**INTRODUCTION to the TERMS OF REFERENCE and GUIDANCE NOTES**

**for EVALUATIONS of INTERVENTIONS (SIEA 2018[[1]](#footnote-2))**

**-VERSION WITHOUT OPSYS – COMPATIBLE WITH SIEA TOR-**

**Version 2.0.2.-b, March 2022**

**Objective of the Terms of Reference (ToR) Template and Guidance Notes**

This Terms of Reference Template and the related Guidance Notes serve to support the work of Operation Managers in EU Delegations (EUDs), and Project Managers in INTPA, NEAR and FPI Headquarters (hereafter, the **Evaluation Managers**) during the preparation of Terms of Reference (hereafter, **ToR**) for **intervention-level** **evaluations** (previously: project and programme evaluations) to be contracted **through the FWC SIEA 2018 (EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi)**.

This template is to be used for:

* evaluations of single interventions
* evaluations of multiple, logically inter-linked interventions
* thematic evaluations at regional or country level (which will require adaptations).

**This template is not to be used for strategic evaluations.**

**Types of evaluation and form of contract**

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

**Evaluation contracts** **must be concluded as** **global price contracts** (ref: [PRAG, Chapter 3.2.1](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/prag/document.do?nodeNumber=3.2.1)); this template is coherent with this payment modality.

**Structure of this document**

The document is structured to fit those evaluation contracts that are not managed under OPSYS.

**Guidance boxes**

|  |
| --- |
| *This template contains several guidance boxes with advice for drafting the ToR. They should be deleted before finalising your document.* |

**Standard and additional/optional text**

*Standard text*: The template contains standard text that can be used as is, without any amendments.

*Additional text*: Text underlined in yellow and included within square brackets is optional or to be adapted/replaced with specific references to your evaluation.

[This is an example of 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 by Evaluation Managers and contractors respectively).

The **use of the EVAL module has been compulsory** for DG INTPA and for DG NEAR since September 2016[[2]](#footnote-3), and for FPI since August 2018, and will continue to be so until its complete integration into OPSYS.

**Need for further support?**

This template is part of a package of services for Evaluation Managers, which include (for **INTPA**) the support provided by the Evaluation Support Service (ESS), Unit D4. The ESS is available to support you in planning or implementing your evaluation, discussing the objectives of your evaluation and reviewing your ToR, the evaluation reports and other evaluation deliverables. You can contact them via email at [helpdesk@evaluationsupport.eu](mailto: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](mailto:near-eval-monitoring@ec.europa.eu).

For **FPI**, please send your requests for assistance via email to: [fpi-evaluation@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fpi-evaluation@ec.europa.eu).

***Chronology of versions***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *1.0* | *September 2018* | *The first version of this document* |
| *1.1* | *November 2018* | *Minor changes made 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* |
| *2.0* | *October 2021* | * *Revision of the document following a wide consultation process and analysis of lessons from its use* * *Renaming DEVCO as INTPA* |
| *2.0.1* | *December 2021* | *Correction of minor typos, hyperlinks, and cross-references* |
| *2.0.2* | *March 2022* | *Minor edits, clarification of terms, hyperlinks, and cross-references* |
| *2.0.2-b* | *March 2022* | *Adaptation of the ToR template 2.0.2. for evaluations not managed in OPSYS (case of the EUTF)* |

**Evaluation ToR Completion Checklist**

This checklist helps you to verify that your ToR are ready for revision. Please fill it before you share them for review[[3]](#footnote-4).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context of the evaluation** (Section 1. and Annexes) | | ToR Reference | Yes/No |
|  | Have you provided relevant **contextual background?** | 1.1 |  |
|  | Have you provided **concise background information on the intervention(s)** and its (their) evolution during the period under evaluation (in past tense)? | 1.2 |  |
|  | Have you described the **Intervention Logic** (or **Theory of Change**)underpinningthe intervention(s) to be evaluated**?** | 1.2 |  |
|  | Have you **annexed the most recent LogFrame(s)?** | Annex-I |  |
|  | Have you **summarised results from previous evaluations or monitoring/ROM missions** (even if financed by other agencies)? | 1.4 |  |
| **Evaluation mandate and structuring** (Section 2.) | | ToR Reference | Yes/No |
|  | Have you defined the **objectives** of your evaluation (why the evaluation is needed, what purpose the results will be used for)? | 2.1 |  |
|  | Have you defined who will be the **key users** of your evaluation? | 2.1 |  |
|  | Have you considered the **DAC evaluation criteria** in relation to the type of evaluation and its objectives, e.g., by eliminating those that are not essential, and justifying this? | 2.1 |  |
|  | Have you developed a set of **Indicative** **Evaluation Questions**, organised in a meaningful way (by DAC+EU criteria or by transversal and/or thematic clusters)? | 2.2 |  |
|  | Is the total **number of Evaluation Questions** between 6 and 10? | 2.2 |  |
|  | Are **most of your questions open ended** and focused on ‘why’ and ‘how’? | 2.2 |  |
|  | Do your Indicative Evaluation questions **refer to gender, age, and disability disaggregated information** (where relevant)? | 2.2 |  |
|  | Is there clear **coherence** between the **objectives** of the evaluation (2.1), the **evaluation criteria** (2.1) and the **Indicative** **Evaluation** **Questions** (2.2)? | 2.1, 2.2 |  |
|  | Have you **considered your evaluation phases**, even in relation to the possibility of doing field work? | 2.3 |  |
|  | Have you **included an evaluation dissemination phase**? | 2.3 |  |
|  | Did you choose **appropriate Reference Group members?** This will be between three and six participants selected from among your colleagues and other stakeholders. | 2.5 |  |
|  | Did you check for a **consistent description** (terminology, timing, etc.) of the **outputs** for each phase of your evaluation throughout the ToR chapters ? | 2.3, Annex V |  |
| **Evaluation Team** (Section 3 & 4) | | ToR Reference | Yes/No |
|  | Have you described the **expertise required**, by category of experts (not per single expert)? | 3 |  |
|  | Does your ToR assign **team leadership to a professional evaluator** of suitable seniority? | 3 |  |
|  | Have you defined the **minimum number of evaluators per category**? | 3 |  |
|  | Have you defined the **minimum number of working days per category**? | 3 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Before finalising your ToR, please delete the Introduction, this checklist, the guidance boxes and complete/adapt the parts highlighted in yellow.*** |

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE**

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

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

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

**[CRIS/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]

|  |
| --- |
| *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).* |
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# BACKGROUND

|  |
| --- |
| *The objective of this chapter is to provide a summarised,* ***descriptive overview of the intervention(s) to be evaluated*** *(****not of the evaluation assignment****, which is described in Chapter 2). It aims to provide the key information required for framework contractors to contextualise the intervention to be evaluated.*  *The chapter should* ***be factual and not contain judgement on the results or the performance*** *of the intervention to be evaluated so as 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 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 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 adapt the title to reflect your specific evaluation, and to use sub-chapters if you prefer.*  *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 intervention 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.* |

