**EVALUATIONS BY GRANTEE PARTNERS**

**Terms of Reference - Suggested structure**

**Objective of this document**

This ToR template (and Guidance Notes) has been developed in order to support the work of EC grantees during preparation of Terms of Reference (thereinafter, ToR) for evaluations of the interventions[[1]](#footnote-2) they manage. Although it has been prepared for evaluations managed by grantees but contracted to external consultants, it can be easily adapted as to be used in case of internal evaluations (i.e. evaluations conducted by staff of the grantees).

Its use by EC grantees is strongly recommended but not compulsory.

**Types of evaluation and form of contract**

The template applies to mid-term, final and ex-post evaluations.

**Structure of this document**

This document contains both the ToR template and a set of Guidance Notes.

**The Guidance Boxes**

*Hint boxes*: Advice for drafting the ToR is included in ‘hint boxes’.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This is the example of a hint box.* |  |

*Adaptation boxes*: This template was prepared with adaptation in mind, as evaluations are all different; ‘adaptation boxes’ highlight the specific parts of the template requiring adaptation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This is the example of an adaptation box.* |  |

**Notation used in the Template**

*Standard text*: The Template contains standard text that can be used as it is, without any amendment.

*Additional text*: Text underlined in yellow and included within squared brackets can be adapted or replaced with specific references or text suited to your evaluation.

[This is an example of a text that can be replaced / adapted]

**Evaluation of multiple interventions**

This ToR template can be used for the evaluation either of single or of multiple interventions. In the case of evaluation of multiple interventions, some parts of the text shall be adapted.

**Before finalising your ToR, do not forget to delete this Introduction as well as the guidance boxes, and to complete / adapt the text highlighted in yellow.**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**[Title of the Evaluation – including type]**

**Contracting Authority: [specify the name of the organisation managing the evaluation, usually a grantee]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Before finalising your ToR do not forget to update this Table of Contents (Ctrl-A, F9, Update entire table).* |  |

[BACKGROUND 4](#_Toc13671446)

[1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background 4](#_Toc13671447)

[1.2 The intervention to be evaluated 4](#_Toc13671448)

[1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention 5](#_Toc13671449)

[1.4 Other available information 5](#_Toc13671450)

[1.5 Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 6](#_Toc13671451)

[DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT 6](#_Toc13671452)

[1.6 Objectives of the evaluation 7](#_Toc13671453)

[1.7 Evaluation criteria and issues to be addressed 8](#_Toc13671454)

[1.8 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs 9](#_Toc13671455)

[1.9 Management and Steering of the evaluation 12](#_Toc13671456)

[1.10 Language of the Specific contract 13](#_Toc13671457)

[EXPERTISE REQUIRED 13](#_Toc13671458)

[1.11 Number of evaluators and of working days per category 13](#_Toc13671459)

[1.12 Expertise required 14](#_Toc13671460)

[LOCATION AND DURATION 15](#_Toc13671461)

[1.13 Location(s) of assignment 15](#_Toc13671462)

[1.14 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar months 15](#_Toc13671463)

[1.15 Starting period and planning 15](#_Toc13671464)

[REPORTING 15](#_Toc13671465)

[1.16 Content, timing and submission 15](#_Toc13671466)

[1.17 Comments on the outputs 16](#_Toc13671467)

[1.18 Language 16](#_Toc13671468)

[1.19 Formatting of reports and number of report copies 16](#_Toc13671469)

[content of the offers 17](#_Toc13671470)

[1.20 Technical offer 17](#_Toc13671471)

[1.21 Financial offer 17](#_Toc13671472)

[budget of the present evaluation 17](#_Toc13671473)

[Deadline for the submission of questions 17](#_Toc13671474)

[Submission of the offers and their assessment 18](#_Toc13671475)

[1.22 Deadline for the submission of the offers 18](#_Toc13671476)

[1.23 Modalities for the submission of the offers 18](#_Toc13671477)

[1.24 Assessment of the offers 18](#_Toc13671478)

[invoicing and payments 18](#_Toc13671479)

[Annex I: criteria to assess the offers 19](#_Toc13671480)

[Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team 21](#_Toc13671481)

[Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary 22](#_Toc13671482)

[Annex IV: Planning schedule 24](#_Toc13671483)

[Annex V: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated intervention(s) 25](#_Toc13671484)

