**INTRODUCTION to the TERMS OF REFERENCE and GUIDANCE NOTES[[1]](#footnote-2)**

**for the EVALUATIONS of BUDGET SUPPORT PROGRAMMES (SIEA 2018)**

**-VERSION COMPATIBLE WITH OPSYS SIEA TOR, PARTS A AND B-**

**Version 1.3.1 – May 2020**

**Objective of the Terms of Reference (ToR) template**

The ToR template and the related Guidance Notes have been developed in order to support the work of Operation Managers in the EUDs and Project Managers in DEVCO and NEAR HQ (thereinafter, the **Evaluation Managers**) during preparation of Terms of Reference (thereinafter, **ToR**) for evaluations of Budget Support Programmes to be contracted through the FWC SIEA 2018 (EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi).

Please, note that these ToR suggest assessing the contribution of the evaluated budget support programme[s]up to the level of induced outputs. If you consider it appropriate to look at the programme[s]' contribution up to the level of its beneficiaries (i.e. at the level of outcome and/or impact), please consult (for DEVCO) the Evaluation Support Service at helpdesk@evaluationsupport.eu or (for NEAR) contact near-eval-monitoring@ec.europa.eu

**Types of evaluation and form of contract**

The template applies to **mid-term** and **final** **evaluations**.

**Evaluation contracts** shall be concluded as **global price contracts** (ref: PRAG, Chapter 3.1.1; DEVCO Companion, Chapter 17.8); this template is coherent with this payment modality.

**Structure of this document**

The document is structured in two parts:

* **Part A** – this part contains both the **Guidance Notes and** the **ToR template (including annexes)** and corresponds to **OPSYS** requirements; **after deletion of the guidance it can be updated as such into the corresponding OPSYS ToR Part A.**

**Part B** – it contains **guidance** to develop online the Part B of the ToR in OPSYS. **It is not to be uploaded in OPSYS.**

**Guidance Boxes contained in this document**

**Before finalising your ToR, please delete this Introduction, the guidance boxes, the entire guidance to Part B and complete / adapt the parts highlighted in yellow.**

*Hints boxes*: The “hint boxes” contain advice for drafting the ToR.

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

*Adaptation boxes*: Evaluations are all different, and what is advisable for a complex programme evaluation is not necessarily applicable when evaluating a single project. The Template has thus been prepared with adaptation in mind; the ‘adaptation boxes’, contained in this template highlight the specific parts of the Template requiring adaptation.

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

**Standard and additional / optional text**

*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 is optional or to be adapted / replaced with specific references to your evaluation.

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

**Integration with the EVAL Module**

ToR prepared with the aid of this template are to be uploaded in the EVAL Module (EVAL). EVAL is a process management tool designed to facilitate the evaluation process and management of documentation by Evaluation Managers. In addition, it provides a central repository of key evaluation documents, such as ToR and reports (to be uploaded to the Module respectively by Evaluation Managers and Contractors).

The **use of the EVAL module has been compulsory** for DG DEVCO and for DG NEAR since September 2016[[2]](#footnote-3), and for FPI since August 2018.

**Need for further support?**

This Template is part of a package of services for Evaluation Managers, which include (for DEVCO) the support provided by the Evaluation Support Service (ESS) of the Results and Evaluation Unit. The ESS is available to support you in planning or implementing your evaluation, for example by explaining the use of this template, discussing the objectives of your evaluation and reviewing or commenting on your ToR. You can contact them via email at helpdesk@evaluationsupport.eu

In the case of NEAR, the M&E sector team is available for feedback and advice. You can contact them via email at near-eval-monitoring@ec.europa.eu

For FPI, please send your requests for assistance via email at fpi-evaluation@ec.europa.eu

***Chronology of versions***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *1.0* | *September 2018* | *The first version of this document* |
| *1.1* | *November 2018* | *Minor changes in the Introduction* |
| *1.2* | *December 2019* | *Redefinition of the evaluation criteria following the release by DAC of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL – 10 December 2019*  |
| *1.3* | *February 2020* | *Adaptation to the new OPSYS template (Part A + Part B)* |
| *1.3.1* | *April 2020* | *Hyperlinks adjusted to new DEVCO website* |

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE for BUDGET SUPPORT PROGRAMMES – PART A**

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

**FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT [number and title of the lot]**

**EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi**

**[OPSYS reference number]**

Contracting Authority: [specify, e.g. the European Union Delegation to xxxxxx; or Unit xxxxxx of the relevant Directorate-General / Service of the European Commission]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Some of the information contained in the above heading is repeated in the Part B of the OPSYS ToR; please ensure* ***internal coherence*** *between the two parts throughout the text.**The inclusion of a Table of Contents improves the user-friendliness of the document; before finalising your ToR do not forget to update it (Ctrl-A, F9, Update entire table).*  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Before starting drafting the ToR, please keep in mind that the active participation of the partner Government is crucial for the success of an evaluation of a budget support programme. It is therefore important to obtain upfront the agreement of the Government with the undertaking of the evaluation. The confirmation of the availability of the main authorities involved in the evaluated programmes (usually, Ministry of Finance and line ministry(ies) concerned) for the provision of the needed information is also of high importance. The Government will also be part of the Reference Group.*
* *The inclusion of a Table of Contents improves the user-friendliness of the document; before finalising your ToR do not forget to update it (Ctrl-A, F9, Update entire table).*
 |  |

[1 BACKGROUND 6](#_Toc40714362)

[1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background 6](#_Toc40714363)

[1.2 The Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated 6](#_Toc40714364)

[1.3 Stakeholders of the Budget Support programme 8](#_Toc40714365)

[1.4 Other available information 8](#_Toc40714366)

[2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT 8](#_Toc40714367)

[2.1 Objectives of the evaluation 9](#_Toc40714368)

[2.2 Requested services 11](#_Toc40714369)

[2.3 Evaluation methodology 17](#_Toc40714370)

[2.4 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs 19](#_Toc40714371)

[2.5 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer) 25](#_Toc40714372)

[2.6 Management and Steering of the evaluation 26](#_Toc40714373)

[2.7 Language of the Specific contract 27](#_Toc40714374)

[3 Logistics and timing 27](#_Toc40714375)

[3.1 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff 27](#_Toc40714376)

[4 requirements 28](#_Toc40714377)

[5 REPORTS 28](#_Toc40714378)

[For the list of reports, please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference. 28](#_Toc40714379)

[5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators 28](#_Toc40714380)

[5.2 Comments on the outputs/products 28](#_Toc40714381)

[5.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary 28](#_Toc40714382)

[5.4 Language 28](#_Toc40714383)

[5.5 Number of report copies 29](#_Toc40714384)

[5.6 Formatting of reports 29](#_Toc40714385)

[6 Monitoring and evaluation 29](#_Toc40714386)

[6.1 Content of reporting 29](#_Toc40714387)

[6.2 Comments on the outputs 29](#_Toc40714388)

[6.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary 29](#_Toc40714389)

[7 practical information 30](#_Toc40714390)

[Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria 31](#_Toc40714391)

[Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team 33](#_Toc40714392)

[Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary 34](#_Toc40714393)

[Annex IV: Planning schedule 37](#_Toc40714394)

[Annex V: Quality Assessment Grid 38](#_Toc40714395)

[Annex VI: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated Budget Support programme[s] 42](#_Toc40714396)

[Annex VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA 43](#_Toc40714397)