Develop your text here

## The intervention[s] to be evaluated[[4]](#footnote-5)

|  |
| --- |
| *The following table may require adaptation in case of complex evaluations, such as thematic evaluations at regional or country level.*  *If your evaluation covers more than one intervention, use bullet points to indicate the required information for each of these interventions. If you prefer, include a different table for each intervention to be evaluated.*  *Please consult the relevant support services in your DG/service in case of doubt.* |

This evaluation covers [indicate number] interventions financed by the EU in the [indicate sector(s) as relevant] sector as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Title[s] of the intervention[s] to be evaluated |  | |
| Budget[s] of the intervention[s] to be evaluated |  | |
| CRIS and/or OPSYS number[s] of the intervention[s] to be evaluated |  | |
| Dates of the intervention[s] to be evaluated | * Start date: | xx/xx/xxxx |
| * End date: | xx/xx/xxxx |

|  |
| --- |
| *This chapter should contain the description of the* ***intervention(s)*** *to be evaluated, as well as its/their* ***context****: the strategic programming framework(s) within which the intervention(s) is/are framed, the rationale behind the EU approach to the provision of support to the sector/theme to tackle the issues described in Chapter 1.1 and its evolution over time.*  *After this contextualisation, move to the description of* ***the intervention(s) to be evaluated and its Intervention Logic/Theory of Change****.*  *It is important that framework contractors understand elements such as the rationale behind the intervention(s), the evolution over time of the relevant EU approach, the time span of the intervention(s) and its/their budget, possible sources of co-financing, how the intervention links with other interventions financed by the EU or other donors and any further relevant information.*  *Do not hesitate to* ***add weblinks*** *to available documents that can enhance the framework contractors’ understanding of the intervention.*  ***Describe the Intervention Logic of the intervention(s) to be evaluated and the assumptions explaining how the intervention(s) is/are expected to attain results with the given inputs and activities*** *(i.e., the Theory of Change underlying the intervention(s)). In the case of multiple interventions, these should be described one by one, in the same sequence used in the previous table(s).*  ***Include*** *in* ***Annex I to the ToR*** *the* *Logical Framework Matrix (****LogFrame****) of the intervention(s) and/or its/their Theory of Change (ToC). The Intervention Logic and/or a detailed Theory of Change[[5]](#footnote-6) with assumptions is the* ***central instrument for an evaluation as most of the Evaluation Questions should derive from this and the analysis to be carried out by evaluators should refer to this instrument.***  *If you are using this ToR template for a thematic evaluation, the relevant sections of the results (and indicators) from the programming documents that govern EU support to the sector within the country should also be annexed.*  *Evaluation Managers and evaluators have a common interest in a clearly articulated Intervention Logic and its underlying assumptions for the measurement of expected changes. The assumptions are the positive conditions (outside of an intervention’s control) that are necessary for the achievement of the desired changes (delivery of outputs and achievement of outcomes). Further to developing the narrative of the Intervention Logic, you could also opt for transposing it into a diagram other than the LogFrame.*  *If the Intervention Logic or programme theory have evolved over time for any reason (such as a change in context, existing evidence base, operational priorities), highlight these changes to help framework contractors to prepare their offer (O&M – Organisation and Methodology). This will help the evaluation team to finalise/reconstruct the* ***Intervention Logic*** *during the Inception Phase and reflect an updated and* ***shared vision*** *of the intended causal chain underpinning the intervention(s).*  *For guidance on the INTPA intervention cycle please* [*click here*](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/PCM/Introduction)*.*  *For NEAR guidance on the definition of the Intervention Logic (IL),* [*please click here*](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/NEARGuidelines/DEFINING+THE+INTERVENTION+LOGIC)*; for examples of IL diagrams,* [*please click here*](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/NEARGuidelines/Examples)*.*  *For FPI guidance and manuals* [*please click here*](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/ProjectManagement/Pages/Index.aspx)*.* |

Develop your text here

## Stakeholders of the intervention

|  |
| --- |
| *This chapter should describe the key stakeholders of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, their role and involvement in the intervention, and how the intervention is expected to directly or indirectly impact on them (positively or negatively).*  *Feel free to use either the following table (which can be adapted[[6]](#footnote-7)) or to formulate your own text in a free format.*  *A stakeholder map may exist, in which case you may want to attach it as an annex to the ToR. The evaluators will refine and finalise this during the Inception phase in order to identify the key informants to be interviewed/surveyed.* |

The following table describes the key stakeholders of the intervention.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder groups | Role and involvement in the intervention | How the intervention is expected to impact on the stakeholder group |
| Implementing partners |  |  |
| National partners |  |  |
| Target groups |  |  |
| End beneficiaries |  |  |

## Previous internal and external monitoring (incl. ROM), evaluations and other studies undertaken

|  |
| --- |
| *This chapter serves to summarise (even in tabular form) the key conclusions of previous internal monitoring reports, ROM or evaluation missions of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, if they exist. If no previous ROM or evaluation missions were conducted, please indicate “No previous ROM or evaluations conducted”. Please also specify any relevant evaluations and/or 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 analyses that have already been done.* |

Develop your text here

# DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |
| --- |
| *The selection of the* ***type of evaluation*** *is crucial and has a* ***direct impact on the methodological approach and on the Evaluation Questions*** *which will be finalised later. Evaluations can be conducted at different times in the intervention cycle and, as a result, will serve different purposes.*   * ***Mid-term evaluations*** *(performed* ***mid-way during implementation*** *of an intervention) should focus on progress to date. By explaining* ***why*** *progress is happening, or is not happening as planned, they should provide recommendations on how to improve the intervention during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. They should also serve to prepare new interventions and encompass both forward- and backward-looking perspectives.* * ***Final evaluations*** *take place at the* ***operational closure of an intervention*** *and should contribute to accountability by providing an assessment of the results achieved. Furthermore, they should contribute to learning by explaining the factors that made possible, or hindered, the achievement of results (their focus is therefore on* ***why****, not only on* ***what****), and by identifying any key lessons that would lead to improved future interventions in the country/region/sector of operation and/or elsewhere.* * ***Ex post evaluations*** *take place* ***one to two years after an intervention has closed*** *and should focus on the impact and sustainability of a given intervention in order to draw conclusions that may inform further interventions. In addition, they should not only describe what has been achieved (or what the intervention contributed to) but particularly* ***why*** *and* ***upon what conditions*** *results have been (or have not been) achieved.*   *In the evaluation of multiple interventions, their type, coverage, geographic scope and the period to be evaluated may differ. In this case, refer to them in the initial table one by one (or use multiple tables), in the same sequence used in the table(s) in Chapter 1.2.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | [mid-term / final / ex-post] |
| Coverage | [the particular component of the intervention(s) to be evaluated; this can also be the intervention(s) in its/their entirety] |
| Geographic scope | [the location of the intervention(s) to be evaluated; this can be a group of countries, a single country, a province in a country, etc.] |
| Period to be evaluated | [the time period of the intervention(s) to be evaluated; this can be the entire period of the intervention 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 and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[[7]](#footnote-8) of the European Commission[[8]](#footnote-9). The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results[[9]](#footnote-10)** of interventions in the context ofan evolving cooperation policy, withincreasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the achievement of the SDGs.**[[10]](#footnote-11)

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether and how the EU intervention(s) has/have contributed to the achievement of these results** 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 performance of the [name of the intervention[s] to be evaluated]*,* paying particular attention to its different levels of 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 interventions.

