**Terms of Reference:**

**[*OPTIONAL DESCRIPTOR*] EVALUATION OF THE**

**[*NAME OF PROGRAM/PROJECT OR COMPONENT TO BE EVALUATED*]**

1. **Background of Program/Project**

*This background should provide a summary of the program/project to be evaluated, its objectives, history, target beneficiaries, implementors, funding. The description should also contextualize the program/project in terms of its outputs and delivery mechanism, its outcomes and how these link to broader development goals (under the Philippine Development Plan and Sustainable Development Goals).*

*.*

*The program/project context, performance, and issues should also be discussed in order to provide an idea of the additional knowledge needed for program/project improvement. Such performance and issues may cite existing evaluations, studies, and administrative reports.*

*Finally, a background of the evaluation, including its purpose and which agency is commissioning the same and the agency’s stakeholders involved in the evaluation project, should be described in brief.*

1. **Evaluation Objectives and Questions**

*The first paragraph should describe the main purpose(s) for the evaluation, particularly its policy mandate, intended use, and main subject of inquiry that is further fleshed out into the following evaluation questions.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Equity |  |
| Sustainability |  |
| Others |  |

*The TOR may note that the evaluation questions are indicative and may be prioritized or enhanced based on feasibility. It is recommended to have less than ten (10) evaluation questions in the TOR, prioritizing those which are of interest to stakeholders and those which are feasible given evaluability considerations. The consultant’s bids and inception report are expected to have more detailed questions. Refer to the Evaluation Plan in the annex, as needed.*

1. **Scope of Services and Methodology**

*The first part should describe the broad type(s) and approach of the evaluation—i.e., if a formative, process, or summative/impact evaluation—and spell out the scope of the evaluation in terms of the time period of the program/project, depth of coverage including components, and target groups. It may also be useful to specify aspects which are outside the scope of the evaluation.*

*The next part should describe the overarching methodology to be employed and the data collection and analysis methods required. While the methodological framework should be specific enough in order to set realistic expectations, it should also be flexible enough to give bidders some room to propose additional or alternative proposals. It is recommended that minimums be defined, e.g., in terms of survey sample, number of case studies, key informants to be interviewed, stakeholders to be engaged, etc. The minimum activities to be undertaken by the firm should also be spelled out. Refer to the Evaluation Plan in the annex, as needed.*

1. **Deliverables and Schedule of Expected Outputs**

*This section should spell out the overall duration of the contract and the outline the key milestone submissions—at the minimum, inception report, draft evaluation report, final evaluation report, and any interim outputs such as monthly progress reports—the description of the minimum contents of these submissions and format. Required reviews and approvals shall also be outlined, following the table below:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables/Outputs** | **Target Due Dates** | **Review and Approval** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Governance and Accountability**

*This section should spell out the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation consultant and the evaluation management team—particularly the evaluation manager and evaluation commissioner. Any reference group or technical working group assembled to guide the evaluation project should also be described and their composition spelled out. Reporting and supervision lines and coordination mechanisms, including regular progress updating, should be spelled out. Finally, facilities, information, data, and other support to be provided by the evaluation manager to the evaluation consultant must be spelled out.*

*Approvals—e.g., ethics reviews and survey instrument clearances—must also be spelled out. It is also important to reiterate ethical norms and standards that are specified in the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) and its Guidelines.*

1. **Professional Qualifications of the Successful Contractor and its Key Personnel**
2. *Present the minimum qualifications of the firm or institution to be sought, including applicable experience in terms of years in business and previous engagements or contracts with respect to the project at hand. The previous engagements or contracts should be able to show the thematic specialization(s) of the firm as well as their capacity for evaluation.*
3. *Present the minimum composition of the evaluation team that the firm will assign to the project, their respective roles, and minimum qualifications in terms of academic achievement, professional background, and previous undertakings. It is recommended that the project lead or lead investigator is an incumbent or “organic” personnel of the firm.*
4. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**
5. *Specify the Approved Budget for the Contract (ABC) of the project.*
6. *Specify the type of contract—e.g., lump sum price contract, time-based contract, etc.—noting that all consultancy contracts must be fixed-price output-based contracts regardless of extensions. The cost structure should be spelled out, i.e., if all costs will be incorporated in the remuneration, or if reimbursable costs will be allowed. Specify the minimum cost components.*
7. *In a table, present the payment terms in terms of deliverables or outputs to be submitted, the target date for submission and for approval, and equivalent proportion of the lump sum price. Specify also if an advanced payment for mobilization will be allowed.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Period** | **Deliverables/Outputs** | **Target Due** | **Percentage of Lump Sum Price** |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Criteria for Shortlisting and for Evaluation of Bids**
   1. *Specify the process and criteria for shortlisting.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Score |
| **Experience of the Firm**, particularly years of operation and past projects that are relevant | 50 |
| **Qualification of Key Staff to be Assigned**, ideally of the project lead and an incumbent employee of the firm | 30 |
| **Current Workload Relative to Capacity**, which may include a measure of financial capacity | 20 |

* 1. *For the Evaluation of Bids, Specify the evaluation scheme, i.e., if Quality-Based or Quality Cost-Based. With the latter, specify the distribution of the scores for the technical and financial proposals, with the latter taking a minimum of 15 percent and maximum of 40 percent. Specify that the minimum passing score of the technical proposal is 70 percent and spell out the criteria for the technical evaluation, as follows:*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Score | | |
|  | *Sample 1:*  *Balanced Rating* | *Sample 2: Emphasis on Methodology* | *Sample 3: Emphasis on Capacity* |
| **I. Quality of Evaluation Team** | 40 | 30 | 50 |
| Overall: composition of the team & allocation of tasks |
| Lead Evaluator:  a. Experience  b. Training  c. Education |
| Evaluator 1   1. Experience 2. Training 3. Education |
| Evaluator 2   1. Experience 2. Training 3. Education |
| **II. Experience and Capability**  **of Consultant (Firm)**   1. Capacity of the firm in terms of experience, organization and leadership 2. Performance in previous projects, quality of outputs, and relationship with past clients 3. Financial capacity | 30 | 10 | 30 |
| **III. Plan of Approach and**  **Methodology**   1. Clarity and completeness of proposed approach and methodology to respond to the TOR requirements 2. Innovativeness of proposed methodologies to respond to the evaluation study objectives/questions 3. Feasibility of the work plan given the approach and methodology and the risks to the project. | 30 | 60 | 20 |

* 1. In the combined scoring, the Financial Proposal will be computed as a ratio of the Proposal’s offer to the lowest price among the proposals received.

1. **Annexes to the TOR**

*Append annexes to the TOR, which should include the following at the minimum*

1. *Annex 1. Evaluation Plan*
2. *Annex 2. Indicative timeline based on the schedule of outputs and deliverables*
3. *Others: project background documents, proposals, reports, etc.*
4. *Refer to the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) and the Guidelines*