

LibMAS 14.10

Second Edition: January 2017

EVALUATION OF MINE ACTION PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

Responsible National entity:

Libyan Mine Action Centre (LibMAC)
mandated by the Ministry of Defence (MOD)

Contact: LibMAC Deputy Director

quality.assurance@lmac.gov.ly



NOTE:

This document is current at the date shown on this page. The Libyan Mine Action Standards (LibMAS) are subject to regular revision, so users should ensure that they are using the latest version of each document in the standards. The most recent versions of LibMAS are the versions that are posted on the LibMAS pages of the LibMAC website www.lmac.gov.ly

Copyright notice

This document has been written with reference to the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS).

In its current form, this document is © **LibMAC Libya 2017** – All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Definitions.....	5
3. Evaluation in General.....	6
4. Purpose of Evaluation in General.....	6
5. Evaluation Criteria in General.....	7
6. Types of Evaluation.....	8
7. Evaluation - General Principles.....	10
8. Monitoring and Audit in General.....	10
9. Evaluation – General Planning Considerations.....	11
10. Implementing Evaluations.....	12
11. Evaluation Reports.....	13
12. Dissemination of Evaluation Reports.....	14
13. Follow-up on Evaluation Recommendations.....	15
14. Rights and Obligations.....	15
15. Responsibilities.....	16
15.1 Libyan Mine Action Centre (LibMAC).....	16
15.2 Evaluation Staff.....	16
15.3 Mine Action Organisations.....	17
15.4 Donors.....	18
16. General References.....	19
17. Record of Amendments.....	19

Foreword

Critical safety, control and quality elements of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) have been retained in the Libyan Mine Action Standards (LIBMAS), so ensuring that they maintain the principles agreed in IMAS guidelines.

The work of preparing, reviewing and revising LIBMAS is conducted by a technical committee with the support of international, governmental and non-governmental organisations in Libya. The latest version of each standard can be found at the LibMAC website.

In all LIBMAS the words “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” are used in the following way. “Must” or “shall” is used to indicate a requirement, something that must be done in order to conform to the LibMAS. “Should” is used to indicate the preferred requirements, methods or specifications, but these may be varied when reasons for doing so are given. “May” is used to indicate a possible method or course of action that should be considered but need not be applied.

In this LibMAS:

- The term “Demining Organisation” refers to any organisation (government, NGO or commercial entity) responsible for implementing demining projects or tasks. Demining Organisations include headquarters and support elements.
- The term “Mine Action Organisation” refers to any organisation (government, military, commercial or NGO/civil society) responsible for implementing mine action projects or tasks. The mine action organisation may be a prime contractor, subcontractor, consultant or agent.

For the purpose of this standard, the words “Demining Organisation” and “Mine Action Organisation” are interchangeable and used to describe the same body.

1. Introduction

- a. The scope of evaluation is vast. Evaluations may be carried out on a mine action policy, programme or project within a mine action programme. Evaluations may be carried out on specific aspects of mine action (e.g. demining or mine/ERW risk education). In addition, evaluations may just look at the design, planning and implementation of a project or programme; or may examine all these aspects, including the post implementation impact and sustainability of the intervention.
- b. In general, evaluation of mine action programmes and projects should be conducted by the relevant stakeholders, such as donors, national mine action authorities (NMAAs), the United Nations, and Mine Action Organisations.
- c. This standard provides guidance on for the evaluation of mine action programmes and projects, is written in accordance with IMAS 14.10 Guide for the Evaluation of Mine Action Interventions, however the standard focuses on the evaluation by the LibMAC of Mine Action Organisations involved in mine action programmes and projects in Libya.
- d. This standard details different categories of evaluations however shall focus on Performance Assessments Evaluations (PAEs) and Outcome Evaluations which may be conducted by the LibMAC on mine action programmes and projects in Libya. IMAS 14.10 Guide for the Evaluation of Mine Action Interventions, should be referred to details on other types of evaluations
- e. Evaluation in an integral part of the Quality Management (QM) which involves Accreditation, quality assurance monitoring and post-demining inspection (quality control). For additional details of QM, refer to LibMAS 07.40 Quality Management.
- f. The LibMAC may conduct specific evaluations of mine action programmes and projects, and the information gained through QM activities may be used in conjunction with these evaluations.
- g. In general, Mine Action Organisations should be informed in advance of any evaluations conducted by the LibMAC, and at the very least shall be informed of the evaluation results, and given an opportunity to respond.
- h. The LibMAC may appoint a third party organisation to conduct evaluations of mine action programmes and projects, and in such cases the relevant Mine Action Organisations shall be informed in advance.
- i. The LibMAC may conduct evaluations of mine action programmes and projects for the following reasons:
 - To confirm that mine action will achieve the expected outcomes.
 - To confirm that mine action has achieved the expected outcomes.
- j. Some advantages of the evaluations are:
 - Identify shortcomings and provide solutions to ensure that mine action achieves the expected outcomes;
 - Confirm why mine action did not achieve expected outcomes and provide solutions to ensure it does.
 - Apportion responsibility for achievements and shortcomings.