|  |
| --- |
| *The above text does not require changes – just complete the parts in yellow.* |

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

|  |
| --- |
| *Please describe* ***in a few words******why your specific evaluation is needed.***  *By doing so* ***focus on the top priorities of your evaluation*** *(what* ***use*** *will you make of the* ***results*** *of this evaluation?). These can be* ***2-3 maximum.***  *Examples (feel free to modify and adapt to your case, being as specific as possible):*   * *To inform the project XXX exit strategy to ensure the sustainability of its results* * *To inform the next phase of programming in the sector...* * *To inform decision-making on the appropriateness and thematic priorities of a second phase of the intervention* * *To draw lessons that can be replicated in other EU interventions in the social sectors of countries in the region...* * *To be accountable for the use of EU resources in relation to the results of the program XX* * *To report transparently on EU support to the YYY sector in country XXX* |

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 intervention 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 and other stakeholders that were not involved in the implementation phase may be the final beneficiaries of the intervention; some may have been involved in the design of the intervention.*  *INTPA: more information about the concept of users of an evaluation can be found by clicking* [*here*](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/utilisation-0#anchor1)*.* |

|  |
| --- |
| *The following text refers to the* ***DAC evaluation criteria*** *as redefined in December 2019; their full definition as well as the guidance on their use can be found* [*by clicking here*](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)*.*  *The text in this chapter refers to the 6 DAC+1 EU evaluation criteria. However, the specific scope of your evaluation* ***may suggest that it is not necessary to cover all the DAC criteria, but*** *this* ***needs to be justified in the ToR****, as requested by the Better Regulation package (SWD (2015) 111,* [*tool #47*](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en)*[[11]](#footnote-12)).*  *For instance, in some cases during a mid-term evaluation it may be premature to assess impact and/or sustainability; and conversely, during an ex-post evaluation it may be too late to assess relevance or efficiency and more cost-effective to focus the attention of evaluators on impact and sustainability. You may also want to ask evaluators to reflect on additional evaluation criteria beyond the standard 6 DAC+1 EU ones, such as conflict sensitivity, coordination, or visibility.*  *Due to its importance, directly stemming from the principle of subsidiarity defined in* [*Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union*](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity) *and applied to areas of non-exclusive competence of the EU, it is not advisable to omit the EU Added Value criterion from the evaluation analysis. For more detailed guidance on the importance of this criterion, please refer to the Better Regulation Guidelines on evaluation and fitness check,* [*chapter 3.6*](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/better-regulation-guidelines-evaluation-fitness-checks.pdf).  *Please consult the relevant evaluation services in your DG/service in case of doubt.* |

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

[In case you deleted some of the DAC criteria, you should justify this decision; use this text as a guidance and adapt it as relevant] The evaluation will not analyse the [indicate the criteria that are not to be covered by the evaluation] of the intervention(s). This is justified by the fact that [add your justification].

The **definitions** of the 6 DAC + 1 EU **evaluation criteria** are contained for reference in **Annex II**.

Furthermore, the evaluation team should consider whether **gender equality and women’s empowerment**[[12]](#footnote-13), **environment** and **adaptation to climate change** were mainstreamed; the relevant **SDGs and their interlinkages** were identified; the principle of **Leave No One Behind** and the **Human Rights-Based Approach** was followed during design, and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

|  |
| --- |
| *The cross-cutting issues mentioned above are the most common ones used in evaluations but feel free to adapt them and/or add new ones such as innovation, scaling up, poverty reduction, public administration reform principles or others you consider appropriate.* |

## Indicative Evaluation Questions

|  |
| --- |
| *This chapter should contain the indicative evaluation* ***questions the evaluators are requested to answer****.*  ***The Evaluation Questions (EQs) define what the evaluation should focus on, have a primary impact on the methodology that the evaluators will develop, and determine the findings that will be produced by the evaluation.***  *The* ***EQs*** *can be organised according to* ***different, alternative and meaningful criteria****:*   * *by the* ***selected evaluation criteria*** *(6 DAC + the EU Added Value, see chapter 2.1). In this case, each criterion that you selected in chapter 2.1 should be covered by at least one Evaluation Question.* * *by* ***clusters*** *covering* ***transversal******areas*** *such as i) policy framework and responsiveness, ii) management and governance (institutional set-up), iii) EU cooperation potential (Team Europe approach) and EU added value, iv) partnerships (engagement, co-ordination and complementarity with other key stakeholders at local, regional, national and/or international level). Feel free to define the transversal areas that are the most relevant to your evaluation if you decide to go for this option.* * *by* ***thematic******areas****.*   *If you organise your EQs by transversal and/or thematic areas (the recommended option in the case of NEAR), one or more evaluation criteria would be covered at the same time within each area.*    *The EQs* ***must be agreed******with the Reference Group****. Ideally, this should happen before finalising the ToR but, if not possible, during approval of the Inception Report.*  *Here are some* ***hints*** *for formulating your EQs.*   * ***Ensure consistency among the evaluation objectives****, its* ***scope*** *(chapter 2.1) and the* ***Evaluation Questions****.* * ***Avoid*** *excessively* ***generic formulations****; tailor the EQs to the specificities of the intervention(s) to be evaluated and the context within which they take place.* * *If you organise your EQs by evaluation criteria,* ***do not******copy******the standard definition of the evaluation criteria****.* * *Use straightforward,* ***plain language****.* * ***Opt for open-ended rather than closed questions****, e.g.:*    + *In the case of questions organised by evaluation criteria: which factors critically influenced the efficient implementation/delivery of support?*   + *In the case of questions organised by transversal clusters: to what extent has(ve) the EU intervention(s) been designed and implemented to maximise the European (i.e., Commission + EEAS + EU Member States) cooperation potential and the EU added value?*   + *In the case of questions organised by thematic clusters: to what extent has(ve) the EU intervention(s) contributed to improvements in sustainable production practices?* * *Construct* ***clear hypotheses to be tested*** *by the evaluation (e.g., how, and to what extent, does the provision of electricity in community X impact on gender equality?).* * *If possible,* ***relate the question to available evidence*** *(e.g., to what extent, and how, does the 30% increase in children’s participation in sports activities, as referenced in the document xxxxxxx, contribute to the achievement of higher school performance?).* * *If possible,* ***address a known gap*** *(e.g., as a follow-up to the previous question, you could add ‘when answering the question, the team will assess whether and how gender/minority/income differences affect participation and school performance’.)* * ***Limit the number of EQs to a maximum of 10*** *(this is a maximum number; you can have a good evaluation with only 5-6 well-tailored questions). The more questions you add, the less time the evaluators will have to address them properly, which will have a negative impact on the quality and usefulness of the evaluation report. Remember, the evaluation team will develop the judgement criteria through which the Evaluation Questions will be answered thereby addressing specific aspects and further defining the scope.* * *Do not forget to* ***number your EQs****; this will simplify your interaction with the evaluators during their finalisation and reporting.*   For more information about the formulation of Evaluation Questions in INTPA please [click here](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/preparing-evaluation-question-0).  For NEAR guidance (including examples) [please click here](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/NEARGuidelines/Evaluation+questions).  For FPI guidance please consult the [FPI Manual](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/ProjectManagement/Pages/Index.aspx) and the specific [guidance for policy instruments](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/Pages/Specific-guidance-by-PolicyInstruments.aspx).  *You may want to ask framework contractors to further refine and develop one or two of 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 and if their methodology is sound. The decision is yours; should you ask them to do so, please adapt the text accordingly.* |