[guidance to the online filling of part b in opsys 44](#_Toc40714398)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***PLEASE KINDLY NOTE:*** *for global price contracts such as evaluations the Contracting Authority must define in the part A of the ToR all the information necessary for the contractor to create its offer. This includes the section “Other available information”.* |  |

# BACKGROUND

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The objective of this chapter is to provide a summarised,* ***descriptive overview of the Budget Support programme***[s] ***to be evaluated*** *(****not of the evaluation assignment****, which is to be described in Chapter 2). It aims at providing the framework contractors with key information helping them to contextualise the Budget Support programme*[s] *to be evaluated.* *The chapter* ***shall be factual and not contain judgement on the results and the performance*** *of the Budget Support programme*[s] *to be evaluated 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 include 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 framework contractors with:** *a* ***snapshot of notable and relevant elements*** *of the country / region / sector background* ***at the time the Budget Support programme***[s] ***to be evaluated was designed****, including a reference to the National Development Plan of the Country;*
* *a short description of the* ***evolution of the background*** *during the period under evaluation.*
 |  |

## The Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated[[3]](#footnote-4)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The text of this chapter - which will follow the previous table - should describe* ***the Budget Support programme***[s]  ***to be evaluated****. In case of multiple Budget Support programmes, they will be described one by one, in the same sequence used in the previous table.**It is important that framework contractors understand elements such as the rationale behind the Budget Support programme*[s]*, the evolution over time of the relevant EU approach, the time span of the Budget Support programme*[s] *and [its/their] budget, possible sources of co-financing, how the Budget Support programme links with projects / programmes financed by other donors and any further relevant elements.* *Do not hesitate to add weblinks to available documents that can enhance the comprehension by framework contractors of the Budget Support programme or provide the following elements:** *Summary of the policy, institutional and PFM context in the partner country (can be extracted from the main issues indicated in the assessment reports drafted during the programming/ identification/formulation/review phases of Budget Support);*
* *Summary of the history of EU budget support programmes in the partner country and the present composition of budget support (volume, policy dialogue and institutional set up);*
* *Brief summary of the budget support activities of the EU and more detailed information on the budget support programme*[s]*to be evaluated;*
* *List of donors implementing Budget Support programmes (sectors covered, amounts, methodology) and brief presentation of Budget Support from the whole EU cooperation in the country;*
* *Presentation of the joint coordination/dialogue mechanism with the partner country and the others donors (if applicable).*

*Describe the Intervention Logic of the Budget Support programme*[s]*to be evaluated and the assumptions explaining how the Budget Support programme*[s] *is/are expected to attain results with the given inputs and activities (i.e. the Theory of Change underlying the Budget Support programme*[s]*).* *Please* ***include*** *the* *Logical Framework Matrix (****Logframe****) of the Budget Support programme*[s] *and/or any Intervention Logic diagram in an* ***Annex to the ToR****. 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 make reference to this instrument.* *You can also look at the Evaluation Framework provided in page 9 (Figure 1) of the OECD/DAC (2012), Evaluating Budget Support, Methodological Approach[[4]](#footnote-5) and adapt it to the specific case of the programme*[s] *to be evaluated.**Evaluation Managers and evaluators have a common interest in a clearly articulated Intervention Logic, which provides enough specificity for the measurement of expected changes.**The Intervention Logic may have evolved over time; please highlight these changes in order to provide framework contractors with additional information that will help them in preparing their offer (O&M – Organisation and Methodology).**As part of the Inception Report/Note, the evaluation team should be* ***asked to reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Budget Support programme***[s] *in order to reflect an updated and shared vision of the intended casual chain underpinning the Budget Support programme*[s]*. This reconstruction shall be based on the existing Logframe/ Intervention Logic, consultation with key stakeholders and on other key documents of the Budget Support programme*[s]*.* *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 Project Cycle Management Guidelines (Volume 1),* [*https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/12023*](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/12023) |  |

## Stakeholders of the Budget Support programme

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

## Other available information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Other analytical tools of the Budget Support programme may exist that are relevant for framework contractors, such as a SWOT analysis, specific Risk Analysis (or management plans), Context Analysis, previous ROM 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).* *In case you are not aware of their existence or if they don’t exist, please skip this chapter.* |  |

The evaluation will take stock of existing reviews, evaluations and data. This includes the studies mentioned above and any other information that the evaluators might discover during the process of the evaluation. A comprehensive list of the already existing evaluations and studies shall be part of the inception report.

# DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The selection of the* ***type of evaluation*** *is crucial and has* ***direct impact on the methodological approach and on the Evaluation Questions*** *(or issues to be studied) that will be formulated later on. Budget Support 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 Budget Support programme) 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 Budget Support programme during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. They should also serve to prepare new BS programmes and encompass both forward and backward-looking perspectives.*
* ***Final evaluations*** *take place at the operational closure of a Budget Support programme 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 Budget Support programmes in the country/region/sector of operation and/or elsewhere.*

*This chapter will clarify that all EU funded Budget Support programmes must promote the cross-cutting objectives of the EC: environment and climate change, rights-based approach, persons with disability, indigenous peoples and gender equality.* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | [mid-term / final] |
| Coverage | [the particular component of the Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated; it can as well be the Budget Support programme[s] in [its/their] entirety] |
| Geographic scope | [location of the Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated; it can be a group of countries, a single country, a province in a country, etc.] |
| Period to be evaluated | [the time period of the Budget Support programme to be evaluated; it can be the entire period of the Budget Support programme to date or just one part of that period – please specify in this format: from dd/mm/yyyy to dd/mm/yyyy] |

## Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[[5]](#footnote-6) of the European Commission[[6]](#footnote-7). The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results[[7]](#footnote-8)** of Budget Support programmes in the context ofan evolving cooperation policy withan increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.**[[8]](#footnote-9)

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**.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public [delete ‘the wider public’ if not relevant and/or complete by other audience] with:

* an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the [name of the Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated]*,* paying particular attention to its [in case of a mid-term evaluation you may add ‘intermediate’] results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
* key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current [if relevant] and future Budget Support programmes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please describe in a few words why this evaluation is needed (e.g., to understand the performance of the Budget Support programme, 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 Budget Support programme, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Budget Support programmes in the same sector).* *In describing this, make direct reference to the particular evaluation you are launching; the text suggested below, outside this box, can be used as it is presented now or can be adapted to the particular needs of your evaluation.* |  |

In particular, this evaluation aims at assessing:

1. to what extent the [name of the budget support programme[s] to be evaluated] has [have] achieved [its/their] expected results, notably through contributing to the implementation of the partner government's [national/sector] strategies [add name of the national/sector strategy(ies) concerned by the programme] by providing opportunities for the improvement of national policy processes and policy implementation.
2. The evaluation should also specifically analyse how the budget support programme[s] has [have] contributed (or not) to strengthen Public Financial Management (PFM) systems, including improved transparency within government systems, improved Domestic Revenues Mobilisation and stronger accountability.
3. The evaluation will also pay attention to other aid modalities (basket/common funds, projects), in order to assess the complementarity and synergy (or discrepancy) of these modalities with budget support.
4. It should also assess the effects of the budget support operation[s] on the M&E systems in the sectors supported by the programme. Budget support should aim to strengthen the monitoring systems in the sectors it supports, in alignment with the existing national level monitoring and evaluation systems and contribute to the improved availability and credibility of data. Availability of the robust progress reports by the government, providing results information against targets set under the strategy, and the use of these reports to facilitate informed policy dialogue between the different stakeholders (CSOs, private sector, Parliament, donors) and evidence-based decision making is one indicator of the capacity of the government in the area of M&E.