[Annex VI: financial offer template 26](#_Toc13671485)

# BACKGROUND

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The objective of this chapter is to provide a summarised,* ***descriptive overview of the intervention to be evaluated*** *(****not of the evaluation assignment****, which is to be described in the Chapter 2). It aims at providing the invited tenderers[[2]](#footnote-3) with key relevant information, helping them to contextualise the intervention.*  *The chapter* ***shall be factual and not contain judgement on the results and the performance*** *of the intervention in order not to influence the independent work of the evaluators.*  *No text is to be included between the Heading of the chapter 1 (Background) and the Heading of the chapter 1.1 (Relevant country / region / sector background), unless you wish to add a preamble.*  *The suggested headings (and their titles) are meant to provide guidance for the writing up of the chapter but* ***can be modified*** *as needed. It is, however, important that all the* ***elements suggested by the sub-headings are addressed****.* |  |
|  |

## Relevant country / region / sector background

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Feel free to modify the title to reflect your specific evaluation.*  *The objective of this chapter is to provide tenderers with:*   * *a* ***snapshot of notable and relevant elements*** *of the country / region / sector background* ***at the time the intervention to be evaluated was designed****, including -if relevant- a reference to the National Development Plan of the Country and/or other relevant policy documents;* * *a short description of the* ***evolution of the background*** *during the period under evaluation and -if relevant- to lessons learnt during previous and related activities.* |  |

## The intervention to be evaluated

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the intervention to be evaluated | * [Indicate the title of the intervention to be evaluated; in case of multiple interventions, indicate each of them in a separate numbered bullet] |
| Budget of the intervention to be evaluated | * [Indicate the **budget** of the intervention to be evaluated; in case of multiple interventions, indicate each of them in a separate bullet, following the same numbering used when listing their titles] |
| Dates of the intervention to be evaluated | * Start: xx/xx/xxxx * End: xx/xx/xxxx |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The text of this chapter - which will start after the previous table - should describe* ***the intervention to be evaluated and the logic behind it****. In case of multiple interventions, they will be described one by one, in the same sequence used in the previous table.*  *It is important that tenderers understand elements such as the rationale behind the intervention, its time span and budget, possible sources of co-financing, how the intervention links with interventions financed by other donors and any further relevant elements.*  *Do not hesitate to add weblinks to relevant available documents that can enhance the comprehension by tenderers of the intervention.*  ***Describe the Intervention Logic*** *of the intervention to be evaluated and the assumptions explaining how this is expected to achieve results with the given inputs and activities (i.e. its underlying* ***Theory of Change****).*  ***Include*** *the* *Logical Framework Matrix (****LogFrame****) of the intervention and/or any different diagram in the* ***Annex V to the ToR, including indicators of performance*** *– if available. The Intervention Logic is the central instrument for an evaluation as most of the Evaluation Questions should derive from it and the analysis to be carried out by evaluators should refer to this instrument.*  *Evaluation Managers and evaluators have a common interest in a clearly articulated Intervention Logic, which provides enough specificity for the measurement of the expected changes.*  *The Intervention Logic* ***may have evolved over time****; please highlight these changes in order to provide tenderers with additional information that will help them in preparing their offer.*  *As part of their Inception Note, the evaluation team will be* ***asked to reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the intervention*** *in order to reflect an updated and shared vision of its intended casual chain. Coherently, it is recommended to specify that the Intervention Logic described in this chapter of the ToR is based on existing documents and shall be subject to the evaluators’ scrutiny and reconstruction during Inception.*  *For specific guidance on the project Cycle Management Principles and the Logical Framework Approach please refer to the EC Project Cycle Management Guidelines (Volume 1),* [*https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/12023*](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/12023) |  |

## Stakeholders of the intervention

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please describe the key stakeholders of the intervention to be evaluated including its final beneficiaries; define their role, involvement in the intervention and how this is expected to impact on them.*  *A stakeholder map may exist; in this case, you may want to attach it as a further Annex to the ToR; the evaluators will be free to refine and finalise this map during Inception in order to identify the key informants to be interviewed / surveyed.* |  |

## Other available information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Other analytical tools of the intervention may exist that are relevant for tenderers, such as a SWOT analysis, specific Risk Analysis (or management plans), Context Analysis, previous monitoring or evaluation reports, minutes of Steering Committee’s meetings etc. In this case, you can link them in this chapter if available online and/or attach these tools as Annexes to the ToR (see also Annex II). If the intervention was subject of previous monitoring or evaluation missions, please do mention here their main conclusions and recommendations.*  *In case you are not aware of the existence of such further documents or if they don’t exist, please skip this chapter.* |  |

## Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

The European Union is committed to the achievement of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development adopted by the UN in September 2015; as a consequence, all interventions co-financed by the European Union should reinforce and make explicit their contributions to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the core of Agenda 2030.