The specific EQs, as formulated below, are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, and further to the finalisation/reconstruction of the Intervention Logic of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, the evaluation team will discuss these with the Evaluation Manager[[13]](#footnote-14) and Reference Group and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions. This will include an 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 indicative Evaluation Questions here]

## Structuring of the evaluation and outputs

|  |
| --- |
| *This chapter identifies* ***the key phases of an evaluation*** *and their respective outputs.*  *The* ***structuring of the evaluation as proposed*** *in this template is* ***adaptable.*** *Depending on different factors such as the type of evaluation, its scope, the financial means available or security conditions in the field,* ***you can simplify the process*** *by* ***merging the desk with the field activities within the interim phase[[14]](#footnote-15); or by deleting the field activities if local missions are not possible****.*  *The three phases: Inception, Interim and Synthesis cannot be omitted. Regarding Dissemination, please refer to the next guidance box.*  *The recent Covid-19 Pandemic has taught us that* ***access to the field is not always possible,*** *and in some cases, remote methods of evaluation should be considered; when structuring your evaluation, assess whether field activities are feasible, and to what extent. Please consult your DG/service, relevant evaluation services in case of doubt, and refer to the resources available through the two ESS/INTPA initiatives* [***Evaluation in Hard-to-Reach Areas*** *and* ***Evaluation in Crisis***](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess)*. These links are also added in the footnote to Chapter 2.4 for sharing with framework contractors.*  *The* ***minimum required outputs*** *from the evaluation are* ***the Inception Report*** *as well as**the* ***Final Report (including its Executive Summary)****.*  *Please* ***adapt the text and tables*** *below and throughout the template so they are consistent with your choices.* |

The evaluation process will be carried out in [specify the number of phases] phases and [specify the number of activities] activities:

* Inception phase
* Interim phase
  + Desk activities
  + Field activities
* Synthesis phase
* Dissemination phase

Throughout the evaluation and following approval of the Inception Report, if any significant deviation from the work plan could compromise the quality of the evaluation or jeopardise the completion of the specific contract within the contractual timeframe, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures taken.

### Inception Phase

Objectives of the phase: to structure the evaluation and clarify the key issues to be addressed.

Main activities of evaluators during the Inception Phase

* Initial review of background documents (see Annex IV).
* [Remote/face-to-face] kick-off session [if face-to-face, specify the location] between [specify: the relevant EU services - define them - or the Reference Group] and the evaluators. Objectives of the meeting: i) to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility; ii) to clarify the expectations of the evaluation; iii) to illustrate the tentative methodology to be used; iv) any other relevant objectives.
* Initial interviews with key stakeholders.
* Finalisation or reconstruction of the description of the Intervention Logic/Theory of Change and its underlying assumptions. This requires an assessment of the evidence (between the hierarchy of results e.g., outputs, outcomes and impact) and the assumptions necessary for the intervention to deliver change as planned.
* Graphic representation of the reconstructed/finalised Intervention Logic/Theory of Change.
* Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and on the reconstructed Intervention Logic.
* Finalisation of the evaluation methodology, including the definition of judgement criteria and indicators per Evaluation Question, the selection of data collection tools and sources. The methodology should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and assess if, and how, interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.
* [For a thematic evaluation or an evaluation covering multiple interventions add the following text as necessary] the methodology will include the proposed representative sample of interventions to be analysed in greater detail to inform the assessment of performance and results/sustainability. The selection of this sample should be underpinned by a clear methodology (incl. selection criteria used).
* Representation of the methodological approach in an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex IV).
* Workplan of subsequent phases.
* Identification of the expected risks and limitations of the methodology, and of the envisaged mitigation measures.
* Preparation of the Inception Report; its content is described in Annex V.
* [Remote/face-to-face] presentation of the Inception Report [if face-to-face, specify the location] to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
* Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.

### Interim Phase

This phase is entirely devoted to gathering and analysing the information required to provide preliminary answers to the EQs. Work in this phase will consist of two activities [adapt this and the following text as needed].

1. Desk activities - review of documentation and interviews with key stakeholders and other initial data collection using different tools such as surveys.
2. Field activities - further data collection and analysis with the aim of testing the hypotheses identified during the ‘Desk activities’.

#### Desk activities

Objectives of the activities: to analyse the relevant data, draft preliminary answers to the Evaluation Questions and identify the hypotheses to be tested.

Main activities of evaluators

* In-depth analysis of relevant documents and other sources. This is to be done systematically and should reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.
* Identification of interviewees [remote/face-to-face] and other sources of information to support the analysis of data, as relevant.
* [As relevant] fine-tuning of the evaluation tools.
* [As relevant] finalisation of the organisation of the field visits, including list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.
* Formulation of the preliminary responses to each Evaluation Question, with analysis of their validity and limitations.
* Identification of the issues still to be covered and of the preliminary hypotheses to be tested during field activities.
* Preparation of the Desk Report; its content is described in Annex V. [For INTPA, this can be skipped and replaced by a slide presentation].
* [Alternative option for FPI for evaluation of small interventions] preparation of a Desk Note.
* Preparation of a slide presentation of preliminary findings from the desk activities (free format).
* [Remote/face-to-face] presentation of the preliminary findings from the desk activities [if face-to-face, specify the location] to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
* Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments [For INTPA and FPI: delete this bullet if no Desk Report is requested].
* [Alternative text for FPI if a Desk Note is chosen] consideration of the comments to the Desk Note to be addressed in the next reports.

#### Field activities

Objectives of the activities: to conduct primary research and validate/modify the hypotheses formulated during the desk activities.

Main activities of evaluators

* Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
* Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders, including the relevant government [and local] authorities and agencies, throughout the field activities.
* Use of the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respecting the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and being sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local, social and cultural environments, throughout the field activities.
* Preparation of the Intermediary Field Note; its content is described in Annex V. [This can be replaced by a slide presentation – see following bullet].
* Preparation of a slide presentation of intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions (to be tested with the Reference group) (For INTPA and FPI: free format; for NEAR: please refer to the [template published here](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/near/whatwedo/monitoring-evaluation-results/Documents/Reports%20templates%20for%20NEAR%20evaluations.zip)).
* [Remote/face-to-face] presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions [if face-to-face, specify the location] to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.

#### Desk and field activities

[In case the two activities are merged, this text should be used as an alternative to the description of the documentation and field activities (in this case the two previous chapters 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2 should be deleted). In case the two activities are kept separate, this chapter 2.3.2.3 should be deleted].

Objective of the phase: to analyse the relevant secondary data and conducting primary research.