The evaluation will take stock of what has been achieved with the main purpose to allow for lessons learnt and recommendations to inform on:

* the conditions under which budget support has an effect (or not) and the possible intensity and nature (positive or negative) of such effect in [name country and/or a specific sector[s]];
* the design and implementation of future budget support operations in [name country and/or a specific sector[s]];
* improvements to be set up by the European Union (or other budget support provider[s]) to maximize the impact of budget support in [name country and/or a specific sector];
* constraints in government policies, institutional structures and administrative arrangements in [name country] which might impede the effectiveness of Budget Support on spending actions and targeted public policies and reforms

This evaluation is taking place at this particular moment because [please, *explain the timeliness of the evaluation: why the evaluation will be conducted at this particular time, referring to the decision-making processes which are to be informed by the evaluation].*

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Usually the main users of an evaluation are the relevant EU services (to be identified) and other stakeholders (national / local partner Institutions, civil society, private sector, etc.) that are involved in the implementation of the Budget Support programme to be evaluated and / or its steering. Please identify them (e.g., the EU Delegation to xxxx, the Department xxxx of the Ministry for xxxx, the Authority for xxxx and the xxxx, …)* *Additionally, users of the evaluation may be the final beneficiaries of the Budget Support programme and other stakeholders that were not involved in the implementation phase; some of them may have been involved in the identification/formulation of the Budget Support programme.**More information about the concept of Users of an evaluation can be found at* <https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/71165>  |  |

## Requested services

### Scope of the evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Should you prefer to rename this chapter, a possible* ***alternative title*** *is “****Specific aspects to be evaluated****”.**In the chapter 2.1 you have described the objectives of your evaluation. Now you want to define its* ***subject*** *or (in other words) what specific aspects of the Budget Support programme you want to be evaluated. This short chapter introduces the Evaluation Questions, which are then dealt with in the following chapter 2.2.3.* *The ToR should prioritise the analysis to be conducted by the evaluators; elements that you may decide to prioritise in this chapter are (for example):** *The matching of the needs of national and local partners.*
* *The materialisation of the expected results (or perhaps only some of them) and their facilitating and contrasting factors.*
* *The performance of the management and its capacity to adapt to changing conditions.*
* *The governing mechanisms of the Budget Support programme.*
* *The contribution to SDGs (specify which ones).*
* *Etc., etc.*

*The examples can be many more; it is extremely important to ensure that the purpose that your evaluation shall serve (2.1), its scope (2.2.1) and the Evaluation Questions (2.2.3) are intrinsically coherent.*  |  |

### Evaluation criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The following text makes reference to five of the six standard DAC criteria and to an additional EU evaluation criterion.* ***PLEASE BE AWARE****: 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). With the same document the DAC included Coherence as a sixth standard evaluation criterion. The new definitions are reported in the Annex VII for reference. The 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 following 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;* [*http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-matters\_en\_0.pdf*](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-matters_en_0.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 programme[s] using five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Impact is not covered by this evaluation.

In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

* the EU added value (the extent to which the Action 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 Budget Support programme, its governance and monitoring.

[OPTIONAL] The contribution of the budget support operation[s] to the image of and awareness on the EU in the country should also be taken into account; in particular, the evaluation should ascertain whether the programme[s] have a communication plan and if it contributes to enhance the capacity of the government to communicate to their stakeholders and the final beneficiaries about the reforms implemented with the support of the EU.

### Indicative Evaluation Questions [or Issues to be addressed]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This chapter shall contain your* ***indicative******Evaluation Questions*** *or (****in alternative****) the* ***issues to be addressed****. Do not forget to adapt the title of this chapter to reflect your choice.**In Chapter 2.1 (Objectives of the evaluation) you defined why the evaluation is needed and who are its users; in Chapter 2.2.1 (Scope of the evaluation) you defined the specific aspects to be evaluated.* *In this chapter, you will define those* ***questions that the evaluators are requested to answer****.* ***You can formulate them either as Evaluation Questions; or as issues to be addressed.*** *Either option is acceptable.****The Evaluation Questions (or the issues to be addressed) will define what the evaluation focuses on, have a primary impact on the methodology that the evaluators will adopt and determine the findings that will be produced by the evaluation.**** ***The Evaluation Questions (EQs)*** *are organised according to five of the six DAC criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability) and 1 additional criterion, i.e., EU added value. These 6+1 criteria are collectively defined as the* ***Evaluation Criteria****.*

*Each evaluation criterion shall be covered by at least one Evaluation Question; as discussed in the box in chapter 2.2.1, your specific evaluation may suggest not covering all these criteria.**The* ***EQs******must be discussed and agreed beforehand with the Reference Group*** *of the evaluation; if this is not the case, this chapter shall include issues to be studied, instead. In formulating your Evaluation Questions,* ***make specific reference to the Budget Support programme***[s] ***to be evaluated*** *and avoid copying their standard definition.**For more information about the formulation of Evaluation Questions please see (for DEVCO):* [*http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol1\_en.pdf*](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol1_en.pdf) *(Chapter 6). For NEAR, please* refer to: <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-v0.4.pdf> (Chapter 13.2).* ***Issues to be addressed*** *are viable alternatives to the EQs: they describe your main topics of concern and are not organised according to evaluation criteria. They can be organised by main issue as to enhance readability of the ToR (i.e. policy/strategy, areas, complementarity with other stakeholders, management and governance, etc.). If you are unsure about the evaluation terminology and/or the evaluation criteria and/or prefer to leave more space for the evaluators to contribute to the definition of the EQs, it is advisable to choose this option. This option is compulsory in cases where the specific EQs have yet to be agreed with the Reference Group.*

*When formulating your ‘issues to be addressed’ (or EQs),* ***ensure consistency with the Objectives (2.1) and the Scope of the evaluation (2.2.1)****. If, for example, your main concern is about Effectiveness (meaning the achievement of the expected outcomes of your Budget Support programme), do not compromise the ability of the evaluators on that area by asking them to explore relevance and efficiency issues in great depth. Conversely, if you are concerned about the long-term effects of your Budget Support programme, focus their analysis on (perspectives of) Sustainability.**The following text is generic and is formulated to provide you with some standard references that are* ***to be adapted*** *in order to* ***ensure the focus of your evaluation****. Therefore, do not hesitate to drop any criterion that is not relevant to the purpose of your evaluation; this needs to be justified in the ToR.* *You may want to ask framework contractors to further refine the EQs in their Specific Contract O&M; this is a good way to check if they have understood the objective of the requested evaluation. The decision is yours; should you wish to ask them to do so, please adapt the text, accordingly.**DEVCO has developed a specific handbook focussing on evaluation tools; it is available at* [*http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol4\_en.pdf*](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol4_en.pdf) |  |

The [specific Evaluation Questions OR Issues to be addressed] as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[[9]](#footnote-10) and propose in their Inception Report 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 Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

 [Please formulate your Evaluation Questions OR your Issues to be addressed here]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Indicatively, the 4+2 Evaluation Criteria could be translated into the following Evaluation Questions; they have to be* ***adapted, prioritised*** *and* ***focused on the specific policy areas*** *targeted by the Budget Support programme*[s] *under evaluation****Try your utmost to limit the EQs or ‘issues to be addressed’ to a maximum of 10****.* ***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 EQs (or Issues to be addressed)****: this will simplify your interaction with the evaluators during their finalisation and during reporting.****On Relevance****:** *To what extent was the design of the Budget Support programme appropriate and relevant in view of the political, economic and social context in the country and its evolution?*
* *How far has the country’s political economy been taken into account in the Budget Support programme*[s]*’ design?*
* *To what extent is the programme relevant having regard to EU and national sector strategies?*