The intervention to be evaluated is expected to contribute to the following SDG [please select]:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goal 1 | No poverty |  |
| Goal 2 | Zero hunger |  |
| Goal 3 | Good health and well-being |  |
| Goal 4 | Quality education |  |
| Goal 5 | Gender equality |  |
| Goal 6 | Clean water and sanitation |  |
| Goal 7 | Affordable and clean energy |  |
| Goal 8 | Decent work and economic growth |  |
| Goal 9 | Industry, innovation and infrastructure |  |
| Goal 10 | Reduce inequalities |  |
| Goal 11 | Sustainable cities and communities |  |
| Goal 12 | Responsible consumption and production |  |
| Goal 13 | Climate |  |
| Goal 14 | Life below water |  |
| Goal 15 | Life on land |  |
| Goal 16 | Peace, justice and strong institutions |  |
| Goal 17 | Partnership for the goals |  |

# DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The* ***type of evaluation*** *has* ***direct impact on the methodological approach and on the issues to be studied*** *that will be formulated later on. Evaluations can be conducted at different times in the project cycle and as a result, will serve different purposes.*   * ***Mid-term evaluations*** *(performed mid-way during implementation of an intervention) should focus on progress to date and, by explaining* ***why*** *progress is happening or is not happening as planned, provide recommendations on how to improve the intervention during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected results, taking into account problems and opportunities. They should also serve to prepare new interventions and encompass both forward and backward-looking perspectives.* * ***Final evaluations*** *take place at the operational closure of an intervention and should contribute to accountability by providing an assessment of the results achieved. They should furthermore contribute to learning by understanding what have been the factors that made possible or created obstacles to the achievement of results (their focus is therefore on* ***why****, not only on* ***what****); and by identifying any key lessons that would lead to improved future interventions in the country/region/sector of operation and/or elsewhere.* * ***Ex post evaluations*** *take place one to two years after an intervention has ended in order to enable the analysis of its impact; they should focus on impact and sustainability in order to draw conclusions that may inform further interventions. Also in this case, they shall not only describe what has been achieved (or what the intervention contributed to achieve) but particularly* ***why*** *and* ***upon what conditions*** *long-term results have been (or have not been) achieved.* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | [mid-term / final / ex-post] |
| Coverage | [the particular component of the intervention to be evaluated; usually, it is the intervention in its entirety] |
| Geographic scope | [location of the intervention to be evaluated] |
| Period to be evaluated | From dd/mm/yyyy to dd/mm/yyyy  [the time period of the intervention to be evaluated can be the entire period of the intervention to date or just one part of that period] |

## Objectives of the evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Feel free to integrate the text below with references to the value of evaluation within your organisation.* |  |

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[[3]](#footnote-4) of the European Commission[[4]](#footnote-5). The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results[[5]](#footnote-6)** of in the context ofan evolving cooperation policy withan increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDG**.[[6]](#footnote-7)

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

In particular, this evaluation will serve […………]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please describe in a few words why this evaluation is needed (e.g., to understand the performance of the intervention, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results in order to adjust its design or implementing modalities; or to understand the performance of the intervention, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future interventions).* |  |

The main users of this evaluation will be […………]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Usually the main users of an evaluation made by partners are the partner itself (Contracting Authority), the relevant EU services and the key stakeholders that are involved in the implementation of the intervention to be evaluated and / or its steering.*  *Additionally, users of the evaluation may be the final beneficiaries of the intervention and other stakeholders that were not involved in the implementation phase.* |  |

