EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR IOM DEVELOPMENT FUND PROJECTS

Background

1. Since 2017, the IOM Development Fund (The Fund) requires all projects to include an evaluation, preferably an ex-post evaluation[1] conducted 12 months after the project is completed. The specific **objective of the evaluations** is **to assess** the **relevance** of project design, **coherence** of the interventions vis-à-vis other interventions, the **effectiveness** and performance of the project, the **efficiency** of project management and implementation, the **impact** and **sustainability** of the project.

2. Evaluations promote transparency and accountability, which will assist the IOM Development Fund in its decision-making on the use of the Fund as seed funding, on project management and to fine-tune interpretation and categorization of the funding criteria and overall regional disbursement strategies.

3. Whether internal or external, it is important to ensure the **independence** and **impartiality**[2] of the ex-post evaluation. The IOM in coordination with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), has agreed to use common norms, standards and ethical guidelines in carrying out evaluations.
   The common principles to be followed by evaluators include, among other things, utility, feasibility, accuracy, transparency, independence, consultation, credibility, impartiality and sustainability. These principles should be applied in full respect of human rights, data protection and confidentiality, gender considerations, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, language, disability, and other considerations when designing and implementing the evaluation.

   To avoid conflicts of interest, particular care should be taken to ensure that independence and impartiality are maintained. Conflicts of interest are typically identified by a lack of independence or a lack of impartiality. These conflicts occur when a primary interest, such as the objectivity of an evaluation, could be influenced by a secondary interest, such as personal considerations or financial gains. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent and must not have been directly responsible for the policy setting, design or overall management of the project evaluated. For example, evaluators should not evaluate projects which they have reviewed/worked on or had responsibility in the recent past, or in which they have been financially involved. Should you have any questions or concerns on the evaluator's ability to be fully independent and impartial, please contact the Fund. For more details, please refer to the *IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines*, **Chapter 2**, pages 25-26.

---

[1] The **ex-post evaluation** is implemented some months after the end of an intervention to assess the immediate and medium-term outcomes and sustainability of results. It includes the extent to which the intervention has contributed to direct or indirect changes; however, it is not as robust as an impact evaluation (IOM M&E Guidelines, 2021).
2 UNEG: Independence means that the evaluator should be able to work freely and without outside interference, while impartiality means that the evaluator should not be biased with respect to what is being evaluated.

Planning for evaluation & Roles and Responsibilities[3]

4. During project development, the Project Developer needs to include in the operational part of the budget the cost of this evaluation of at least five per cent (5%) of the total budget. The allocated budget is strictly for project evaluation use and should remain unspent until the project has been completed or until the project evaluation is to be conducted.

5. RO Monitoring and Evaluation Officers (RO M&E Officers) can contribute by conducting some of these evaluations (unless they have been involved in the project development phase of the specific projects) so that only flight and DSA costs need to be budgeted. However, this has to be coordinated at the project development stage in order for RO M&E Officers to include the tasks in their evaluation plans. Otherwise, the mission will have to rely on other IOM staff or on external consultants. The Evaluation Unit (EVA) under the Department of Strategic Planning and Organizational Performance (DPP) , as well as the RO M&E Officers can provide support to identify internal options or to support the contracting an external evaluator. Depending on the option chosen, evaluation estimated costs should be within five per cent (5%) of the total budget.

6. During the final stage of project implementation and in particular if the Project Manager is no longer available after project end to supervise an ex-post evaluation, the conduct of the project evaluation is coordinated by the IOM managing Mission with the IOM Development Fund.

7. For more information on roles in evaluation (commissioner, evaluator, etc.) and evaluation stages, please refer to the *IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines*, **Chapters 5.1.1 and 5.1.2**.

8. For ex-post project evaluations, the budget for the evaluation will be transferred to the IOM Development Fund evaluation code as the main project code will be closed during Regional Accounting Support (RAS) endorsement of the final financial report.

9. A WBS code from the IOM Development Fund evaluation code will be provided to the IOM Mission upon confirmation of the evaluation period. Only costs related to the ex-post project evaluation should be charged to the relevant WBS code provided and this will be closed once the evaluation is completed. In some instances, if needed and if budget allows, an interpreter can also be budgeted after coordination with the Fund Unit.

10. The IOM Development Fund will request confirmation that the evaluation is on-going.

11. Any remaining balance on the evaluation budget will remain with the IOM Development Fund and be carried forward for future IOM Development Fund regional and thematic project evaluation initiatives.