***On Efficiency****:** *Were the direct and induced outputs achieved in a cost-efficient way compared to other aid modalities? If this question is selected, clarity would need to be given on whether we refer to Budget support just as a financial flow or also including the dialogue and the Technical assistance.*
* *Were the direct and induced outputs achieved on time compared to alternatives? Again, if this question is selected, clarity would need to be given on whether we refer to Budget support just as a financial flow or also including the dialogue and the Technical assistance.*
* *To what extent has budget support contributed to greater harmonisation and alignment and reduced transaction costs of external assistance? (direct outputs)*
* *To what extent have the transaction costs associated with the management of budget support been at reasonable level compared to those related to similar programmes? Have these transaction costs decreased/increased over time? Has joint support provided with other players helped in decreasing transaction costs?*

***On Effectiveness****:** *To what extent has budget support contributed to an increased size and share of external funding subject to the government's budgetary process and to an improved predictability of aid flows? (direct outputs). Has the discretionary budget in the sector increased as consequence of the programme set up?*
* *To what extent has budget support contributed to an efficient and effective policy dialogue between the main stakeholders (government, donors, CSOs, private sector, etc.) and to well-coordinated capacity building activities, both focused on strategic government priorities? (direct outputs)*
* *Have macroeconomic indicators and Public Financial Management system been improved, and to what extent and through which mechanisms (flow of funds, policy and institutional effects, others) did Budget Support contribute to these improvements? (induced outputs)*
* *Have there been improvements in policy formulation and implementation processes, in the quality of the policy setting and in democratic accountability, and to what extent and through which mechanisms (flow of funds, policy and institutional effects, others) has Budget Support contributed to these improvements? (induced outputs)*
* *How has the level and composition of public spending changed, and with which consequences in terms of allocative and operational efficiency in the provision of public services and goods (with a focus on institutional improvements and not on their use by the final beneficiaries, which is part of the outcomes), and what was the contribution of Budget Support to the observed changes? (induced outputs)*
* *How have the M&E systems improved in the sectors supported by budget support?*
* *To what extent there have been positive changes in the outcomes of the [name and describe the policy supported] by the [name the Budget Support programme]?*

***On Impact****: please note that this type of evaluation does not look at the impact of the actions since the analysis reaches only up to the outcome level.* ***On Sustainability****:** *To what extent the [name the Budget Support programme]'s direct and induced outputs are likely to remain after the programme has come to an end? [In the case of the continuation of the programme: what is it likely to happen to the [name the Budget Support programme]'s direct and induced outputs in the event that the programme comes to an end in the next two years?*
* *To what extent the [name the Budget Support programme]'s outcomes are likely to remain after the programme has come to an end? [In the case of the continuation of the programme: what is it likely to happen to the [name the Budget Support programme]'s outcomes in the event that the programme comes to an end in the next two years?*
* *To what extent the Budget Support programme*[s] *have tackled the issue of the mobilisation of domestic revenues?*
* *To what extent the Budget Support programme*[s]*’ sustainability would have been better/worse compared to other aid modalities?*

***On EU added value****:** *To what extent the fact that [name the Budget Support programme*[s]*] has been financed through the EU has had added benefits to what would have resulted from Member States’ and other donors interventions only?*

***On Coherence with the EU and other donors’ strategy****:* * *To what extent is [name the Budget Support programme*[s]*] (its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, results, etc.) complementary and coordinated to the intervention of EU Member States and other partners in the region/country/area?*
* *To what extent is [name the Budget Support programme*[s]*] creating synergies (or duplication) with the intervention of EU Member States and involves concerted efforts by EU Member States and the EC to optimise synergies and avoid duplication?*
* *To what extent has the intervention been coherent with EU policies in the sector?*
 |  |

## Evaluation methodology

It is expected that this evaluation is based on the standard methodology for the evaluation of budget support[[10]](#footnote-11).

This methodological approach, which is explained in detail in section 2.3.1 [add this only if you decide to include section 2.3.1 in the ToR], has been thought for the undertaking of Budget Support ***Strategic*** evaluations. Budget Support ***Strategic*** evaluations are usually joint evaluations with other development partners and cover all the budget support operations that have been (or are being) implemented in a country during a relatively long period of time (usually around 10 years).

**This evaluation not being a Strategic one, it is not expected to provide information on the contribution of the Budget Support programme**[s] **[name programme**[s] **covered by the evaluation] to development outcomes or impacts.** This means that the evaluators will carry out Step 1 of the analysis and part of Step 2. Regarding Step 2, the evaluators are asked to provide information on the changes at outcome level (and at impact level, if possible) achieved by the partner country's policies supported by the [name budget support programme[s]] but not to undertake the thorough (including quantitative) analysis that would be needed to find out how much different variables contribute to the achievement of these outcomes. Indeed, the OECD-DAC methodology foresees as one of the analyses of Step 2 'the identification of the factors that have contributed to determine the key changes (or absence of changes) at impact and outcome level “. In this evaluation, the identification of such factors contributing to changes is not to be undertaken.

It is expected that the evaluators collect data related to the evolution during the [years covered by the evaluation] of the outcome and impact indicators supported by the [name the budget support programme[s]]. It is also expected that the evaluators present the evolution of the design and monitoring framework indicators between [years covered by the evaluation] in a consolidated table. In addition, the evaluation should provide information on how the Risk Management Framework has been used and a judgement on whether it served its purpose. Moreover, [ad here any other particular information you would like the evaluation provides (e.g. evolution of the donors' coordination arrangements, evolution of the policy dialogue, etc]

***2.3.1 The standard OECD/DAC methodological approach for the (strategic) evaluation of budget support*** [This section is optional. You can choose to leave it in the ToR or delete it. It depends on whether you think that it could help the contractors to better understand the methodology or you think that the reference made to the OECD DAC methodological approach in section 2.3 is enough]

This methodology combines a comprehensive evaluation framework articulated in five levels of analysis as follows:

Level 1: *Budget Support inputs:* funding, policy dialogue, disbursement conditions, complementary support measures[[11]](#footnote-12).

Level 2: *Direct outputs of Budget Support:* the country opportunities that are expected to improve as a direct consequence of the deployment of budget support inputs, e.g.: the new fiscal space created by the transfer of funds; increased predictability of funds, reduced transaction costs, a more aligned and coordinated policy dialogue and capacity strengthening activities conducive to reforms; improved monitoring of reforms; the products or services delivered by the complementary support measures.

Level 3: *Induced outputs:* expected improvements in the partner’s legal and regulatory framework, public policies, public sector spending and public sector delivery, i.e., reform steps expected to be achieved by the public institutions (and/or other stakeholders) supported by budget support, as a consequence of their appropriation and implementation of the new opportunities provided (the direct outputs). These induced outputs should facilitate the achievement of outcomes. Some examples are an increase in the number and quality of schools, the improvement of the institutional and legislative framework on prevention and repression of corruption, improved PFM systems, improved business environment (e.g. related legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, and new services). The focus is on institutional improvements and not on their use by the final beneficiaries, which is part of the outcomes.