## Evaluation criteria and issues to be addressed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This chapter makes reference to the six standard OECD/DAC and the one additional EU evaluation criteria.*  ***PLEASE KINDLY NOTE****: The definition of the DAC evaluation criteria has changed following the release (10 December 2019) of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” (DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL). In this document the DAC included Coherence as a sixth standard evaluation criterion. The new definitions are reported in the Annex VII for reference. The DAC work to issue new guidance documents on the use of the new criteria is ongoing and can be followed at this link:*  <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>  *The = links quoted in this guidance box contain the previous definitions of the DAC evaluation criteria and will be updated over time.*  *The specific scope of your evaluation may suggest not to cover all of the above criteria; this needs to be justified in the ToR, as requested by the Better Regulation package (SWD (2015) 111,* [*https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox\_en*](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en)*, tool #47). Conversely, it may call for the addressing of additional or alternative criteria.For a definition of the previous five DAC and the two EU criteria (apart from the already quoted tool # 47 of the Better Regulation package) , see for DEVCO “Evaluation Matters, the Evaluation Policy for European Union Development Co-operation”, 2014;* <https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/system/files/evaluation-matters_en.pdf>  *For DG NEAR, see* [*https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf*](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf) |  |

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and [add: ‘perspectives of’ OR ‘early signs of’, if this is not an ex-post evaluation] impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

* the EU added value (the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);

The definition of the 6 DAC + 1 EU evaluation criteria is contained for reference in the Annex VII.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Intervention, its governance and monitoring.

The evaluation team must consider to what extent and how **gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed and addressed by the intervention and the results of this**. It shall furthermore consider whether the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the , its governance and monitoring.

The **issues to be addressed** as formulated below are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[[7]](#footnote-8) and propose in their Inception Note a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Note, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

[Please formulate your issues to be addressed here -and number them]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***The issues to be addressed define what the evaluation will focus on, have a primary impact on the methodology that the evaluators will adopt and determine the findings that will be produced by the evaluation.***  *In formulating your issues to be addressed, describe your main topics of concern without necessarily organising them by evaluation criteria. They can be organised by main topic area as to enhance readability of the ToR (i.e. policy/strategy, areas, complementarity with other stakeholders, management and governance, etc.).*  *By being specific about the focus of your evaluation* ***try your utmost to limit the issues to be addressed to a maximum of 7****.* ***The more questions you add, the less time the evaluators will have to address them properly, which is likely to have a negative impact on the usefulness of the Evaluation Report.***  *As a practical consideration, the* ***wider the focus*** *of the analysis, the* ***higher the cost of the evaluation will be.***  *Do not forget to* ***number your issues to be addressed****: this will simplify your interaction with the evaluators.* |  |

## Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This chapter identifies* ***four phases of an evaluation****, and their respective outputs.*  *The* ***proposed structuring*** *in phases is* ***adaptable as your evaluation may require a different organisation.***  *Because of its importance, the* ***Inception Phase******shall not be omitted;*** *it is during this phase that the evaluators will consolidate their methodology of analysis and finalise the evaluation questions to be answered. Similarly, the* ***Synthesis phase cannot be omitted****: it is the phase devoted to the final analysis of findings, their synthesis and to the reporting.*  *The* ***minimum required outputs*** *from the evaluation are the* ***Inception Note*** *as well as**the* ***Final Report****.*  *Please* ***adapt the different tables and text*** *below to make them consistent with your needs and internally coherent with other parts of the ToR.* |  |

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

* Inception
* Field
* Synthesis
* Dissemination

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each of these phases and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with [specify: Contracting Authority and / or the Reference Group]. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

| **Phases of the evaluation** | **Key activities** | **Outputs and *meetings*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Phase** | * Initial document/data collection * Document analysis * Inception interviews [as relevant] * Stakeholder analysis * Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) * Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix * Planning of the Field phase | * *Kick-off meeting [with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group]* [specify if face-to-face and in which location or via remote conference] * Inception note * Slide presentation of the Inception note [as relevant] |
| **Field Phase** | * Gathering of primary evidence with the use of [specify the tools you want the evaluators to use, such as interviews, focus groups, storytelling sessions, surveys etc. – OR specify ‘the most appropriate techniques’ if you want to leave them more freedom] | * Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase [The presentation is a key support to the debriefing sessions to be conducted at the end of the Field Mission] * *Debriefing with* [specify with whom and if the meeting will be held face-to-face or via remote conference] |
| **Synthesis phase** | * Final analysis of findings * Reporting | * Draft Final Report [mandatory] * Final Report [mandatory] * Slide presentation [as needed] * *Final Report presentation to* [specify to whom and if the meeting will be held face-to-face or via remote conference] |
| **Dissemination phase** | * [Should a dissemination phase is requested, the activities leading to its outputs are to be described here] | * [Describe here the outputs to be delivered by the evaluators such as one-pagers targeting special audiences, leaflets, publications, radio spots, videos, a conference, webinars, etc. In your description of the outputs of this phase be as specific as you can.] |

### Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

It will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in [location; ALTERNATIVELY, consider the possibility to have the kick off via teleconference; in this case, the evaluators will travel only at the beginning of the Field Phase] between the evaluators and [specify: the Evaluation Manager or the Reference Group]. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed. Further to this, and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the evaluators will reconstruct the Intervention Logic / Theory of Change of the to be evaluated.

Based on the Intervention Logic and/or the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases. The methodological design of the evaluation will be summarised into an evaluation matrix.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception note**; its content is described in Chapter 5. Please, see also Chapter 5.2.

[The evaluation team will then, if needed, present in [place] the **Inception Report** to the Reference Group.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The* ***Evaluation Design Matrix*** *is an important* ***tool for planning and organising an evaluation, which we recommend you ask the evaluators to produce.***  *In its basic format, it is a table with one row for each evaluation question and columns that address evaluation design issues, such as judgement criteria, indicators, stakeholders, data collection methods, data sources, etc.* ***The Matrix links each Evaluation Question to the means for answering that question and its indicators****. There is* ***no single format for an Evaluation Design Matrix****, and any experienced evaluator shall be able to draw a meaningful Matrix at the end of the Inception phase. The analysis of the Evaluation Matrix will* ***allow you to appreciate in a simple and schematic way*** *to what extent the evaluation team has taken into consideration the complexity of your evaluation and is proposing a sound and relevant approach to answer its mandate.* |  |

### Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception note by the Evaluation Manager.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant national / local authorities and agencies; and with the relevant Civil Society Organisations. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the Field Phase the evaluators will prepare a Slide Presentation to inform a debriefing session with [to be specified]; its content is described in Chapter 5.

### Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of the Final Report, whose structure is described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the early phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and the preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will make sure that:

* Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
* When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
* The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver to the Evaluation Manager the **Draft Final Report** and, after addressing the comments consolidated by the Evaluation Manager, will finalise the **Final Report** (including the Executive Summary. Please refer to chapter 5.2 for a description of the process.

### Dissemination phase

[If your evaluation includes a Dissemination phase, please include the detailed description of your expectations – otherwise delete the chapter]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The evaluation contract is an occasion for disseminating the results of the analysis that has been conducted by evaluators; in order to do so, a dissemination phase can be integrated in the design of the evaluation mandate.*  *No standard text is proposed for this chapter as the dissemination very much depends on your specific needs. This chapter shall describe the main products you expect from the evaluation team regarding the dissemination of the final Evaluation Report. If a dissemination seminar of the Report is planned, indicate the place and which team members should be present, as this has budget repercussions. Besides the seminar, different and more specialised communication modalities can be used for a better dissemination of the Report: blogs, videos, publications, radio broadcasts etc.….*  *These activities are to be described with a sufficient level of detail, as they will have an impact on the overall budget of the evaluation and may require the hiring by the evaluators of additional expertise.* |  |

## Management and Steering of the evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The establishment of a Reference Group for the steering of an evaluation has many advantages in terms of ownership of the results. Furthermore, it supports the work of the Evaluation Manager by agreeing on the ToR of the evaluation, providing a sounding board for discussing the validity of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team; even a very small evaluation can be steered by a small Reference Group.*  *However, for the evaluation of small grant schemes the setup of a formal Reference Group may be considered as redundant; should this be the case, feel free to adapt this chapter.* |  |

The evaluation is managed by [the Evaluation Manager]; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of [identify the institutions / groups / CSOs that you want to include in the Reference Group, including a representative from the EU Delegation that financed the under evaluation].

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

* To agree on the focus of the evaluation, including the evaluation questions at Inception Phase.
* To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the external stakeholders.
* To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the .
* To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team.
* To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
* To support the development of a proper follow-up plan after completion of the evaluation.
* To support the Dissemination Phase if there is one.

## Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be [specify].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Independently from the language of the specific contract, some documentation may be available in other languages; should this be the case, do not forget to specify this aspect and to ensure consistency with the linguistic skills of the team.* |  |

# EXPERTISE REQUIRED

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *It is advisable to define the expertise needed by your evaluation* ***in terms of expertise required within the team (not in terms of profile of the individual evaluators)****.*  *This has one main advantage in terms of size of competition. The tenderers have more opportunities to procure the sought expertise by attributing, for example, sector and evaluation expertise to different individuals within the team with fewer restrictions.*  *This chapter envisages the possibility to categorise the experts based on their seniority; feel free to adapt the proposed categorisation to the standard definitions used by your organisation and do not forget to provide a definition of these categories.* |  |

## Number of evaluators and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the tenderers.

| Category of experts | Minimum number of evaluators | Total minimum number of working days (total) | (Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Senior |  |  |  |
| Medium |  |  |  |
| Junior |  |  |  |

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the offer) is expected to possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than xx working days, out of which yy in the field.

## Expertise required

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The expertise required must include professional evaluation skills (particularly for the Team Leader) and other expertise such as, for example, sector-specific expertise, team management skills, gender expertise, communication and language skills etc.*  *While evaluators can difficultly conduct evaluations requiring specific thematic expertise on their own, the* ***setting up of mixed teams*** *including professional evaluation expertise and relevant thematic expertise is a commendable practice, should budget allows for that.*  *To define your requirements, you can use a formulation such as: ‘the team shall have a cumulative experience of at least xx years in the area of evaluation in the region xxx; a sound practice of development interventions in the sector of xxxx demonstrated by ….; etc.’ In case your team includes experts of different categories, formulate these requirements per category of expert.* |  |

**Minimum requirements of the team [(Cat. xx experts)]** [define a set of minimum requirements per category of experts and add as many specifications as needed]**:**

* [XX] years of experience in evaluation;
* [XX years of experience in….;]
* [At least one member of the team: XX years of experience in….;]

**Additional requirements of the team [(Cat. xx experts)]** [should you wish so, define a set of additional requirements per category of experts and add as many specifications as needed]**:**

* …..
* …..

**Language skills of the team:**

* [Xxxxxxx]: at least [x] members [of category xxxx] shall possess a level [yy] expertise;
* [Xxxxxxx]: at least [x] members [of category xxxx] shall possess a level [yy] expertise;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

**Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended** and should be striven for.

# LOCATION AND DURATION

## Location(s) of assignment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *If the precise places to be visited by evaluators during the Field phase are still to be decided, inter alia as an output of the Inception phase, the potential places will be qualified as "tentative".* |  |

The assignment will take place in [indicate the place(s) where the assignment will take place, as described in the previous section], with field visits in [indicate as needed].

## Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar months

Maximum duration of the assignment: [indicate duration in calendar months, not number of working days] calendar months.

This overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, [dissemination activities] and distribution of outputs.

## Starting period and planning

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Do not forget to leave sufficient time between the signature of the contract and the start of the assignment to allow the to-be-selected contractor to mobilise the evaluators, on time.*  *The Annex IV -referenced in this chapter- is not to be filled by you but rather by the tenderers as an integral part of their offer. Should you have any specific date constraint (such as the date for which the approved version of the Final Report must be delivered), indicate these dates in this chapter.* |  |

Provisional start of the assignment is [indicate a period of a month, e.g. "mid-February", "beginning of June" and year].

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception note). The ‘Indicative dates’ are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as ‘0’).

# REPORTING

## Content, timing and submission

The evaluation deliverables must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of the intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The following* ***table should be adapted*** *and the outputs be consistent with what indicated in the Chapter 2.3.* |  |

|  | **Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*** | **Main Content** | **Timing for submission** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Note** | [xx] pages | * Intervention logic * Stakeholder map * Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: * Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods * Consultation strategy [as needed] * Field visit approach [including the criteria to select the field visits] * Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures * Work plan of the entire evaluation | End of Inception Phase |
| **Slide presentation** | [xx] slides | * Key, preliminary findings of the field phase to guide the debriefing session | End of Field Phase |
| **Draft Final Report** | [xx] pages | * Cf. detailed structure in Annex III | End of Synthesis Phase |
| **Final report** | [xx] pages | * Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted | [xx weeks] after having received comments to the Draft Final Report. |

## Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments [including those received from the Reference Group] or the approval of the report within [number] calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within [10] calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

## Language

All reports shall be submitted in the official language of the contract, as indicated in Chapter 2.5.

