

Terms of Reference of the 2020 Evaluation of the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation

1. Evaluation object and scope

The evaluation object is the programmatic and administrative work of the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (DHF) during the time period 2015-2020 and the results thereof. This Terms of Reference follows OECD/DAC Evaluation terminology and structure, including evaluation criteria and questions.¹

The Foundation's Working Procedures (Annex A) provide detailed guidance for the implementation of the statutes and constitute an operational connection between the statutes and the Foundation's other planning documents and instruments. The Strategic Framework, (Annex B), includes a vision and mission statement, adopted by the Board, that informs the scope of work of the Foundation for the years 2018-20.² The Strategic Framework defines the rationale of engagement through Hammarskjöld's legacy and identifies four thematic focus areas with priorities:

- *Multilateralism - trends, norms and governance*
- *Repositioning of the UN System*
- *Agenda 2030*
- *Building and Sustaining Peace*

Annual Work Programme and Budgets (Annex C) translate the Foundation's Strategic Framework into programmatic projects, and cover all actions and activities conducted by the Foundation during the year which are divided into three categories; administration, communications and programmatic work.

A separate Financial Audit of the Foundation is carried out annually by a certified auditor.

The Annual Report and the Auditor's report constitute the official financial accountancy of the Foundation and together with the Statutes, the Working Procedures, the three-year Strategic Framework and the Annual Work Programme and Budget, provide the main documents of the Foundation.

The statutes for the Foundation were laid down by the King-in-Council of Sweden on March 2, 1962; a revised version applies as of November 8, 1968. The Strategic Framework, the Working Procedures, the Annual Work Programme and Budget and the Annual report are all adopted by the Board of Trustees.

2. Evaluation purpose

This evaluation is carried out to fulfill paragraph 12 of the agreement between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and The Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, stipulating that an external evaluation of the Foundation's work and results should be completed by 31 October 2020.

¹ OECD/DAC 2019: "Better Criteria for Better Evaluation. Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use" <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

Minor adjustments have been made in line with existing practices at Sida, and as applied by e.g. International IDEA. In case of this Terms of Reference, this essential means that the evaluation categories "Efficiency" and "Impact" are merged under the category headline: "Outcome/impact".

² Documentation for the full period 2015-2020 will be provided to the Evaluators separately. This documentation includes the Strategic Plan 2015- 17 and all Annual Workprogrammes and Budget 2015-20.

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Help the Foundation and its partners to assess what works well and less well .
- Provide the Foundation and its partners with input to upcoming discussions concerning the preparation of a new Strategic Framework and funding.
- Serve as input for decisions by present and potential partners and donors on continued, extended and possible new support.
- Inform the DHF, its Board and Secretariat of the adequacy of the Foundation's administrative capacity.

3. The primary intended users of the evaluation are:

- The Ministry for Foreign Affairs as the main financier
- The Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (DHF), its Board and Secretariat

The evaluation should be designed, conducted and reported in a manner that meets the needs of the intended users, and the tenders should elaborate how this will be ensured during the evaluation process.

4.. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluator shall assess the substance, relevance and effectiveness of the work of the Foundation during the period 2015-2020 and formulate recommendations on how to adjust and improve implementation and learning of the Foundation's programmatic work and administrative support to programmatic work.

The mandate and the financial support of the Foundation allows for flexibility in implementation of the programmatic work.³ The evaluation shall systematically consider how the Foundation can develop and improve more flexible and adaptive ways of working, to ensure that results are optimised.

The evaluation shall also include an overall assessment of the Foundation's operational and administrative capacity, including organisation, competence and number of administrative and programmatic personnel. This assessment shall be informed by the ongoing organisational adjustment process, initiated in 2019.

The evaluation questions are:

Relevance

- How does DHF's work contribute to the realisation of the Vision and Mission as formulated in the past and present Strategic Frameworks during the evaluation period 2015-2020?
- What are DHF's comparative advantages compared to similar actors, and how can these advantages be further developed?
- How is the Foundation described by its partners, and what aspects of DHF's work are most relevant to its partners and drivers of change?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the Foundation contributed to change in relation to the contextual forecast and within the four thematic areas and its priorities?

³ The Foundation is financially supported by the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in accordance with the agreement between the Foundation and the Government Offices (Ministry for Foreign Affairs) for the period 1 July 2018- 31 December 2020).

- How does the DHF’s use of consultants and senior advisers contribute to the effectiveness of programmatic work?
- Does DHF’s administrative set-up provide sufficient financial oversight and administrative support for the programmatic work?
- Given the flexibility of DHF for implementing its work programme, is the Foundation using the right methods to achieve the expected results ?
- How effective is the Foundation when working within the Foundation’s different roles – i.e. facilitator, training provider, catalyst and communicator, knowledge producer?
- How and when are DHF activities and outputs (e.g., seminars, roundtables, training, publications, communication channels) effective in realising DHF’s goal and achieving outcome level results?
- How has the on-going transition from projects to programmes and thematic focus areas been progressing and what more is needed to improve effectiveness?
- How has the Foundation worked to integrate conflict, gender, and human rights across its operational work?