Level 4: *Outcomes:* positive changes in the behaviour of the targeted beneficiaries – services users, economic and institutional actors – to the changes in policies, organisational management and service delivery (for example in the education sector these could be improvements in enrolment, dropout, repetition and completion rates), which are supposed to open the way towards the longer term impacts (for example in the education sector, learning achievements and literacy rates). Other examples of outcomes include increased business confidence and private sector investment, or an improvement in corruption perception. In certain cases, outcomes can also include behavioural changes at the organisational level constituting a response by institutional actors (for example in the public administration reform area these could be the increase in prosecution of cases of corruption, that would open the way toward longer-term impacts, such as the decrease of corruption perception).

Level 5: *Impact:* the expected longer term and intermediate changes leading to the achievement of the country’s strategic goals to which budget support is expected to contribute: enhanced sustainable and inclusive growth, reduced income and non-income poverty, empowerment and social inclusion of disadvantaged groups (including women), environmental protection and other impact areas, depending on the specific partnership framework, such as improvements in democracy, human rights, peace, and stabilisation.

In addition, the approach discerns three ‘steps’ in the evaluation. This ‘three step approach’ recognises the different roles of donors and government in Budget Support processes, as well as the indirect impact of Budget Support on poverty alleviation (ie. through government policies):

* The *first step* foresees an assessment of the inputs provided by Budget Support and their effect on the relationship between external assistance and the partner country’s budget and policy processes (direct outputs) as well as the induced changes in the financing and institutional framework for public spending, public policy, policy management and service delivery (induced outputs).
* The *second step* aims at an assessment of the outcomes (beneficiaries’ responses) and impacts (e.g. sustainable growth, poverty reduction, improved governance, etc.) which are achieved through the government policy(ies) supported by the Budget Support programme[s] being evaluated.
* Finally, based on the findings in step one and two, *step three* aims at a synthesis and conclusions in which way Budget Support has contributed to changes (intended but also unintended) in the partner country. It should allow matching the results of the two previous steps and help identifying the related links, if any, thereby completing the contribution assessment on the causal relationship between Budget Support and the government strategy outcomes.

## Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This chapter identifies* ***all the five typical phases of an evaluation****, and their respective outputs/products.* *The* ***proposed structuring*** *in phases is* ***adaptable as your specific evaluation may require fewer phases.*** *Depending on different factors such as the type of the evaluation, its scope, the financial means available, security conditions in the field etc.,* ***the Evaluation Manager can simplify the process*** *by, for example,* ***merging some phases (Inception and Desk; or Desk and Field) and reducing the number of outputs/products****.* *Because of its importance, the* ***Inception Phase*** *can include the Desk phase but* ***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/products*** *from the evaluation phases* ***are the Inception Note*** *(a shorter version of the Inception Report) as well as**the final outputs/products:* ***Executive Summary and 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 (e.g., the indicative workplan).* |  |

The evaluation process will be carried out in five phases [the number of phases can be reduced, see the Guidance Notes – should you do so, please ensure consistency throughout the text]:

* Inception
* Desk
* Field
* Synthesis
* Dissemination

The outputs/products of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

### Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs/products to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output/product is described in Chapter 5 and in part B that is completed directly in OPSYS.

| **Phases of the evaluation** | **Key activities** | **Outputs and *meetings*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Phase**  | * Initial document/data collection
* Background 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
 | * *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 report [Inception Note if you prefer a shorter output/product – this is a **compulsory output/product** and cannot be omitted]
* Slide presentation of the Inception Report [or Note] [as relevant]
 |
| **Desk Phase**  | * In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)
* Interviews [as relevant]
* Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase
* Methodological design of the Field Phase
 | * Desk Note [Feel free not to include any output/product for this phase if coherent with the purpose of your evaluation and the available resources]
* Slide presentation of key findings of the desk phase [as relevant]
* *Meeting with Reference Group* [as relevant; specify if face-to-face or via remote conference].
 |
| **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]
* Data collection and analysis (linked to the hypotheses to be tested in the field and in view of filling the gaps, if defined during a desk phase)
 | * *Initial meetings at country level with* [specify stakeholders/topics]
* Intermediary Note [or Field Note. Feel free not to include a note for this phase if coherent with the purpose of your evaluation and the available resources].
* 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 as such we advise not to remove it]
* *Debriefing with the Reference Group* [or with the EUD; specify if face-to-face or via remote conference]
 |
| **Synthesis phase**  | * Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)
* Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations
* Reporting
 | * Draft Final Report [mandatory]
* Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module [mandatory]
* Final Report [mandatory]
* Slide presentation [as needed]
* *Meeting with Reference Group* [as relevant; specify if face-to-face or via remote conference]
 |
| **Dissemination phase** | * Organisation of the final presentation seminar [as needed, to be specified in function of the specific dissemination activities that are requested]
 | * *Final presentation seminar* [as needed or any other dissemination output/product you may wish to ask, 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. Ensure consistency with your chapter 2.4.1]
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The previous description of each phase is generic and includes all five phases of an evaluation; you should* ***adapt it in case you wish to merge or skip some of the phases****.**Likewise,* ***the description of phases in the following chapters shall be adapted and made coherent with the table above****.* |  |

### Inception Phase

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

The phase will start with a kick-off session in [location] between [specify: the relevant EU services - define them - or the Reference Group] and the evaluators. Half-day presence of [evaluators whose presence is required] is required. 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.

[ALTERNATIVE TEXT] The phase 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 desk phase can follow from home and the evaluators will travel only at the beginning of the Field Phase] between [specify: the relevant EU services - define them - or the Reference Group] and the evaluators. Half-day presence of [evaluators whose presence is required] is required. 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 (see annex II) [should your evaluation include a Desk phase, ensure consistency between the documentary analysis to be performed in the Inception and in the Desk phases].

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to [location / sector], the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager [adapt as needed], will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Budget Support programme to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Budget Support programme that describes how change is expected to happen within the Budget Support programme, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Budget Support programme to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and 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 approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix[[12]](#footnote-13), which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive**, **contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how Budget Support programmes have contributed to progress on gender equality**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *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.*  |  |

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report [or 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. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report** [or Inception Note]; its content is described in Chapter 5 and in part B that is completed directly in OPSYS.

[The evaluation team will then, if needed, present in [place] the **Inception Report** to the Reference Group.] [Specify if the entire evaluation team has to participate or only some members, e.g. the Team Leader and other key members.]

### Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Budget Support programme. [Please specify any evaluations and research studies carried out by civil society, Government, other donors (especially EU Member States) and/or the private sector. This is to ensure a more robust approach to identifying information gaps and to ensure complementarity with evaluations that have already been done].

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected [phone / face-to-face] interviews with the [project/programme] management, the relevant EU services [be specific and define where they are based, whether in Brussels and/or in which country/ies] and key partners in [place] [the concerned country or countries; do not include if not relevant] may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

[As relevant] During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the desk phase a **Desk Note** [and/or a Slide Presentation] will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5 and in part B that is completed directly in OPSYS [delete this phrase if this is not the case].

A presentation by the evaluation team to the Reference Group, if needed, will take place in [place]. One day presence of [evaluators whose presence is required] is required (excluding travel time). [Delete / amend as needed]

### Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Note [or a Slide Presentation OR Inception Report / Note] by the Evaluation Manager.

[IF DESK PHASE HAS BEEN CONDUCTED] The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

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.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with [the project / programme management, and/or Delegation and/or local authorities and /or other relevant stakeholders].