[If relevant] The [Executive Summary OR the entirety] of the following [reports OR other outputs] shall be furthermore translated into [languages]:

* [specify the outputs to be translated].

## Formatting of reports and number of report copies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *In this chapter you can include your organisation’s specific requirement in terms of formatting of reports, number of copies, etc.*  *Example:* All reports will be produced using [specify font, font size and spacing]. They will be submitted both in Word and PDF formats.  Apart from their electronic submission, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in [number] paper copies double sided [if necessary] at no extra cost. |  |

# content of the offers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The text provided in this chapter is indicative, as your organisation may have some institutional guidance on this aspect and specific templates to be followed by tenderers.* |  |

The offers to be submitted for the execution of this contract will include a Technical and a Financial Offer.

## Technical offer

The Technical Offer will compulsorily include:

* An introductory and short chapter detailing the comprehension by tenderers of the assignment and its main challenges.
* A chapter detailing the tentative methodology to conduct the evaluation; this methodology will then be finalised in the Inception Note. The proposed methodology will detail how the evaluation will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication messages, materials and management structures.
* A short analysis of the main risks and remedy measures of the assignment.
* A chapter detailing the relevance of the team composition and competencies to the work to be undertaken and how the tasks will be organised.
* Annex: the CVs of the proposed expert(s) (max length of each CV: 5 pages).
* Annex: a synoptic table detailing the work to be undertaken by each proposed expert and their role, based on the proposed methodology.
* Annex: the proposed timetable (Gantt chart).

The maximum length of the Technical offer is [15] pages excluding annexes.

## Financial offer

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *In order to get comparable offers, it is strongly advisable to include -as an annex to these ToR- a budget template that all tenderers shall use.* |  |

The Financial Offer must respect the format of the attached Annex VI. Offers using a different format will be disqualified.

# budget of the present evaluation

The maximum budget allowed for the execution of the present contract is [indicate the maximum budget with the indication of the currency]. This is inclusive of all fees and costs related to the assignment.

# Deadline for the submission of questions

Questions and requests for clarification are to be submitted (if need will be) by the [indicate the date – this must be at least one week before the deadline for submission of the offers] at [indicate the time], local time of [indicate the capital city of the country where offers are to be submitted] via email at [indicate the email address where questions can be submitted].

The text of the questions received (once anonymised) and the responses will be sent to all tenderers to ensure equal treatment.

# Submission of the offers and their assessment

## Deadline for the submission of the offers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Don’t forget to leave sufficient time to tenderers to prepare their offer – in general 2-3 weeks will be sufficient for a small evaluation.* |  |

The offers for undertaking this assignment must be received by [indicate the date] at [indicate the time], local time of [indicate the capital city of the country where offers are to be submitted]. Late submission of offers leads to their disqualification.

## Modalities for the submission of the offers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Include in this chapter your organisation’s rules on the submission of the offer. They can be submitted in different ways such as in electronic format via email (indicate the email address), via paper (in this case indicate the address and whether you want to receive the entire offer together or in a double envelope, keeping the technical offer separate from the financial offer -this allows to assess the financial offer only of those tenderers whose technical offer has successfully passed the assessment).* |  |

## Assessment of the offers

The offers will be assessed ad detailed in the Annex I.

# invoicing and payments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Include in this chapter your organisation’s rules and indications about invoicing and payment. This includes (e.g.) the contacts of the person to whom the invoices shall be submitted, the moments of payments (i.e. if linked to the production of deliverables and if an advance payment is foreseen) and the modalities of payment.* |  |

Annexes

# Annex I: criteria to assess the offers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The proposed text is based on the processes and criteria used by DG DEVCO, DG NEAR and FPI of the EC for the assessment of the evaluation of interventions under the framework contract SIEA. Feel free to adapt this entire Annex as to suit your needs.*  *The objective of this Annex is to openly disclose with invited tenderers the criteria upon which their offers will be judged, as well as to guide the work of those that will be called to assess the proposals.*  *The assessment will first take into consideration the Technical Offer and score them based on a set of criteria attributing a maximum 50 points for the proposed approach to work and 50 points for the proposed team. Only Financial Offers of those tenderers whose Technical Offer scored higher than a 75/100 threshold will be assessed.*  *Frequent alternatives to this table increase to 60 the weight for the approach to work; or decrease it to 40.* |  |

