conclusion to the assumptions is clarified
- The Report
 - Responds to TOR

- Responds to comments to inception report and draft version
- Response to stakeholder comments as per DAC quality evaluation standards
- Acceptable grammar, style and organisation
- Quality assurance is complete and explains deviations if any