Any specific evaluations which not regular QM

2. Definitions

- a. The following definitions are commonly used for evaluations of mine action programmes and projects:

2.1 Programme

A group of projects or activities which are managed in a co-ordinated way to deliver benefits that would not be possible or as cost effective were the projects and/or contracts managed independently.

2.2 Project

An endeavour in which human, material and financial resources are organised to undertake a unique scope of work, of given specification, within constraints of cost and time, so as to achieve beneficial change defined by quantitative and qualitative objectives.

2.3 Project management

The process by which a project is brought to a conclusion.

2.4 Outputs

In relation to evaluation this refers to the products, capital goods and services that result from a mine action intervention. Outputs may also include changes resulting from the intervention that are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (such as the development of local capacities).

2.5 Outcome

In relation to evaluation this refers to the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Outcomes are related to the 'effectiveness' of an intervention.

2.6 Impact

In relation to evaluation this refers to the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. The term 'final outcome' may be substituted.

2.7 Triangulation

In relation to evaluation refers to the use of multiple theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. The sources of information may not necessarily be people but include documents, maps, photographs, satellite imagery etc.

2.8 Intervention

In relation to evaluation this refers to an activity, project, programme, or policy.

3. Evaluation in General

- a. Evaluation refers to the process of determining the 'worth or significance' of an activity, policy, project, or programme. 'Worth or significance' for mine action evaluation is assessed primarily in terms of changes in the wellbeing of people (men, women and children) in mine-affected communities, areas, and countries, as well as enhancements in local capacities to manage their own development and progress in meeting the international obligations of countries in eliminating landmines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW).
- b. The activities and direct outputs of mine action, (for example, areas cleared, people receiving mine and ERW risk education - MRE, victims assisted, etc.) are also considered in evaluations, but mainly as means to promote the desired end (enhanced wellbeing of the target beneficiaries; the development of local capacities; and progress toward international obligations) – they do not themselves constitute the worth of a mine action project or programme.
- c. There are a number of common definitions for evaluation, however one that accurately describes the evaluation process is shown below.
- d. An evaluation is "an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors."¹
- e. Evaluation emphasises:
 - The need for a systematic and objective approach to evaluation;
 - The possibility of evaluating a project or programme during implementation (formative evaluation) or on completion (summative evaluation);
 - The need to look at all stages of a project cycle from design, to implementation, to final results in order to capture a complete set of lessons that can guide further programme implementation and enhance future planning; and
 - That evaluation results should be disseminated as widely as possible, including to donors, NMAAs, and beneficiaries of an intervention.
- f. Evaluation is more than just the systematic gathering and processing of data. Evaluation requires the identification of critical issues, the determination of the background and motivation for decisions, an analysis of causes and effects and, in some cases, the forecasting of likely future outcomes.

4. Purpose of Evaluation in General

- a. The principal purposes served by evaluations are:
 - Performance improvement in terms of the outcomes or enhanced wellbeing and capacities of local people and organisations resulting from the mine action project or programme, and

- To enhance accountability to stakeholders (donors, NMAAs, target beneficiaries, etc.).
- b. Evaluation should endeavour to benefit multiple stakeholders, including men, women and children affected by mine action, donor agencies sponsoring mine action, the government and its supporting organs such as the NMAA and MAC, and the implementing agency and its partners.