---

[3] Ref: IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines, Chapter 5, available: https://evaluation.iom.int/technical-reference

12. **Terms of Reference (ToRs)** need to be developed by the relevant Mission and shared beforehand for review with the IOM Development Fund and the RO M&E Officers, as well as with other relevant stakeholders, in particular other Missions involved in the implementation of the project.

The ToRs should include

- a brief project background,
- define a clear objective for the evaluation, explaining why the evaluation is undertaken and what the evaluation intends to accomplish,
- the scope of the evaluation or plan for conducting the evaluation,
- the issues to be addressed through the listing of the evaluation criteria that will be used, as well as related questions,
- the products expected from the evaluation, which may include in addition to the report itself particular strategies or recommendations on some specific areas,
- the methodology used,
- the party responsible for conducting the evaluation
- and finally the implementation arrangement, including a realistic timeframe and logistical arrangements.
- cross-cutting issues like gender related analysis and questions also need to be included in the ToRs and be properly covered by the evaluation.

Note:

- A **TOR template** can be found here: ***Annex 5.4 IOM Evaluation Terms of Reference template*** of the ***IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines*** as well as other **technical references** (link: ***https://evaluation.iom.int/technical-reference***)

13. The following six **OECD/DAC evaluation criteria**[4] should be included in the ToRs:

a.   **Relevance** of the project - the extent to which the project/programme's objectives and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified (it can include an analysis of the validity of design).

b.   **Effectiveness** of the project considers the extent to which a project or programme achieves its objectives/intended results, taking into account their relative importance. It is equally important to examine if changes would have occurred regardless, without the implementation of the project or programme. Effectiveness is also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity. Cost-effectiveness examines whether the objectives were achieved at minimal cost (or at the lowest possible cost), or whether the results or benefits justify the cost.

c.   **Efficiency** of project management and implementation - analyses how well resources in general (funds, expertise, time, etc.), or inputs, are used to undertake activities, and are converted into outputs. Sometimes, the definition also takes into account the analysis of alternatives for the use of resources.

---

[4] Evaluation criteria based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) guidelines :

d.   **Coherence** of the interventions vis-à-vis other interventions - The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. Includes internal coherence and external coherence: Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

e.   **Impact** - how activities of the project/programme contributed to a change in a situation, intended or unintended, directly or indirectly, positive or negative, and what the project/programme was expected to bring. This criterion is raising major debates, especially due to the methodological constraints imposed by its measurement. What is important to remember when discussing the impact is first to properly define what is intended by 'impact', or which impact, in the framework of the evaluation and then examine how it can be observed, measured and described. Due to the complexity of measuring it rigorously, the 'judgment of the wise' based on qualitative and quantitative elements available and observation can sometimes be used as a solution for discussing globally the impact.

f.   **Sustainability** of the project to date - is the durability of the project's results, or the continuation of the project's benefits once external support ceases. The notion of 'seed money' as an IOM Development Fund criteria should be examined here.

14. To assist in the preparation of the evaluation, please refer to :

- The most recent version of the ***IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines***
- Latest publications : ***https://evaluation.iom.int/technical-reference***
- Templates : ***IOM M&E Guidelines – Resources***
- Guidance for ***evaluation managers***

15. In addition, the IOM Development Fund requests the use of a **scoring matrix** to score each OECD/DAC evaluation criteria when reviewing the findings during the ex-post evaluation. Supporting evidence will have to be detailed for each rating given. Please see table below (**noting this is only applicable to the Fund projects**):

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
RELEVANCE *IS THE INTERVENTION DOING THE RIGHT THINGS?* The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.	● Level of alignment with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM/Fund priorities/criteria.	Project is not aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is only partially aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is mostly aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.	Project is well aligned with national priorities, strategies, policies, global commitments and IOM / Fund priorities / criteria.
	● Level of evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.	No evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.	Adequate evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design but with many limitations.	Good evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design but with some limitations.	Very good evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were involved in project design.	Excellent evidence that beneficiaries and stakeholders were significantly involved in project design.
	● Existence of needs assessment.	No needs assessment carried out.	Very limited or no needs assessment carried out.	Limited needs assessment carried out.	Needs assessment carried out.	Needs assessment carried out.
	● Level of integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	No integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Little or no integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Some integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Strong integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.	Very strong integration of human rights and gender equality within the project design and implementation.