Main activities of evaluators

* Completion of in-depth analysis of relevant documents and other secondary sources, to be done systematically and to reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.
* Selected [remote/face-to-face] interviews to support the analysis of secondary data, as relevant.
* Formulation of the preliminary responses to each Evaluation Question, with analysis of their validity and limitations.
* Identification of the issues still to be covered and of the preliminary hypotheses to be tested during primary research.
* [Remote/face-to-face] [specify the location] presentation of the preliminary findings emerging from the desk review (incl. gaps and hypotheses to be tested in the field) to kick-off the in-country portion of this Interim Phase, supported by a slide presentation.
* Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
* Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders, including the relevant government [include and local authorities as relevant] authorities and agencies, throughout the Interim Phase.
* Use of the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respecting the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and being sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local, social and cultural environments, throughout the Interim Phase. Preparation of the Intermediary Note; its content is described in Annex V.
* Preparation of a slide presentation of intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions (to be tested with the Reference group) (For INTPA and FPI: free format; for NEAR: please refer to the [template published here](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/near/whatwedo/monitoring-evaluation-results/Documents/Reports%20templates%20for%20NEAR%20evaluations.zip)).
* [Remote/face-to-face] presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions [if face-to-face, specify the location] to the Reference Group, supported by the slide presentation.

### Synthesis Phase

Objectives of the phase: to report on results from the evaluation (final answers to the Evaluation Questions (final findings) and formulate conclusions and recommendations).

Main activities of evaluators

* Analysis and synthesis of the evidence and data collected during the previous phases to provide a final answer to the Evaluation Questions.
* Preparation of the Draft Final Report; its content is described in Annex V.
* [Remote/face-to-face] presentation of the Draft Final Report [if face-to-face, specify the location] to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
* Preparation of a response to the draft QAG (Quality Assessment Grid) formulated by the Evaluation Manager via the EVAL module[[15]](#footnote-16).
* Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report, and uploading it to the EVAL module; its content is described in Annex V. 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 evaluators must explain the reasons in writing (free format).
* Preparation of the Executive Summary and upload to the EVAL module by using the compulsory format given in the module.
* Inclusion of an executive summary (free text format) in the Final Report (see Annex V).

The evaluators 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 taking place already.
* the wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, considers the audience as identified in Art. 2.1 above.

### Dissemination Phase

Objective of the phase: to support the communication of the results of the evaluation. In particular [specify as much as possible your dissemination objectives in a context-specific manner].

The targeted audience will be [describe your targeted audience, being as specific as possible].

Main activities of evaluators

* [Specify in bullet point format, the activities to be conducted by evaluators and the dissemination products to be delivered, including their duration (for videos and podcasts) or length (for infographics and other printed materials).]

References: the team should take inspiration from the ESS/INTPA work on **Dissemination of Evaluation Results** at <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations>; this contains an analysis of best practices in 12 international organisations and NGOs plus five ‘how-to’ guides on the production of infographics, briefs, videos, blogs and podcasts.

|  |
| --- |
| *The dissemination of the results of evaluations 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 the ideal occasion for disseminating the evaluation results.*  *Dissemination very much depends on your specific needs. This chapter should describe the main actions you can expect from the evaluation team regarding the dissemination of the evaluation results. This could include the production of infographics, briefs, videos, blogs, podcasts, or other communication products. In order for this phase to be effective you should clearly specify your dissemination objectives and the expected users of such products.*  *If a dissemination seminar of the Report is planned, you should specify the location of the event, which team members should be present and whether it will be a remote, face-to-face, or semi-remote event. Specify, to the extent possible, its duration, and any other elements impacting on its cost (such as the number of participants, the coverage of some logistic expenses...).*  *The dissemination activities that are expected from the evaluation team should be described with a sufficient level of detail, as they will have an impact on the overall budget of the evaluation and often require the hiring of additional expertise.*  *By their nature, global price contracts are not suitable for organising events with an uncertain number of participants or when logistical support needs (e.g., interpretation, protocol, security) are not precisely defined in advance, as their final cost will depend on all these elements. In this case, another contract may be foreseen with a logistics/communication contractor, outside the evaluation contract. The evaluation contract will have to foresee the contribution in terms of experts’ presence and design of dissemination materials.* |

### Overview of deliverables and meetings and their timing

The synoptic table below presents an overview of the deliverables to be produced by the evaluation team, the key meetings with the Reference Group (including the Evaluation Manager) as described previously, as well as their timing.

|  |
| --- |
| *Ensure consistency of the content of the following table with the content of the previous chapters, which you may have adapted (e.g., replacement of the Desk Report with a slide presentation in case of INTPA and FP or merging of field and desk activities).* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation phases** | **Deliverables and *meetings*** | **Timing** |
| **Inception phase** | * *Meeting: kick off* | * *[To be defined: usually after initial document analysis]* |
| * Inception Report | * End of Inception Phase |
| * Slide presentation | * End of Inception Phase |
| * *Meeting: presentation of Inception Report* | * End of Inception Phase |
| **Interim phase: Desk activities** | * Desk/Interim Report [INTPA: delete this if not requested in 2.3.2; FPI: replace with Desk note if you selected this option in 2.3.2] | * End of Desk Activities |
| * Slide presentation | * End of Desk Activities |
| * *Meeting: presentation of Desk Report* | * End of Desk Activities |
| **Interim phase: Field activities** | * Intermediary note | * End of Field Activities |
| * Slide presentation | * End of Field Activities |
| * *Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings* | * End of Field Activities |
| **Interim: Desk and Field activities**  *[As an alternative to the separate desk and Field activities; in this case, the rows dedicated to the Desk and to the Field activities should be deleted.]* | * *Meeting: presentation of preliminary findings (to be tested) emerging from the desk work* | * Shortly before or at the beginning of the field activities |
| * Intermediary note | * End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| * Slide presentation | * End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| * *Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings* | * End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| **Synthesis phase** | * Draft Final Report | * [*Indicative date to be included*] |
| * *Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report* | * [*Indicative date to be included*] |
| * Comments on the draft QAG | * Together with Final Report |
| * Final Report | * 15 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report |
| * Executive summary of the Final Report | * Together with Final Report |
| **Dissemination Phase**  [*To be described in bullet point format based on the specific requirements of your evaluation. Add or delete as many rows as needed and ensure consistency with chapter 2.3.4*.] |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Specific contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

|  |
| --- |
| *The* *Specific Organisation and Methodology that framework contractors should submit is their Technical Offer (which also includes the CVs of the proposed evaluators), allowing you to judge the suitability of their proposed approach to the work.*  *It is based on the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its Annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii). The optional text in yellow is provided to allow you to extend the maximum length of the specific contract Organisation and Methodology, which is sometimes needed to allow the invited framework contractors to prepare a proper evaluation methodology.*  *In this chapter, indicate your expectations as well as any specific instructions you may have; generic guidance is provided.*  *It is highly recommended that you request the development of one or two Evaluation Questions with relevant judgement criteria, indicators, data collection tools and methods. However, you should limit this request to those EQs where there are sufficient data sources available to bidders, e.g., EC services websites, or other sources in the public domain. It can also be useful to ask the contractor to elaborate on the methodology for the development and administration of a survey or any specific exercise that is expected to be key in your evaluation.*  *The deadline for submitting an offer (to be stated in the Request for Services) can be a critical factor in framework contractors’ ability to secure relevant expertise; we remind you that Article 8.1 of the Global ToR SIEA foresees ‘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., holiday period).’* |

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 Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference; it should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and be able to demonstrate how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The methodology should also include (if applicable) communication-related actions, messages, materials, and related managerial structures.