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum** |
| ***Total score for the approach to work*** | ***50*** |
| * Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided | **10** |
| * Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges | **25** |
| * Qualification of tenderer and backstopping | **5** |
| * Organisation of tasks including timetable | **10** |
| ***Score for the expertise of the proposed team*** | ***50*** |
| ***Overall total score*** | ***100*** |

1. **Technical threshold**

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

1. **interviews during the evaluation of the offers**

[Delete if you do not plan to hold interviews] During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

Phone interviews will be tentatively carried out during the period from [dd/mm/yyyy] to [dd/mm/yyyy].

# Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This Annex will contain a list of the available information on the intervention. This will include both documents that can be gathered during tendering (this will enhance the quality of the Technical Offer); and documents that will be given to the evaluators after the signature of the contract.*  *Relevant information / documentation that is not available and that is to be gathered by the evaluators shall be explicitly mentioned; this will ensure that proposals contain a realistic calculation of efforts and costs.*  *The following is a generic checklist, which is* ***to be customised with specific references and integrated as appropriate*** *(e.g., with the addition of other sources of information such as baseline surveys, specific studies or analyses of specific issues/groups, relevant country, sector, thematic and evaluations, whenever available, etc.)* |  |

* Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the (s) to be evaluated
* Country Strategy Paper [country/region] and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
* Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
* identification studies
* feasibility / formulation studies
* Financing agreement and addenda of the
* Quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports of the
* External and internal monitoring and evaluation reports of the
* Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
* [Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/guidance-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimension_en)
* Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the (s)
* Any other relevant document

***Note***: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the .

# Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The structure of the evaluation report will be as follows.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

‘’*This evaluation is supported and guided by [indicate the name of your organisation] and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of [indicate the name of your organisation] nor of the European Commission, which financed the evaluated* ’’.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** | | A tightly-drafted and to-the-point Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. |
| **1. Introduction** | | A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| **2. Answers to the Evaluation Questions** | | A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence (findings) and reasoning.  An overall assessment of the intervention is to be added, as well. It shall be based on the detailed response to the Evaluation Questions. |
| **3. Conclusions and Recommendations** | |  |
|  | **3.1 Conclusions** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.  A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.  The transferable lessons from this evaluation are to be included in this chapter. |
|  | **3.2 Recommendations** | They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new one for the next cycle.  Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels. |
| **Annexes to the report** | | The report should include the following annexes:   * The Terms of Reference of the evaluation * The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs can be attached, but summarised and limited to one page per person) * Evaluation methodology including tools utilised, analysis of the limitation of the methodology, remedy and degree of confidence in the conclusions. * Evaluation Matrix (a table presenting the tools used to respond to each evaluation question as well as the indicators used). * Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrix of the intervention. * Relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place * List of persons/organisations consulted * Literature and documentation consulted * Other technical annexes as relevant (e.g. statistical analyses, matrix of evidence, databases) |

# Annex IV: Planning schedule

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please remember that the following table* ***is not to be filled by you*** *but rather by the tenderers as an integral part of their offer.* |  |

This annex must be included by tenderers in their Technical Offer and forms an integral part of it. Tenderers can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

|  |  | **Indicative Duration in working days[[8]](#footnote-9)** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Location** | **Team Leader** | **Evaluator …** | **Indicative Dates** |
| **Inception phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Field phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (maximum)** | |  |  |  |

# Annex V: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated intervention(s)

[To be included]

# Annex VI: financial offer template

[Please include here the template to be used by tenderers to submit their Financial Offer, with any needed indication on how to fill it.]

1. The term “intervention” is used in this text in lieu of “project” or “grant” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The tenderers are the consulting firms and/or individual consultants invited to submit an offer based on the ToR. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. COM(2013) 686 final “Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation” - <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf>; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf> ; SWD (2015)111 “Better Regulation Guidelines”, <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf> ; COM(2017) 651 final ‘Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results’, <https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 “Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external ” - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\_cir.pdf. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Add one column per each evaluator [↑](#footnote-ref-9)