5. Evaluation Criteria in General

5.1 Criteria

- a. Evaluations examine the achievement of objectives (short, mid-, and long-term) and factors such as relevance and sustainability. For mine action evaluations, the following criteria may be employed:
- Relevance. The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, global priorities, and donor policies;
 - Efficiency. A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results (outputs and outcomes);
 - Effectiveness. The extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance;
 - Impact. The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. The term 'final outcome' may be substituted;
 - Sustainability. The continuation of benefits from a mine action intervention after major assistance has been completed; and
 - Safety and quality. This relates principally to demining activities and covers whether the work was carried out safely and achieved the required standards of quality for the activity (i.e. technical survey, clearance, marking, etc.).
- b. Of the criteria above, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and safety/quality are the easiest to examine. The determination of the long-term impact and sustainability of a project or programme is difficult to assess unless the evaluation is carried out at some time after the intervention has been completed.
- c. Other common criteria that may be included for a mine action evaluation include:
- Value-for-money (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness).
 - Cost-effectiveness (used for comparing alternative means for achieving comparable objectives).
 - Cost-benefit (used for comparing alternative means for achieving alternative objectives, whether comparable or not).

- Client satisfaction for both men and women.
- Beneficiary satisfaction.
- Replicability (whether a project or programme can be replicated in a different environment).
- Scalability (whether a project or programme can be increased in size or 'scaled-up').

6. Types of Evaluation

6.1 General

- a. Evaluations may be commissioned to examine only certain aspects of mine action interventions, or they may encompass the complete range of a project cycle and results, including the impact.
- b. The scope and scale of any evaluation is dependant on the specific requirements of the commissioning body and the timing of the evaluation.
- c. For example, an evaluation carried out while a project or programme is ongoing would not be able to examine in any detail the achievement of long-term objectives.
- d. Generally, evaluations may be broken down into four categories:

- **Performance assessments**
- **Outcome evaluations**
- **Impact evaluations**
- **Formative evaluations**

6.2 Performance Assessments Evaluations (PAEVs)

- a. Performance Assessments Evaluations (PAEs) assess the implementation of an intervention and the degree to which the 'outputs' (deliverables) have been achieved.
- b. PAEs use criteria such as efficiency and economy and the essential requirements for mine action interventions of safety and quality.
- c. PAEs only examine a project or programme up to the stage where the outputs (cleared land, MRE etc.) reach the target beneficiaries, unless the implementing agency has been set the objective to ensure proper utilisation of outputs by the intended beneficiaries.

- d. PAEs deal with tangible criteria, for example:
- Efficiency. Did the implementer use the right mix of and minimum required inputs to achieve the required outputs?
 - Effectiveness. Did the outputs reach all the required beneficiaries?
 - Economy. Did the implementer use the lowest costs in the provision of inputs (taking into account quality)?
 - Safety. Were the activities that contributed to the inputs carried out safely?
 - Quality. Were the outputs of the required quality or better?
- e. In general PAEs by the LibMAC shall focus on the activities of Mine Action Organisations, for example:
- Training – of personnel and MDD.
 - Test and Evaluation (T&E) – of equipment and machines.
 - Operations – management and conduct.
 - Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC).
 - Reporting and recording – of training, T&E, operations, QA and QC.

6.3 Outcome evaluation

- a. Outcome evaluations may assess all aspects of an intervention including whether it was well conceived and designed, and resulted in positive outcomes to the beneficiaries. Outcome evaluations may also examine sustainability.
- b. The outputs for socio-economic benefit (outcomes – for example the use of cleared land for growing crops or the safer behaviours resulting from MRE) or are using new capacities for improved performance.
- c. Note: The output may vary between beneficiaries based on gender. For example, men and women may not have the same access and use of the land once it is cleared. A gender needs analysis should be conducted to ensure that outputs are benefiting men, women and children.
- d. In general Outcome Evaluations by the LibMAC shall focus on land released by Mine Action Organisations, for example:
- Land use.
 - Mines and ERW – in released land.
 - Accidents – in released land.

7. Evaluation - General Principles

- a. The scope and scale of evaluations will vary across mine action interventions, however certain general principles apply:
- b. Evaluations should only be conducted when there is an identified need for an independent and impartial assessment of a mine action project or programme;
- c. Evaluation planning should be incorporated into the original design of an intervention. so baseline information and progress indicators are collected, providing vital evidence for evaluators;
- d. Evaluation should be useful. Fundamentally, evaluation is intended to improve the planning and delivery of an intervention; it contributes to decision making and strategy formulation;
- e. Where possible, evaluation should be a collaborative undertaking with participation from all stakeholders; and
- f. Evaluation results should be disseminated to all stakeholders including the beneficiaries of a mine action interventions. (**Note:** In some cases, the evaluation report cannot be distributed to all stakeholders because it contains confidential or commercially-sensitive information. Efforts should still be made to communicate the relevant results of the evaluation to all stakeholders).