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government [include local authorities as relevant] authorities and agencies. 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 evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with [the project /programme management, the EU Delegation, the Reference Group].

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** [AND/OR a Slide Presentation] will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5 and in part B that is completed directly in OPSYS [delete this phrase if this is not the case].

### Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

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 and then present in [place] the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence is required of – as minimum - [specify which members of the team are required to participate].

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

### Dissemination phase

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The dissemination of the results of evaluation is a key component of the capitalisation of results and various EU documents promote its practice: “Appropriate feedback mechanisms shall be provided so that all types of evaluation results are transmitted to all persons responsible for decision-making” (Commission Communication on Evaluation Standards and Good Practice (COM 2002/5267); “Delegations and Services are responsible for integrating learning into the design and implementation of new interventions” (DEVCO-EEAS Evaluation Matters, 2014); “The purpose of evaluations, namely to promote inputs to decision-making, organisational learning, accountability/transparency and efficient resource allocation, can only be achieved if the resultant information reaches all interested parties. All relevant supporting outputs (…) should therefore be disseminated in a manner suited to the potentially different audiences” (Better Regulations, tool #50).**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 Budget Support programmes 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 other 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 of additional expertise within the team.**Please consider that – by their nature - global price contracts such as evaluations are not suitable for organising events with an uncertain number of participants as their final cost will depend on the size of the attendance.*  |  |

## Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The Specific Organisation and Methodology that Framework Contractors shall submit is their Technical Offer (which also includes the CVs of the proposed evaluators), allowing you to judge the appropriateness of their approach to work.* *It is based on the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii). The text in yellow is provided as to extend the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology, which sometimes is needed as to allow the invited Framework Contractors to elaborate a proper evaluation methodology.* *In this chapter, indicate your expectations as well as any specific instructions you may have; a generic guidance text is provided.* *The deadline for submitting an offer (to be stated in the Request for Services) can be a critical factor for the possibility for Framework Contractors to secure the relevant expertise; we remind that the Art.8.1 of the Global ToR SIEA foresee ‘a minimum of 14 calendar days for Requests with a maximum budget of 300,000 EUR or less, and a minimum of 30 calendar days for Requests with a maximum budget above 300,000 EUR, from the date of dispatch of the Request (…). The Request may allow for a longer period of submission of offers, in particular to take into account factors such as the complexity of the assignment or the time of the year (e.g. holidays period) etc.’* |  |

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-I and is to be consistent with what described in the chapter 2.3 of these Terms of Reference. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology 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 Budget Support programme messages, materials and management structures.

[OPTIONAL TEXT: By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor’s own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page]

## 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 project evaluation can be steered by a small Reference Group.**For* ***specific guidance on the composition and role of the Reference Group****, please refer to* [*http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol1\_en.pdf*](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/evaluation-methods-guidance-vol1_en.pdf) *(chapter 4.2). When describing the composition of the Reference Group, please ensure consistency with the stakeholders identified in Chapter 1.3.****The Reference Group of an evaluation of a budget support programme usually includes several representatives of the partner Government (from the Ministry of Finance and from the concerned line ministries).*** |  |

### At the EU and Partner's Country level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group (RG) consisting of members of EU Services [please identify these services] and [identify the other institutions / groups that you want to include in the Reference Group such as (for example) specific Government bodies / local authorities / civil society groups / donor representatives / representatives of beneficiaries].

It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Manager:

* To ensure that the evaluation is supported by and accompanied by the [partner country’s] government and that key stakeholders are involved in the budget support evaluation;
* To launch and manage the evaluation contract;
* To verify that the evaluation team proposed covers all fields of expertise required by the ToR;
* To ensure the communication with the RG and with the most relevant stakeholders to approve all the deliverables.

The main functions of the RG are:

* To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
* To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
* To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Budget Support programme.
* To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to 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 Budget Support programme plan after completion of the evaluation.

### At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

* Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
* Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team’s work throughout the assignment.
* Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

## Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be [specify: English, French].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *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.* |  |

# Logistics and timing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The majority of section 4 of the previous evaluation ToR (Location and duration) has been moved into Part B of the OPSYS ToR. Keep the text following this hint box, without modifications.* |  |

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

## Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff[[13]](#footnote-14)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Please remember that the Annex IV is not to be filled by you but rather by the framework contractors 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 it in this chapter.* |  |

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV [(to be finalised in the Inception Report)]. 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’).

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

# requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The section 4 of the previous evaluation ToR (Expertise required) has been moved into Part B of the OPSYS ToR. Keep the text following this hint box, without modifications and refer to the guidance for the Part B.****PLEASE KINDLY NOTE****: In case of global price Specific Contracts -such evaluations-, Framework Contractors are required to submit an indicative Budget Breakdown, (which will follow the template in Annex VII(e)(ii)), showing the build-up of the global price. This will contain amongst others, the daily expert fees, the daily management fee relating to the expert and “Other details” (such as costs for dissemination and costs related to field missions).* *Costs that are to be identified by Framework Contractors in their Budget Breakdown are to be described in this chapter, after the sentence “Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.”* |  |

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

# REPORTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Both the list of outputs and their language have been moved into Part B of the OPSYS ToR.*  |  |

## For the list of reports, please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

## Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **will be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

## Comments on the outputs/products

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments 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.

## Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA’s Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

## Language

All reports shall be submitted in [indicate the chosen language].

[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].

## Number of report copies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The Maximum number of paper copies of the Final Report is set at 10 by the Global Terms of Reference (Art. 7.2). You can decrease this number in case you need a lower number of printed copies. Copies above 10 must be budgeted by the framework contractor in the Financial Offer. Do not forget to specify this in case you need a higher number of paper copies.* |  |

Apart from their submission via the EVAL Module, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in [number – max 10] paper copies [if necessary] and in electronic version [specify in which format if you have preferences and on which type of support] at no extra cost.

## Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. [Add any other specific requirement regarding formatting and layout you may have]. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The chapter titled ‘Incidental expenditure’ – included in the ToR evaluation under the previous FWC Benef - has been deleted because it applies to fee-based contracts only.**The chapter titled ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ – included in the ToR evaluation under the previous FWC Benef - has been deleted because its text (describing the use of the Quality Assessment Grid) has been included in a previous chapter.* |  |

# Monitoring and evaluation

## Content of reporting

The outputs 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 Intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).

## Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments 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.

## Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA’s Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

# practical information

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address(es): [please indicate the e-mail address of the functional mailbox used for all FWC-related communication for the current RfS]

Annexes

# Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

**SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**[Request for Services n. …….]**

**FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT [number and title of the lot]**

**EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi**

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[[14]](#footnote-15).

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid: [change the grid as needed]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *The table below is based on the standard SIEA template and is adapted to evaluation services. It proposes a maximum 50 points for O&M and 50 points for the proposed team.****Feel free to adapt the table and the proposed scoring to the specific needs of your evaluation; for instance, you may prefer a different weighing of the different elements included in the grid****. If you adapt the table, please be aware that the evaluation of the individual experts is forbidden.**Frequent alternatives to this table increase to 60 the weight for O&M; or decrease it to 40.**Please be aware that under global price contracts only the overall team can be scored and not the individual experts.* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum** |
| ***Total score for Organisation and Methodology*** | ***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** |
| * Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium
 | **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 Budget Support programme (and its effects, if already available). 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 project evaluations, whenever available, etc.)* |  |

* Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Budget Support programme[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
* Budget Support programme identification studies
* Budget Support programme feasibility / formulation studies
* Budget Support programme financing agreement and addenda
* BS programme’s quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
* European Commission’s Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Budget Support programme
* BS programme’s mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports
* 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 Budget Support programme[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 Budget Support programme.