[OPTIONAL TEXT]: This evaluation may be impacted by difficulties in accessing the field due to security constraints or health-related issues. The to-be-selected contractor will bear the duty of ensuring that the evaluators will respect, at all times, the relevant international, national and local guidance regarding travel limitations and will exert due care in preventing the spread of diseases and avoiding any unreasonable, unnecessary risks. The specific contract Organisation and Methodology should contain a clear and detailed description of the methods that the evaluation will use to address potential difficulties in accessing the field. These may include the combination of face-to-face and remote methods of data collection, if relevant[[16]](#footnote-17).

[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 [xx – usually up to 15] 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 included in this limit and may be presented on an A3 page.

|  |
| --- |
| *In some cases, you may want to draw the attention of framework contractors to specific constraints/requirements that their methodology must address. This is the place where you should do so, e.g.*   * *the need for them to develop a* [*methodological approach*](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess) *to face external constraints such as difficulties or the impossibility of accessing the field* * *the need to accurately describe their approach to sampling in an evaluation requiring a large survey* * *their approach to data security in a particularly sensitive context* * *the need for them to specify how they intend to use a specific methodological approach such as participatory evaluation techniques, or specific methods such as the need for the reconstruction of a missing baseline.* |

### Evaluation ethics

All evaluations must be credible and free from bias; they must respect dignity and diversity and protect stakeholders’ rights and interests. Evaluators must ensure confidentiality and anonymity of informants and be guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in observation of the ‘do no harm’ principle. The approach of framework contractors to observe these obligations must be explicitly addressed in the specific Organisation and Methodology, and implemented by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation, including during dissemination of results.

|  |
| --- |
| *Asymmetrical power relations, the prevalence of donor-recipient modalities of thinking and acting, and cross-cultural differences make evaluation of international development interventions difficult and subject to intricate ethical choices. Ethics in evaluation should ensure that the conduct, reporting and utilisation of any evaluation will not harm (intentionally or unintentionally) any stakeholders, including those participating in the evaluation.*  *This section on ethics ensures that the evaluation team refers to and abides by stringent ethical protocols and guidance in their evaluations, which will subsequently be assessed in any future outputs.* |

## 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 evaluation results. Furthermore, it supports the work of the Evaluation Manager by providing input, agreeing on the ToR of the evaluation and providing a sounding board for discussing the validity of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation team. Even a small project evaluation can be steered by a small Reference Group.*  *When describing the composition of the Reference Group, please ensure consistency with the stakeholders identified in Chapter 1.3.*  *INTPA: for guidance on the composition and role of the Reference Group, please click* [*here*](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/roles-0#anchor3) *(chapter 4.2 in the printed format).* |

### At the EU level

The contracting authority of the evaluation is [Contracting Authority]

The evaluation is managed by [the Evaluation Manager of the EUD/Unit xxxx of the DG xxx/Service of the EC]. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Evaluation Manager with the assistance of a Reference Group 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 specific Government bodies/local authorities/civil society groups/donor representatives/representatives of beneficiaries or others as relevant].

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

* to propose indicative Evaluation Questions
* to validate the final 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 with, all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention
* 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 provide feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation
* to support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

### At the Contractor level

Further to the requirements set out in Article 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 their 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 for the evaluation team’s work throughout the assignment
* ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the timeframe of the contract.

## Language of the specific contract and of the deliverables

|  |
| --- |
| *As per the special conditions, the language of the Framework Contract and of all written communication between the Framework Contractor and the FWC Contracting Authority and/or the FWC Project Manager shall be English.*  *The language of evaluation deliverables such as reports and communication products may be English, French, Spanish or Portuguese and should be specified in the Terms of Reference of each Contract. .*  *In summary, for contractual purposes only English should be used, but evaluation deliverables may be in English, French, Spanish or Portuguese, or a selection of these languages according to the type of deliverable as specified in the Terms of Reference.* |

The language of the specific contract is to be English

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

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

* [specify the outputs to be translated].

# Logistics and timing

|  |
| --- |
| *Keep the text following this guidance box as is and refer to the guidance boxes* |

## Planning, including the period for notification of staff placement[[17]](#footnote-18)

|  |
| --- |
| *Please remember that Annex VI is not to be completed 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 Annex VI [(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 authorities or other stakeholders.

## Location

|  |
| --- |
| * Normal place(s) of posting: *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".* |

* 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]

## 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.* * *Similarly, do not forget to plan for buffer time: the time needed to implement the contract is much longer than the time needed to conduct the exercise!* * *Specify that the overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, for dissemination activities and distribution of outputs.* * *Do not forget to ensure coherence with the duration of the assignment as planned 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

|  |
| --- |
| *Keep the text following this guidance box as is.*  ***PLEASE KINDLY NOTE****: in the case of global price specific contracts (such as evaluations) framework contractors are required to submit an indicative Budget Breakdown (which will follow the SIEA template in Annex VII(e)(ii)), showing the build-up of the global price. This will contain, amongst others, the experts’ daily fees, the daily management fee relating to the expert and “Other details” (such as costs for dissemination and costs related to field missions).*  *If relevant, the costs that are to be identified by framework contractors in their Budget Breakdown are to be described in this chapter, after the sentence below.* |

All costs, other than the costs for key experts of the evaluation team will be reflected in a dedicated budget line under the chapter “Other details” of the framework contractor’s financial offer.

## Expertise

|  |
| --- |
| * *As described in the Global ToR SIEA, Article 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.’* * *This section is important for the****global price contracts****and is mostly about defining your expertise requirements (Qualifications and skills, General professional experience, Specific professional experience) for the team as a whole, with the option to have additional requirements and minimum quantities for some key positions in the team (for example a Team Leader).* * ***The expertise required must include professional evaluation skills (particularly for the Team Leader)*** *and other expertise as needed, such as sector-specific expertise, team management skills, gender expertise, communication and language skills.* * *While professional evaluators can have difficulties in conducting 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 suitable seniority.* * *Please remember: design, 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. Therefore, do not use formulas such as ‘the team will have a cumulative experience of xx years in design, management, monitoring, evaluation or audit of cooperation development projects.’* |

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]

|  |
| --- |
| * *When defining the requirements, equal access must be guaranteed and the profiles should not create unjustified obstacles to competitive tendering. Furthermore, the profiles should be clear and non-discriminatory. For example, "local expertise" or “locally-available expertise” may be required but not a "local expert" (i.e., a national/resident of a country).* * *Due consideration should be taken to the real minimum requirements and the existence of such experts on the market when choosing the criteria. The criteria should be as broad as possible. Quantifiable criteria should be drafted with vigilance.* * *Please specify carefully what minimum and what preferred requirements are. It should be borne in mind that, if the proposed team of experts does not meet the minimum requirements, the entire offer is rejected.* * *Please add to your specifications: “The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.”* |

* General professional experience of the team:

[General professional experience]

|  |
| --- |
| *To define your requirements in terms of general professional experience in the evaluation field, please use a formulation as follows (adapt as needed): “The evaluation team must have a cumulative experience of at least XX years in the area of evaluation (of which at least a minimum of XX successfully completed intervention-level or strategic evaluations), mostly in but not limited to the field of development cooperation, with solid experience in rigorous evaluation methods and techniques.”*  *Add further requirements (in particular, relevant thematic expertise) as needed.* |

* Specific professional experience of the team:

[Specific professional experience]

|  |
| --- |
| *To define your requirements in terms of specific professional experience in the evaluation field, please use formulations as follows (adapt as needed): “At least one of the experts must have a minimum of XX successfully completed intervention-level or strategic evaluations. This includes the capacity to adapt and use quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis.*  *Experience in the evaluation of [indicate the sector of your evaluation] will be considered an asset.”*  *Add further requirements (in particular, relevant thematic expertise) as needed.* |

* Language skills of the team: [Language skills]

|  |
| --- |
| *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: “Language 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 should be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.”* |

## 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… |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| *The column "minimum requirements for the category": is optional and can for example be used for qualitative or quantitative specifications such as a minimum number of experts in the category, or an additional type of requirement for the specific category.*  *The column “additional information”: can also be used to specify the minimum number of days in the field expected for the concerned category of experts.*  *Special attention for the team leader: With reference to the Cat I expert, include* *in the last column (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 provide not less than XX working days, out of which YY in the field.”* |

# REPORTS

|  |
| --- |
| *Keep the text following this guidance box as is and refer to the guidance boxes to complete the sections/tables according to your expectations for deliverables (reports or other types of deliverables, such as videos, leaflets etc.).* |

## Content, deadlines and formats of deliverables

For the list of required reports and deliverables, please refer to Chapter 2.3 of these Terms of Reference.

|  |
| --- |
| *In filling the table below, ensure consistency with the table in chapter 2.3.5 and follow these indications to avoid repetitions:*   * *Column Title - specify the titles of the reports/deliverables to be submitted by evaluators (e.g., Inception Report, Draft Final Report, dissemination/communication material)* * *Column Content - write: “See Table in chapter 2.3.5 of these Terms of Reference”* * *Column Language – define the language(s) of each deliverable* * *Column Submission timing or deadline – please copy what you wrote in the Table in chapter 2.3.5* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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] |

## Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

Not applicable for interventions not managed under OPSYS.

## Number of report copies

|  |
| --- |
| *The Maximum number of paper copies of the Final Report is set at 10 by the Global Terms of Reference (Article 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 its submission, 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.

# 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 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 will 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 VII). The Contractor is given the chance to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager through the EVAL module. The QAG will then be reviewed, following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and the Executive Summary.

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

# 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 TO tor

# Annex I: logical framework matrix (LogFrame) of the evaluated interventions

*[Include here the LogFrame(s) of the intervention(s) to be evaluated]*

# Annex II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of 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 respects the new definitions of these criteria, their explanatory notes and the guidance document. These can be found at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in chapter 2.1, the evaluation will assess the intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their short 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.”
  + **Impact**: the “extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.”
  + **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 intervention 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>).

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

|  |
| --- |
| *This annex will contain a list of the available information on the intervention (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 should 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 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.)* |

The following is an indicative list of the documents that the Contracting Authority will make available to the selected evaluators shortly after the contract signature:

* legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the intervention(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.
* intervention design studies.
* intervention feasibility/formulation studies.
* intervention financing agreement and addenda.
* intervention’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 intervention.
* intervention’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 intervention(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 intervention.

# Annex IV: THE EVALUATION matrix

**DG NEAR: please refer to the templates published at** [https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/near/whatwedo/monitoring-evaluation-results/Documents/Reports%20templates%20for%20NEAR%20evaluations.zip](https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/near/whatwedo/monitoring-evaluation-results/Documents/Reports%20templates%20for%20NEAR%20evaluations.zip%20) [**delete all the following text until the end of this annex**]

The evaluation matrix (hereinafter: the matrix) will accompany the whole evaluation by summarising its **methodological design** (**Part A**, to be filled and included in the Inception Report) and **documenting the evidence analysed** to answer each EQ (Part B)

The full matrix (parts A and B) is to be included in all reports.

Use one set of tables (Parts A and B) for each Evaluation Question (EQ) and add or delete as many rows as needed to reflect the selected judgement criteria and indicators. Delete the guidance and the footnotes when including the matrix in the reports.

**PART A – Evaluation design**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ1: “Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx?”** | | | | | |
| **Evaluation criteria covered [[18]](#footnote-19)** |  | | | | |
| **Judgement criteria (JC)** [[19]](#footnote-20) | | **Indicators (Ind)** [[20]](#footnote-21) | **Information sources** | | **Methods / tools** |
| **Primary** | **Secondary** |
| JC 1.1 - | | I 1.1.1 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.1.2 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.1.3 - |  |  |  |
| JC 1.2 - | | I 1.2.1 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.2.2 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.2.3 - |  |  |  |
| JC 1.3 - | | I 1.3.1 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.3.2 - |  |  |  |
| I 1.3.3 - |  |  |  |

**PART B – Evidence log**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ind[[21]](#footnote-22)** | **Baseline data[[22]](#footnote-23)** | **Evidence gathered/analysed** | **Quality of evidence[[23]](#footnote-24)** |
| I 1.1.1 |  |  |  |
| I 1.1.2 |  |  |  |
| I 1.1.3 |  |  |  |
| I 1.2.1 |  |  |  |
| I 1.2.2 |  |  |  |
| I 1.3.1 |  |  |  |

# Annex V: Structure of the reports

**DG NEAR: please refer to the templates published at** [<https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/near/whatwedo/monitoring-evaluation-results/Documents/Reports%20templates%20for%20NEAR%20evaluations.zip>] [delete all of the following text until the end of the annex]

1. INCEPTION REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Inception phase)

The format of the Inception Report is free and should have a maximum length of 20 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | Short description of the context of the evaluation, its objectives and focus |
| Reconstructed Intervention Logic | This will be based on initial analysis of secondary sources and consultation with key stakeholders |
| Stakeholder map | Free format: this will represent the key stakeholders of the intervention(s) under evaluation and their relations with the intervention(s) |
| Finalised Evaluation Questions with Judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix, part A) | See the template |
| Methodology of the evaluation | This will include:   * Overview of entire evaluation process and tools * Consultation strategy [as needed] * Case studies [as needed] * Approach to the following phase of the evaluation, including planning of field missions |
| Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures | In tabular from (free style) |
| Ethics rules | Including, but not limited to, avoiding harm and conflict of interest, informed consent, confidentiality and awareness of local governance and regulations |
| Work plan | This will include a free text description of the plans and their representation in Gantt format |

1. DESK/INTERIM REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the desk activities)

*[Include this only if foreseen for your evaluation; if not foreseen, or Desk and Field activities are merged, delete this chapter]*

The format of the Desk Report is free and should have a maximum length of 15 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction |  |
| Background and key methodological elements | With an indication of:   * Overall evaluation approach * Desk activities:   + Data collection and analyses   + Overview of tools and techniques used * Challenges and limitations |
| Preliminary findings | Preliminary answers to each EQ**,** with an indication (in tabular form) of the hypotheses to be tested in the field and information gaps |
| Update of field visit approach and work plan *[To be included only if relevant]* |  |
| Main annexes | * Preliminary answers by judgement criteria * Updated evaluation matrix (Part A + Part B) |