8. Monitoring and Audit in General

8.1 Monitoring

- a. Monitoring supports evaluation by providing quantitative and qualitative data on implementation and the achievement of results.
- b. Monitoring data is of primary use to project/programme managers, but should also be compiled and maintained so that it can be used by evaluators. In addition to determining compliance with a plan or procedures, monitoring may also assess:
 - Progress in implementing objectives or achieving results.
 - Compliance with standards of quality and safety.
 - Change in the environment in which the intervention is being implemented. This information will assist evaluation by indicating some of the external factors affecting an intervention.
 - Change in the wellbeing of the beneficiaries of a project or programme, which will assist evaluation in determining effectiveness and potential impact.

- c. Monitoring and evaluation should be considered together in the design and planning of an intervention.

8.2 Audit

- a. Audits and evaluations are complementary functions and there is some overlap between them. An audit is an assessment of the adequacy of management controls to ensure the economical and efficient use of resources; the safeguarding of assets; the reliability of financial and other information; the compliance with regulations, rules and established policies; the effectiveness of risk management; and the adequacy of organisational structures, systems and processes.
- b. An audit is an activity designed to assure stakeholders that operations comply with applicable statutes, regulations, standards, and norms (a compliance audit) or that agreed performance targets are being met in an economical and efficient way (performance audit).
- c. Audits focus on operations and management controls, and assess these against more-or-less explicit norms or standards (such as LibMAS and IMAS), whereas the scope of evaluations is broader, embracing more strategic issues, with judgements made on the basis of broad principles and criteria, and with different approaches that might be used to assess the worth of a project or programme from different perspectives.
- d. The principal purposes served by audits are:
 - To ensure compliance with established norms or standards (such as IMAS and Mine Action Organisation's SOPs).
 - To enhance accountability to those paying for mine action (mine action donors, financiers or prime contractors of infrastructure works, etc.).
 - Performance improvement in terms of operations – the resource inputs and activities of a mine action project/programme and the direct outputs of mine action goods and services – in brief, 'doing the job right'.

9. Evaluation – General Planning Considerations

- a. There are a number of factors that should be considered when planning evaluations, for example:

9.1 Identified Need

Specific evaluations should only be planned when there is an identified need for an independent and impartial assessment of a mine action project or programme (or a part thereof) and there is an intent to use the evaluation findings to improve performance and accountability.

9.2 Timeliness

Evaluation results are often used for critical decisions in project or programme cycles therefore evaluations should be planned sufficiently in advance to ensure there is time to conduct, report and disseminate the results. This ensures that recommendations and lessons are available before critical decisions are made.

9.3 Harmonisation

Evaluations may place significant demands on the staff of Mine Action Organisations and other stakeholders. Where feasible, the LibMAC should attempt to harmonise their evaluation plans with the Mine Action Organisation.

In certain situations, the LibMAC may decide that it is of mutual benefit to include evaluators from the Mine Action Organisation assessed.

9.4 Scope of Evaluation

The scope of an evaluation and the issues to be evaluated should be carefully considered to ensure that the most critical issues are addressed. Evaluations should generate 'need to know', rather than 'nice to know' information.

10. Implementing Evaluations

10.1 Engaging and Working with Evaluators

Evaluations should be conducted by qualified personnel with sufficient knowledge of the evaluation process and activities to be evaluated.

LibMAC evaluators must conduct their responsibilities in an objective manner.

LibMAC evaluators should prepare an evaluation work plan to be presented to the LibMAC Chief of Operations (or other relevant senior staff), which should include the objectives, responsibilities, and expected timeframe for the evaluation.

10.2 Preparation of an Evaluation Work Plan

The preparation of an evaluation work plan may involve conducting initial interviews, file and documentary research, and preliminary analysis.

The work plan generally requires a substantial investment in time, however a thoroughly prepared work plan can provide sufficient information to allow much of the analysis work to occur even before any field visit takes place.