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

The contractor will deliver – **preferably** **through their uploading in the EVAL Module** - **two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Budget Support programme, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

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

‘’*This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission*’’.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** | A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. 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. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. |

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Introduction** | A description of the Budget Support programme, 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. Answered questions / Findings** | A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning. |
| **3. Overall assessment *(optional)*** | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Budget Support programme. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria. |
| **4. Conclusions and Recommendations** |  |
|  | **4.3 Lessons learnt** | Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.  |
|  | **4.1 Conclusions** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.  |
|  | **4.2 Recommendations** | They are intended to improve or reform the Budget Support programme in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Budget Support programme for the next cycle. Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5. Annexes to the report** | The report should include the following annexes:* The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
* The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
* Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
* Evaluation Matrix
* Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
* Relevant geographic map[s] where the Budget Support programme took place
* List of persons/organisations consulted
* Literature and documentation consulted
* Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
* Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators
 |

# Annex IV: Planning schedule

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

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors 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[[15]](#footnote-16)** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Location** | **Team Leader** | **Evaluator …** | **Indicative Dates** |
| **Inception phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Desk phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Field phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (maximum)** |  |  |  |

# Annex V: Quality Assessment Grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

|  |
| --- |
| **Budget Support programme (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation data** |
| **Evaluation title** |  |
| **Evaluation managed by** |  | **Type of evaluation** |  |
| **CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract** |  | **EVAL ref.** |  |
| **Evaluation budget** |  |
| **EUD/Unit in charge** |  | **Evaluation Manager** |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | **Start:** |  | **End:** |  |
| **Date of draft final report** |  | **Date of Response of the Services** |  |
| **Comments** |  |
| **Project data** |
| **Main project evaluated** |  |
| **CRIS # of evaluated project**[s] |  |
| **DAC Sector** |  |
| **Contractor's details** |
| **Evaluation Team Leader** |  | **Evaluation Contractor** |  |
| **Evaluation expert**[s] |  |

**Legend: scores and their meaning**

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

|  |
| --- |
| **The evaluation report is assessed as follows**  |
| 1. **Clarity of the report**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:* Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
* Highlight the key messages
* The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
* Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
* Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
* Avoid unnecessary duplications
* Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
* The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Reliability of data and robustness of evidence**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which: * Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
* The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners’ relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
* The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Validity of Findings**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which: * Findings derive from the evidence gathered
* Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
* Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
* When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
* The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Validity of conclusions**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which:* Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
* Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
* Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
* Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
* (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Usefulness of recommendations**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:* Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
* Are concrete, achievable and realistic
* Are targeted to specific addressees
* Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
* (If relevant) provide advice for the Budget Support programme’s exit strategy, post-Budget Support programme sustainability or for adjusting Budget Support programme’s design or plans
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis *(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)***
 |
| **This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:*** Lessons are identified
* When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Final comments on the overall quality of the report** | **Overall score** |
|  |  |

# Annex VI: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated Budget Support programme[s]

[Please include here the Logframe[s] of the Budget Support programme[s] to be evaluated]

# Annex VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number 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).

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis will respect the new definitions of these criteria and their explanatory notes. Reference and guidance documents are being developed and can be found here: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in the chapter 2.2.1, the evaluation will assess the Action using five of the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their definitions are reported below:

**DAC CRITERIA**

* + **Relevance**: 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.”
	+ **Coherence**: the “compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”
	+ **Effectiveness**: the “extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”
	+ **Efficiency**: the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”
	+ **Sustainability**: the “extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.”

**EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION**

* + **EU added value**: the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| guidance to the online filling of part b in opsys***THIS FINAL SECTION PROVIDES GUIDANCE ON HOW TO FILL ONLINE THE SECTION B OF YOUR TOR IN OPSYS.******ALL PAGES FROM HERE TO THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE ENTIRELY DELETED BEFORE FINALISING YOUR TOR AND NOT UPLOADED IN OPSYS.*** |  |

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Please, ensure coherence with the Part A of your ToR throughout the text.*
* *(Chapter 3) - Independently from the language of the specific contract, some documentation may be available in other languages and there may be need to conduct interviews in local languages; should this be the case, do not forget to ensure consistency with your requirements in terms of linguistic skills of the team.*
 |  |

**1. Benefitting zone**

[Benefitting zone]

**2. Contracting authority**

[Contracting authority]

**3. Contract language**

[Language]

**LOCATION AND DURATION**

 **4. Location**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Option to be selected: “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request on expertise by a team”*
* *Please note that evaluations are home-based assignments; missions are done by the evaluators as needed by the methodology and depending on their place of residence (usually during Inception and/or Field).*
* *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 (e.g. as a result of a sampling for case studies), the potential places will be qualified as "tentative".*
 |  |

[If the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request individual expert per position”]

* [**Position title**]:
	+ Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: [normal place of posting of the specific assignment]
	+ Mission(s) outside the normal place(s) of posting and duration(s): [other mission locations and indicative number]
* [**Position title**]:
	+ Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: [normal place of posting of the specific assignment]
	+ Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): [other mission locations and indicative number]

Etc.

[Else if the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request on expertise by a team”]

* Normal place(s) of posting of the specific assignment: [normal place of posting of the specific assignment]
* Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): [other mission locations and indicative number]

[Else if the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Expertise not defined by C.A. (=pure global price)”]

See part A of the Terms of Reference if a normal place of posting of the specific assignment is defined.

[End if]

**5. Start date and period of implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *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.*
* *Specify that the overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, [for dissemination activities – if foreseen]) and distribution of outputs.*
* *Do not forget to ensure coherence with the duration of the assignment as you planned it in the EVAL module.*
 |  |

The indicative start date is [indicative start date] and the period of implementation of the contract will be [duration of the assignment] [days/months/years] from this date (indicative end date: [indicative end date]).

**REQUIREMENTS**

**6. Expertise**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Option to be selected: “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request on expertise by a team”. As described in the Global ToR SIEA, Art. 6.2.3, ‘The precise time inputs of the experts under a global price contract will be left to the discretion of the Framework Contractor to propose in the specific offer. However, the specific Contracting Authority may, where appropriate, decide to indicate an absolute minimum input in terms of working days and/or qualifications for one or more experts.’*
* *In correspondence with the Cat I expertise, include (under “Additional Information”) the following text: “In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Cat I expert, 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.”*
* *The expertise required must include professional evaluation skills (particularly for the Team Leader) and other expertise as needed such as, for example, sector-specific expertise, team management skills, gender expertise, communication and language skills etc.*
* *While evaluators can difficulty conduct evaluations requiring specific thematic expertise on their own, the setting up of mixed teams including professional evaluation expertise and relevant thematic expertise is in many cases an ideal configuration. In these cases, the leadership is given to a professional evaluator of an adequate seniority.*
* *Identification, monitoring, evaluation, audit and management are not synonyms and the experience acquired in each of these domains is not interchangeable. A good monitor is not necessarily a good evaluator and the same goes for auditors; therefore, please do not use formulas such as ‘the team shall have a cumulative experience of xx years in identification, management, monitoring, evaluation or audit of cooperation development projects.’*
* *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 with at least xx evaluations conducted 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.*
* *Regarding the language skills, define them according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (*[*https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr*](https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr)*) and, unless you require C2-level expertise, specify that the ToR identify minimum requirements in order not to disqualify teams possessing a higher level of expertise. The following text can be added below: “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*](https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr) *and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.”*
 |  |

[If the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request individual expert per position”]

For this assignment, one individual expert must be proposed for each position.