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
VALIDITY OF PROJECT DESIGN	● The validity and logic of the project design as seen in the results matrix (RM).	Poor vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)	Adequate vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)	Good vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)	Very good vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)	Excellent vertical logic of the RM (assessing quality of results-formulation as well as linkages between objectives, outcomes and outputs)
		Poor horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)	Adequate horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)	Good horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)	Very good horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)	Excellent horizontal logic of the RM (inter alia indicator quality)
		Indicators do not match the respective result and therefore do not measure progress adequately against the respective result	Only some (or few) Indicatorsmatch the respective result and measure progress adequately against the respective result .	Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result with some limitations.	Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result with very few limitations.	Indicators match well the respective result and measure well progress adequately against the respective result
		Baselines and targets are inappropriate and unrealistic.	Most baselines and targets are inappropriate and unrealistic.	Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic, with some limitations.	Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic, with very few limitations.	Baselines and targets are appropriate and realistic.
		No assumptions are described.	No assumptions are described or very few.	Assumptions are described, but more could have been foreseen.	Assumptions are described.	Assumptions are described.
COHERENCE	● Extent of compatibility and coordination	Poor coherence with other IOM projects; relevant staff not	Adequate coherence with other IOM projects; relevant	Good coherence with other IOM projects; relevant staff aware	Very good coherence with other IOM projects as	Excellent coherence with other IOM projects as

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
HOW WELL DOES THE INTERVENTION FIT? The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.	with other interventions of the sector.	aware of other IOM projects within the country and at other IOM missions.	staff aware of other projects but little or no contact.	of each other's projects and are in contact.	demonstrated through coordination between projects.	demonstrated through working together, possible joint activities and sharing resources.
		Poor coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff not aware of them.	Adequate coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff being knowledgeable of some interventions but not all relevant.	Good coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through IOM staff being knowledgeable of them.	Very good coherence with relevant external interventions as demonstrated through contact between IOM and interventions' staff.	Excellent coherence with external relevant interventions as demonstrated through coordination meetings and possible joint activities.
EFFECTIVENESS **IS THE INTERVENTION ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?** The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across	• Extent to which the project objective and outcomes were achieved.	Poor or no evidence that the project activities were translated into short- & long-term results. Evidence of unintended negative results.	Some satisfactory evidence that the project produced positive effects. Evidence of unintended negative results.	Good evidence that the project produced good positive effects. Few negative unintended effects.	Strong evidence that the project produced very good positive effects. Few negative or no unintended effects identified.	Excellent evidence the project achieved more than set targets including unintended positive changes.
		Project objective and outcomes not achieved.	Project objective and outcomes partially or not achieved.	Project objective and outcomes partially achieved.	Project objective and outcomes partially or mainly achieved.	Project objective and outcomes mainly or fully achieved.
	• Effectiveness of collaboration and coordination with partners and	Collaboration and coordination with partners inadequate and evidence of negative impact on	Collaboration and coordination with partners inadequate.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective with some limitations.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective with very few limitations.	Collaboration and coordination with partners effective.

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
groups.	stakeholders.	results.				
	● Evidence of involvement of beneficiaries in project processes.	No involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.	Very limited Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.	Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes but with some limitations.	Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes but with very few limitations.	Involvement of beneficiaries in the project processes.
	● Resilience/agi-lity to manage and monitor risks, or unexpected internal/external factors	Risks/unexpected factors not managed/monitored adequately	Risks/unexpected factors partially managed/monitored	Risks/unexpected factors were managed/monitored	Most risks/unexpected factors were well managed/monitored	All risks/unexpected were very well managed/monitored
EFFICIENCY *HOW WELL ARE RESOURCES BEING USED?* The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.	● Economic use of resources (human, physical and financial).	Little evidence of efficiency; results disproportionate with resources invested. Under 60% use of budget.	Only some evidence of appropriate use of resources but some results could have been achieved with less budget or fewer resources. Less than 70% use of budget.	Evidence of good use of resources and noticeable efforts to choose cost-effective interventions and approaches. At least 70% use of budget.	Very good evidence that results proportionate with resources invested. At least 80% use of budget.	Excellent use of resources. Strong evidence that the project resources used are proportionate to the results generated. At least 90% use of budget.
	● Timeliness of interventions (ability to stick to project timeline).	One or more no-cost extensions.	One or more no-cost extensions.	One or no no-cost extension.	No no-cost extensions.	No no-cost extensions.
	● Respects reporting requirements	Project reports not submitted to PRIMA on time (with delays between 4 weeks and more).	Most project reports submitted to PRIMA late (with delays between 2 weeks and more).	Most project reports submitted to PRIMA on time (within 1-2 weeks delay).	All project reports submitted to PRIMA on time.	All project reports submitted to PRIMA on time.