Although work plans can be drafted in many ways, with emphasis on aspects particular to the type of evaluation being conducted, the following basic elements may be included (in addition to those detailed in 10.1 above):

- a. An overview of the design and scope of the project.
- b. Analytical commentary on the historic, local, regional and national context.
- c. Identification of the users of evaluation information and the implications for evaluation emphasis.
- d. Analysis of the evaluation objectives and the key issues to be examined.
- e. Analytical commentary on methodology and sources of information.
- f. Identification of participants in the evaluation, together with a definition of roles.
- g. Details on work scheduling.
- h. Details on reporting.

10.3 Conducting Evaluations

Evaluations should be conducted in a professional and ethical manner, giving appropriate opportunities for the participation of all relevant stakeholders and respecting the confidentiality, and dignity of those providing information.

Evaluation procedures should be realistic, diplomatic, gender- and culturally-sensitive, and reflect both cost-consciousness and respect for the time of those asked to provide information.

Evaluation findings should be well documented and based on transparent methods that provide valid and reliable sex and age disaggregated data. Key findings should be substantiated through triangulation whenever possible.

Evaluators should ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process. They also have a responsibility to ensure that evaluations are independent, impartial, and accurate.

Evaluators should provide maximum notice, minimise demands on time, and respect an individuals' right to privacy.

Normally evaluators should avoid evaluating individuals except when it is essential in order to understand the background to the success or otherwise of the project.

During and/or after the evaluation is completed, the LibMAC should conduct a debriefing to the relevant Mine Action Organisation which should include:

- a. The objectives of the evaluation.
- b. The specific issues addressed.
- c. The conduct of the evaluation (including any problems encountered and how these were addressed).
- d. A preliminary assessment of key findings plus a description of what further work remains to be done.
- e. An estimated date when a draft of the report, or relevant sections thereof, will be available to Mine Action Organisation for review.

11. Evaluation Reports

Evaluation reports should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis.

The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. A reader should be able to understand:

- a. The purpose of the evaluation.
- b. What was evaluated;
- c. How the evaluation was designed and conducted;
- d. What evidence was found;
- e. How the evidence was analysed;
- f. What conclusions were drawn;
- g. What recommendations were made; and
- h. What lessons were learned.

The evaluation report should contain an executive summary providing:

- a. A brief description of the subject being evaluated;
- b. The context, present situation, and description of the subject *vis-à-vis* other related matters;
- c. The purpose of the evaluation;
- d. The objectives of the evaluation;
- e. The intended audience of the report;
- f. Methodology, data sources used, data collection and analysis methods used, and major limitations;
- g. The most important findings and conclusions; and
- h. Main recommendations.

12. Dissemination of Evaluation Reports

Evaluation reports should be disseminated in whole, part, or as a summary, to Mine Action Organisation evaluated, and possibly to other interested parties such as donors and recipients of released land.

Commercially sensitive information and confidential matters should be kept separated to allow the widest possible distribution of the main report. If evaluators identify credible evidence of fraud, misconduct, abuse of power, or human rights violations, they should refer the matter in confidence to the LibMAC Director (or other senior staff).

13. Follow-up on Evaluation Recommendations

Mine Action Organisation project or programme managers should respond to the recommendations resulting from an evaluation. This may take the form of a management response, action plan and/or agreement clearly stating responsibilities and accountabilities.

Follow-up on the implementation of evaluation recommendations that have been accepted by management should then be systematically carried out. Periodic reporting on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should also be conducted and presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organisation.

14. Rights and Obligations

14.1 General

Mine Action Organisations undergoing evaluation shall cooperate with the LibMAC evaluators.

LibMAC evaluators should provide the Mine Action Organisation with sufficient notice of the evaluation, details of the subjects to be evaluated and a tentative schedule for the evaluation.

Mine Action Organisations undergoing evaluation have the right to expect that the evaluation staff gives due regard to time demands on management and staff, and that the evaluation should cause as least disruption to the Mine Action Organisations work as possible.

14.2 Opportunities

In general, evaluations provide an excellent opportunity to recognise the successes achieved, making it easier to obtain continued or enhanced support from donors and the national government.

Evaluations also provide an excellent opportunity for the evaluation subject(s) to explain their views to impartial evaluators on how well a project, programme, or policy was designed, what unforeseen events have occurred that create implementation problems or opportunities, and the changes they recommend for performance improvements.