The expertise required for the implementation of the specific contract is detailed below.

* **[Position title]:**
* General description of the position: [General description of the position]
* Expert category: [Expert category]
* Qualifications and skills required:

[Qualification and skills required]

* General professional experience:

[General professional experience]

* Specific professional experience:

[Specific professional experience]

* Language skills: [Language skills]
* Number of working days: [**Number of working days**] days

[If “Additional information” is not empty]

* Additional information: [Additional information]

[End if]

* **[Position title]:**
* General description of the position: [General description of the position]
* Expert category: [Expert category]
* Qualifications and skills required:

[Qualification and skills required]

* General professional experience:

[General professional experience]

* Specific professional experience:

[Specific professional experience]

* Language skills: [Language skills]
* Number of working days: [**Number of working days**] days

[If “Additional information” is not empty]

* Additional information: [Additional information]

[end if.]

Etc.

[end if]

[If the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Request on expertise by a team”]

The minimum requirements covered by the team of experts as a whole are detailed below.

* Qualifications and skills required for the team:

[Qualifications and skills required]

* General professional experience of the team:

[General professional experience]

* Specific professional experience of the team:

[Specific professional experience]

* Language skills of the team: [Language skills]

Requested number of days per category:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expert category** | **Minimum requirement concerning the category** | **Number of working days** | **Additional information** |
| [Expert category] | [Minimum requirement concerning the category] | [Number of working days] | [Additional information] |
| [Expert category] | [Minimum requirement concerning the category] | [Number of working days] | [Additional information] |
| Etc… |  |  |  |

[If the “Expertise composition” of the RfS = “Expertise not defined by C.A. (=pure global price)”]

No expertise is defined by the contracting authority for this assignment. The contractor is responsible for proposing the expertise necessary to implement the specific contract.

However, the contracting authority may, where appropriate, decide to indicate an absolute minimum input in terms of working days and/or qualifications for one or more experts. If such case, please refer to Part A of the present terms of reference for additional information

[end if]

1. **Incidental expenditure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This is not applicable to evaluation contracts, which are based on global price.* |  |

[If not applicable:] No incidental expenditure provided for in this contract. [End if]

[If applicable:]

The provision for incidental expenditure covers ancillary and exceptional eligible expenditure incurred under this contract. It cannot be used for costs that should be covered by the contractor as part of its fee rates, as defined above. Its use covers:

**[Number] - [Incidental expenditure category] - [Incidental expenditure title]**

[Incidental expenditure description]

**[Number] - [Incidental expenditure category] - [Incidental expenditure title]**

[Incidental expenditure description]

**[Number] - [Incidental expenditure category] - [Incidental expenditure title]**

[Incidental expenditure description]

[If a binding total provision is defined in the RfS:] The provision for incidental expenditure for this specific contract is [EUR for direct management, ISO code of national currency for indirect management] [amount]. This amount must be included unchanged in the budget breakdown. [End if]

[End if]

If applicable, see part A of the Terms of Reference for more details on the use of the incidental expenditure.

**8. Lump sums**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This is not applicable to evaluation contracts, which are based on global price.* |  |

[If not applicable:] No lump sums provided for in this contract. [End if]

[If applicable:]

**[Number] - [Lump sum activity title]**

[**Activity description**]

Number of time the activity should be performed: **[Quantity]**

[End if]

1. **Expenditure verification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *This is not applicable to evaluation contracts, which are based on global price.* |  |

[If no Expenditure verification is required]No expenditure verification report is required [end if]

[If Expenditure verification is required for interim and final]An expenditure verification report is required for interim and final payments [end if]

[If Expenditure verification is required for final payment only]An expenditure verification report is required for final payment only [end if]

[If Expenditure verification is required]

The provision for expenditure verification covers the fees of the auditor charged with verifying the expenditure of this contract in order for the contracting authority to check that the invoices submited are due.

Tenderers are required to indicate, in their “Organisation and Methodology”, the name and address of the proposed auditor or audit firm that will be in charge of producing the expenditure verification report(s).

The provision for expenditure verification for this contract is [EUR for direct management, ISO code of national currency for indirect management] [provision amount]. This amount must be included unchanged in the budget breakdown.

[If comment not empty] Comment: [Comment] [End if]

[end if]

**REPORTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *The OPSYS template moved to Part B the list of Outputs (previously, chapter 5.1).**The table in this box is provided as guidance for the online filling of the chapter 10 in OPSYS.**It* ***should be adapted*** *and the outputs be consistent with what indicated in the Chapter 2.3.1, (Synoptic table). For instance, if you have merged (example) Inception phase and Desk phase you will have just one Inception and Desk report.*

| **Title** | **Content** | **Submission timing or deadline** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Inception Report [or Inception Note – compulsory requirement, it cannot be skipped] | * 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
 | End of Inception Phase |
| Desk Report [or Note] | * Preliminary answers to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information
* Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit
* [Update of the field visit approach if relevant]
* [Update of the work plan of the following phases if relevant]
 | End of the Desk Phase |
| Intermediary Report [or Note] | * Activities conducted during the field phase
* Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted
* Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field ones)
 | End of the Field Phase |
| Draft Final Report [compulsory requirement, it cannot be skipped] | * **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**
 | End of Synthesis Phase |
| Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template [compulsory requirement, it cannot be skipped] | * **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**
 | End of Synthesis Phase |
| Final report [compulsory requirement, it cannot be skipped] | * 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. |
| Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template [compulsory requirement, it cannot be skipped] | * Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted
 | Together with the final version of the Final Report |

 |  |

**10. Reports requirements**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Content** | **Language** | **Submission timing or deadline** |
| [type] | [Description of content] | [Language] | [submission timing or deadline] |
| [type] | [Description of content] | [Language] | [submission timing or deadline] |
| [type] | [Description of content] | [Language] | [submission timing or deadline] |

1. The ToR template and guidance was developed and is used by DG DEVCO, DG NEAR and FPI; references to DEVCO included in these Guidance Notes may need to be adapted as to take into account DG NEAR and FPI evaluation policies and procedures. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Note of the Director-General Mr Manservisi 12/09/2016 (Ref. Ares(2016)5167746) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The term ‘Action’ is used throughout the report as a synonym of ‘project and programme’. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/Methodological%20approach%20BS%20evaluations%20Sept%202012%20_with%20cover%20Thi.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 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-6)
6. 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-7)
7. Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and s. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 “Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action” - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\_cir.pdf. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. 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-9)
9. The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action[s] under evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. See OECD/DAC (2012), Evaluating Budget Support. Methodological Approach, Paris. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/Methodological%20approach%20BS%20evaluations%20Sept%202012%20_with%20cover%20Thi.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. This will typically include one or more of the following: i) capacity development measures aimed at strengthening the capacity of the public institutions to coordinate, implement, monitor, evaluate and communicate the public policy in question; ii) capacity development measures aimed at strengthening the capacity of civil society to contribute to the implementation and monitoring of public policies; iii) monitoring, evaluation and supervision TA of the EU-funded action; and iv) support for the design and implementation of a visibility and communication strategy. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions, [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - <https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Add one column per each evaluator [↑](#footnote-ref-16)