Outcome/impact

- To what extent has the Foundation been successful in achieving its objectives at short and medium term including behavioural change, as defined in the strategic framework, annual workplans and project planning documents?
- How do DHF communications and publications contribute to outcome and impact level results?
- To what extent does DHF’s work contribute to policy development, and how this can be assessed ?
- How can the Foundation best follow up results?

Organisational Sustainability

- Are DHF capacities resilient and can they sustain net benefits,⁴ also as foreseen over the medium term?
- What can DHF learn from previous and present, formal and informal, partnerships to improve our future work? The partnership with the UN Multi Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) on the yearly report: *Financing of the UNDS* shall be included in the assessment.

4. Evaluation approach and methods for data collection and analysis

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully presented in an inception report. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection.

The Foundation’s approach to evaluation is learning and utilisation-focused which means the evaluator should undertake the entire evaluation process with careful consideration of the practical applicability of the findings of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation. In addressing the evaluation questions, the evaluator shall seek feedback (video/phone conference where possible) from DHF partners and target

⁴ OECD/DAC 2019: “Better Criteria for Better Evaluation. Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use”, p. 12. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>.

groups, including: the *UN system (UN Secretariat, PBSO, DCO, MPTFO/UNDP, UNSSC/Turin, UN/Geneva, UN Foundation), IPI, New York Peacebuilding Group, DC stakeholders (World Bank, Brookings), agencies and institutes in Sweden and abroad, as well as representatives from Governments of Member states (not only Sweden).*

The evaluator shall visit DHF's NY presence; DHF may assist in organising meetings.

5. Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. The intended user(s) is primarily Sweden's Ministry for Foreign Affairs, DHF, its Board and Secretariat.

The DHF will form a steering group, where the primary intended users can choose to be represented, and whose role it is to evaluate tenders, approve the inception report and the evaluation reports during the evaluation process. The steering group will participate in the start-up meeting of the evaluation as well as in the debriefing workshops.

6. Evaluation quality

The evaluation shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation.⁵ The evaluators shall use the OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation as revised in 2019.⁶ The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

7. Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a timeline and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out between April and 31 July 2020. The timing of any surveys, interviews and office visits needs to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Deadlines for final inception report and final report **must** be kept in the tender, but alternative deadlines for other deliverables may be suggested by the evaluator and negotiated during the inception phase.

⁵ DAC Quality Standards for development Evaluation, OECD, 2010

⁶ OECD/DAC 2019: "Better Criteria for Better Evaluation. Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use" <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meeting [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE PARTICIPANTS] MFA	[STATE DATE] [Allow a minimum of 5 weeks from start of call-off process to start of the assignment. This period should include 2 weeks for submission of the tender, and the time needed for evaluation of tenders at the Foundation.
2. Draft inception report		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow a minimum of 3 weeks from start-up of evaluation. It is highly recommended to allow more than 3 weeks for the inception phase]
3. Inception meeting [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE PARTICIPANTS] MFA	Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]
4. Comments from intended users to evaluators		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for commenting]
5. Final inception report		[STATE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for revisions]
6. Debriefing workshops	[STATE PARTICIPANTS] MFA	[STATE TENTATIVE DATES]
7. Draft evaluation report(s)		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]
8. Comments from intended users to evaluators		Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for commenting and plan for quality assurance of revised versions]
9. Final evaluation report(s)		[STATE DATE] [Allow at least 2 weeks for revisions]
10. Seminar [STATE LOCATION/VIRTUAL]	[STATE TARGET GROUPS] MFA	Tentative [STATE TENTATIVE DATE]

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by the Foundation before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. A specific timeline and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented. The timeline shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proofread. The executive summary shall be maximum three pages. The evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and lessons learned shall flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, and directed to relevant stakeholders. The report should be no more than 35 pages, excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report).

The evaluator shall adhere to the Foundation's terminology as identified in the Working Procedures of the Foundation and OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation.⁷

8. Evaluation Team Qualification

The evaluation team shall include a Team Leader and team assistant. The tender needs to demonstrate that the team has the following competencies:

- Evaluation skills and organizational assessment experience
- Demonstrated extensive experience from evaluation of Foundations and/or similar institutions and organisations with international reach.
- Team Leader with previous experience in the role as Team Leader
- Demonstrated knowledge of the UN system
- Excellent written and oral English and Swedish skills.

A CV shall be included in the tender for each team member and contain full description of the evaluators' qualifications and professional work experience.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

9. Resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is SEK 350.000, of which 80 percent is allocated for fees and 20 percent for reimbursables, including travel costs.

The contact person at the Foundation is Per Nordlund. The contact person will provide relevant documentation, contact detail to intended users for the evaluation and should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics, such as booking interviews, debriefs, seminars and visits, including any necessary travel and security arrangements.

⁷ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, OECD/DAC, 2014.
https://www.sida.se/contentassets/e90423c8aec74fecha0105ab6b63b976/glossary-of-key-terms-in-evaluation-and-results-based-management_3709.pdf