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
IMPACT *WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE INTERVENTION MAKE?* The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.	● The significance of short- and long-term effects and changes of the project	No positive short- or long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified.	None or very few positive short-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; no indications of potential long-term results.	Positive short-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; some indications of potential long-term results.	Positive short- and long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified; impact looks significant but too early to be sure.	Positive short- and long-term incidences of effects/changes of the projects identified and estimated to have significant impact (e.g. policy in place, practices changed, etc.).
	● The significance of negative effects/changes.	Negative effects/changes of the project identified with potential negative impact (e.g. project delay policy process, reputation of IOM negatively affected by project, raised expectations of beneficiaries by project, etc.).	Negative effects/changes as a result of the project identified.	Insignificant or no negative effects/changes of the project identified.	Insignificant or no negative effects/changes of the project identified.	No negative effects/changes of the project identified.
SUSTAINABILITY *WILL THE BENEFITS LAST?* The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are	● Temporality/ permanence of outcomes achieved	No evidence of sustainability in the design, implementation, and results.	Little evidence of sustainability in the design, implementation, and results.	Good evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.	Strong evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.	Excellent evidence of sustainability in design, implementation, and results.
	● Extent to which processes and deliverables put in place by the	Processes and deliverables of the project not generating benefits.	Processes and deliverables of the project generating very few results.	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating a few	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating some	Processes and deliverables of the project are still generating

CRITERIA / OECD DEFINITION	DIMENSIONS MEASURED	1- Poor	2-Adequate	3 - Good	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
likely to continue.	project continue to deliver benefits beyond its lifecycle			results.	results.	considerable results.
	● Extent to integration of project in national/local structures	No evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.	Little evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.	Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures with some limitations.	Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures with very few limitations.	Evidence of integration of project processes/deliverables in national/local structures.
	● Existence of follow up projects/mechanisms and hand-over	No evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.	Little evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.	Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions but with limitations.	Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.	Evidence of an officially documented hand-over / follow-up plan or actions.
	● Evidence of resources within IOM and/or partners to continue to deliver project benefits	No consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.	Little consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.	Consideration of sources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.	Consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.	Consideration of resources within IOM and/or partners for the continuity of the project results.

16. Examples of questions related to the evaluation criteria can be found in *Chapter 5 Evaluation (pages 222-226)* of the *IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines.*

17. An **Evaluation Matrix** is required as part of the evaluation process. The Evaluation Matrix is a tool for guiding the evaluation by specifying: (a) the criteria being assessed by the evaluation; (b) the questions and sub-questions that will be answered in order to assess each criterion; (c) the indicators to be used to guide the assessment; (d) the sources of data; and (e) the data collection tools.

18. For standardization, the IOM Development Fund requires the use of following standard IOM evaluation templates:
    - *Template for a final evaluation report* (Annex 5.9 of the *IOM Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines* also attached to these guidelines)
    - *Evaluation Brief Template* (see *Chapter 5: Evaluation guidance*)
    - *Management Response Template* (see *Management Response and follow-up on IOM evaluation recommendations*)

19. A draft copy of the **Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief** and **Evaluation Management Response** needs to be submitted to the IOM Development Fund within two months of the evaluation start date. The final copy of the evaluation report, evaluation brief and evaluation management response need to be submitted to the IOM Development Fund and to OIG Evaluation Unit within two months of completion of the draft report.

20. The Evaluation Report will then be shared with the relevant IOM mission(s) and governments and will be published on the OIG webpage and evaluation repository.

EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT

"Title"

Project code	XX.NNNN
Project funded by	IOM Development Fund
Report commissioned by	IOM Development Fund and
Report date	Month YYYY
Internal / External evaluator	Surname, Name Evaluation Firm (if external)

---

[5] **Noting this is applicable to the Fund projects**

[IOM HEADER]

TITLE

[Midterm/Final/Other evaluation for title of "Intervention"]

The final report is usually the most important deliverable provided by the evaluator. The final report should provide a full description of the evaluation, how it was conducted, and its main findings and recommendations. Many evaluators have their own standard templates for final reports, and it is not necessary to demand that they follow this proposed template. However, it is important to ensure that their formats follow the same presentation logic and that the final report includes, at a minimum, the information described in this template.

1. Title page

The title page should include the title of the evaluation, date of completion (such as the date that the draft report is submitted), as well as the name of the evaluator(s) or evaluation firm(s).

2. Executive summary

An executive summary is a brief overview of the contents of the evaluation report. It should include an explanation of the project background, an overview of the evaluation background, a concise description of the evaluation methodology, a summary of all lessons learned and good practices, as well as a summary of all recommendations. Ideally, it should not be more than three to five pages long.

3. List of acronyms

This presents the acronyms list.

4. Context and purpose of the evaluation

4.1. Context/Project background

This section describes the context of the evaluation. Typically, it includes the following: (a) general description of IOM; (b) few paragraphs about the project that is to be evaluated (including the intervention logic and funding arrangements); (c); general description of the relevant contextual factors (political, environmental, social, economic and/or legal context) in which the project is being implemented; and (d) description of key project stakeholders.

4.2. Evaluation background, scope and purpose

In this section, the evaluator presents an explanation of the evaluation purpose (why the evaluation is being conducted, who commissioned it and why it is being conducted at this time).

The evaluation scope should be provided, describing what the evaluation covered, the time period, geographical scope and phase of projects (if relevant). Any specific exclusion in any of these areas should

be clearly stated.

A list of evaluation clients and the main intended audience for the report, as well as the use of the evaluation should be described here. Typically, the information in this section reflects some of the information in the evaluation ToR, perhaps in an expanded form.

4.3. Approach and methodology

This section highlights the evaluation approach and methodology used. The following information may be included here:

- Evaluation criteria that were considered in the evaluation and the questions that were being answered.

- Methodology used, including the data collection methods and sources, how the data was analysed and the sampling methods used (which also includes a description of the population, the sampling frame and the sampling size).

- Cross-cutting themes, including how they were considered throughout the evaluation.

- Stakeholder participation, describing who was consulted and how were they consulted.

- Limitations of the evaluation, outlining any challenges or limitations identified, to what extent were they mitigated and how.

- Description of evaluation norms and standards, providing information about the extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards.

5. Evaluation findings

In this section, the evaluator presents the findings of the evaluation. Typically, the findings are clustered into the evaluation criteria being applied. Findings must be complete, in that they address all proposed evaluation criteria and questions, and are aligned with the evaluation purpose, questions and approach outlined in the previous sections. Findings must also be robust, meaning that they are justified by the evidence, which is also to be presented in this section, and using relevant data disaggregated by key variables. Findings should further identify the causal factors that lead to both accomplishments and failures, including a description of unintended effects. Finally, findings should ensure that IOM cross-cutting themes are adequately addressed.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

Lessons learned and good practices may be included in this section as well. See below.

6.1. *Conclusions*

In this section, the evaluator presents any conclusions derived from the evaluation. Conclusions are to be based on the evidence presented in the Findings section of the evaluation and, to the extent possible objective and clearly justified.

6.2. Recommendations

In this section, the evaluator presents any recommendations derived from the evaluation. Recommendations are to be clear, concise, based on findings and/or conclusions of the report, relevant, actionable and identify the person responsible for the implementation.

6.3. Lessons learned and good practices

In this section, the evaluator should identify and provide lessons learned that surfaced through the evaluation. A lesson learned should include a description of the specific circumstances in which it emerged and an explanation of the link between the identified action or practice and its effect (negative or positive). It should also describe how it can be applied outside of its original circumstances, where and by whom. A lesson learned, which has identified a practice that, over time, produces satisfactory results and that is worthy of replicating and possibly scaling-up, may also be included as a good practice. Good practices should concisely capture the context from which they are derived, specify the target users and demonstrate a realistic link to the specific effects of the intervention.

7. Annexes

The following are standard annexes for evaluation reports.

- Evaluation terms of reference
- Inception report or evaluation matrix (if an inception report was not done)
- List of documents reviewed
- List of persons interviewed or consulted
- Data collection instruments