Evaluation subjects can make the most of these opportunities by:

- a. Putting in place a sound system for monitoring progress toward the planned objectives (outputs, outcomes, and impact);
- b. Documenting problems encountered during implementation and the steps taken to resolve these;
- c. Providing constructive criticism on the draft terms of reference for the evaluation to ensure the most critical issues from their perspective are included;
- d. Being well prepared for the evaluation mission itself; and
- e. Providing constructive criticism on the draft evaluation report.

15. Responsibilities

15.1 Libyan Mine Action Centre (LibMAC)

The LibMAC or the organisation acting on its behalf should:

- a. Encourage the evaluation of mine action programmes and projects and ensure that Mine Action Organisations have made provisions for project evaluations;
- b. Ensure that where possible evaluations benefit multiple stakeholders, including communities affected by mine action, donor agencies sponsoring mine action, and the government.
- c. Evaluate its own activities as part of the national mine action plan;
- d. Facilitate the exchange of pertinent information by distributing complete, part, or summaries of evaluation reports and lessons learned to other Mine Action Organisations and relevant stakeholders, such as the national government and donors, ensuring no breach of confidentiality occurs. It may compile results and disseminate these as 'lessons learned'; and
- e. Ensure that action is taken on the findings of evaluations.

15.2 Evaluation Staff

In general, while the responsibility of the evaluation staff may vary depending on the type and objectives of the mine action evaluation, as general guidelines, the following outlines major tasks that evaluation staff may undertake during evaluations (in addition to other detailed in this standard):

- a. Review and consolidate information from all reviews, evaluations and studies of a similar nature that have been undertaken in the past;
- b. Identify and consult with a wide range of stakeholders, including government, donors, mine action operators and civil society involved in peace building and development;

- c. Analyse the government commitments made in the field of mine action (ratification of treaties, status of implementation) and any changes that should occur if the country increases its national commitments;
- d. Collect information from direct male and female beneficiaries;
- e. Analyse the current structure of the programme or project to be evaluated, at the policy and operational levels, including commercial and humanitarian operators, governance and coordination mechanisms and quality management;
- f. Review the nature and extent of technical and managerial capacity;
- g. Discuss donor priorities and objectives;
- h. Review the past and current deployment of resources for the programme or project, including prioritisation, accountability and transparency;
- i. Review the current development context and make an analysis of the future;
- j. Make recommendations for the future, taking into account the lessons learnt and the current trends in resource availability;
- k) Integrate stakeholder comments into the evaluation; and
- l) Present and disseminate final evaluation report.

15.3 Mine Action Organisations

The Mine Action Organisations implementing Mine Action Projects and Programmes shall;

- a. Evaluate their own progress against the objectives and should evaluate the outcomes and, where feasible, the impact of their intervention in a gender inclusive manner for men and women. They should adequately plan for evaluations and make available the necessary resources required;
- b. Ensure that relevant stakeholders are involved in the evaluation process. In particular they should ensure community participation and encourage the use of the evaluation as an educational process for building the capacity of community members and the staff of the Mine Action Organisations;
- c. Ensure that evaluators (including external consultants) are properly briefed and supported and behave in a professional and impartial way, in accordance with evaluation guidelines and requirements detailed in LibMAS and IMAS;
- d. Ensure that agreed recommendations of the evaluation are applied. Evaluation should be linked back to the needs assessment and project planning stages to ensure appropriate follow-up action is taken; and
- e. Should ensure that results of the evaluation are disseminated: that reports are transparent and made available (with the agreement of the stakeholders, where necessary); and that general lessons learned from the evaluations are shared through the NMAA or other mine action coordination mechanisms.

15.4 Donors

Donor organizations where relevant, should ensure that projects have an evaluation component and the necessary resources to undertake them. They should also evaluate projects they have funded and should take into account evaluation findings and recommendations for future funding of mine action programmes.

16. General References

- a. International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), in particular, 14.10, Guide for the Evaluation of Mine Action Interventions.
- b. LibMAS 07.40 Quality Management.

17. Record of Amendments

Ser.	Date: D/M/Y	Standard	Section / Paragraph	Amended by: Name / Position / Org.	Comments
1	08/12/15	14.10 Evaluation of Mine Action Programmes and Projects	All	Doug Ware, Chief of Ops/QA, UNMAS	New Standard.