1. INTERMEDIARY FIELD NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the field activities)

*[Include this only if foreseen for your evaluation; if not foreseen, or Desk and Field activities are merged, delete this chapter]*

The format of the Intermediary Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 10 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

|  |
| --- |
| list of activities conducted |
| difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted |
| intermediate/preliminary findings |
| preliminary overall conclusions (to be tested with the Reference Group) |

1. intermediary desk and field NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the Desk and Field phase)

*[Include this only if Desk and Field activities are merged; if they are not merged, delete this chapter]*

The format of the Intermediary Desk and Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 15 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

|  |
| --- |
| list of activities conducted |
| difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted |
| intermediate/preliminary consolidated Desk and Field findings |
| preliminary overall conclusions (to be tested with the Reference Group) |

1. DRAFT Final Report and FINAL REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Synthesis phase)

The Draft Final and the Final Report have the same structure, format, and content. They should 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 40 pages excluding annexes. 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 should 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*’’.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Executive Summary | The Executive Summary is expected to highlight the evaluation purpose, the methods used, the main evaluation findings and the conclusions and recommendations. It is to be considered a “stand alone” document. |
| 1. Introduction | A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| 2. Findings | A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Question headings, supported by evidence and reasoning. Findings per judgement criteria and detailed evidence per indicator are included in an annex to the Report. |
| 3. Overall assessment *(optional)* | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the intervention. 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 reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria. |
| 4. Conclusions and Recommendations |  |
| 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 emphasising the three or four major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. |
| 4.2 Recommendations | They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle underway, or to prepare the design of a new intervention 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. |
| 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. |
| 5. Annexes to the report | The report should include the following annexes:   * Terms of Reference of the evaluation * names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person) * detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses * detailed answer by judgement criteria * evaluation matrix with data gathered and analysed by (EQ/JC) indicator * Intervention Logic/Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated) * relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention 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. |

1. Executive Summary (EVAL Module)

An Executive Summary is to be prepared using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. Its format will be available to evaluators at the time of submission of the Final Report through EVAL.

This is addition to the request to prepare a self-standing executive summary to be included in the Final Report (please refer to the paragraph above, detailing the content of the Final Report).

# Annex VI: Planning schedule

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 should reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

|  |  | **Indicative Duration in working days[[24]](#footnote-25)** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Location** | **Team Leader** | **Evaluator** | **Indicative Dates** |
| **Inception phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Desk activities: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Field activities: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (maximum)** | |  |  |  |

# Annex VII: EVAL Quality Assessment Grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (following 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, who will be able to include their comments.

|  |
| --- |
| **Intervention (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation data** | | | | |
| **Evaluation title** |  | | | |
| **Evaluation managed by** |  | | **Type of evaluation** |  |
| **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/OPSYS # 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; * have various chapters and annexes well balanced in length; * 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) 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 intervention’s exit strategy, post-intervention sustainability or for adjusting the intervention’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; * where relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s). | |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Final comments on the overall quality of the report** | | **Overall score** |
|  | |  |

# ANNEXE VIII : TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The contracting authority selects the offer that present the best quality-price ratio using a 80/20 relationship between technical quality and price[[25]](#footnote-26).

**CRITERIA GRID**

The technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid [change the grid if necessary]:

|  |
| --- |
| *The table below is based on the standard SIEA template, adapted for evaluation services. Note that it is possible to adapt the standard grid to the specific aspects of your evaluation. This adaptation 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 weighting of the different elements included in the grid****. Frequent alternatives to this table increase the weight for O&M to 60 or decrease it to 40.*  *If you adapt the table, please be aware that, under global price contracts, only the overall team can be scored; scoring of the individual experts is not allowed.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Maximum*** |
| ***Total score for the Organisation and Methodology*** | ***50*** |
| 1. Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided | *10* |
| 1. Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges | *25* |
| 1. Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium | *5* |
| 1. Organisation of tasks including timetable | *10* |
| ***Score for the expertise of the proposed team*** | ***50*** |
| ***Overall total score*** | ***100*** |

**TECHNICAL THRESHOLD**

Any offer below the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points will be automatically rejected.

**INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF OFFERS**

[Delete this item if you do not plan to conduct interviews] During the evaluation phase of the bids received, the contracting authority reserves the right to conduct telephone interviews with one or more members of the proposed evaluation team.

Telephone interviews will be conducted during the period from [dd/mm/yyyy] to [dd/mm/yyyy].

1. For FPI, please note: instead of the FWC SIEA 2018, please use, whenever feasible, existing FPI-specific FWCs that can be utilised for evaluation assignments. At the time of release of this ToR template, this FWC is the FWC PSF 2019 if available. In this case, adaptation to this standard template will be needed by replacing all references to SIEA 2018 with reference to the specific FPI FWC being used. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Note of the Director-General Mr Manservisi 12/09/2016 (Ref. Ares(2016)5167746) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Please refer to your respective DG/Service support services for a review of your ToR. INTPA: [helpdesk@evaluationsupport.eu](mailto:helpdesk@evaluationsupport.eu); NEAR: [near-eval-monitoring@ec.europa.eu](mailto:near-eval-monitoring@ec.europa.eu); FPI: [fpi-evaluation@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fpi-evaluation@ec.europa.eu) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The term ‘intervention’ is used throughout the report as a synonym of ‘project and programme’. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. A Theory of Change (ToC) is a graphic representation of assumptions and hypotheses about how the programme being evaluated is expected to work. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The table includes four ‘traditional’ stakeholder groups, but your intervention may have additional groups. In some cases, the national partners are the target groups of the intervention; if this is the case, delete one of these rows and explain. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. 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-8)
8. 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-9)
9. Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 “Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action” - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\_cir.pdf. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. 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-11)
11. The Better Regulation package was developed 4 years before the redefinition of the DAC criteria; therefore it makes reference to the previous 5 DAC + 2 EU criteria. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link (outdated, produced at the time of the GAP II): <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/documents/new-guidance-note-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimenstion> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. The Evaluation Manager is the staff member 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-14)
14. A description of the merged Desk and Field phase is provided in this chapter as an alternative to the two distinct phases. Please use the descriptions that suit your specific evaluation and delete what is not needed. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. All mentions to the EVAL module throughout the text in accordance with the Art.43.3 of the “Draft Framework Contract Agreement and Special Conditions” of the SIEA Framework Contract. The module EVAL will be integrated into OPSYS. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. The Framework Contractors are invited to consult the wealth of resources available through the two ESS/INTPA initiatives Evaluation in Hard-to-Reach Areas and Evaluation in Crisis: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess>. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. What evaluation criterion/criteria is/are addressed by this EQ? [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Describe each selected JC and number them as illustrated in the template; the first numeric value represents the EQ the JC refers to. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. As above. The two first numeric values represent the JC the indicators refer to. The number of JC and indicators per JC as reported in the table is purely illustrative. The table is to be adapted to your specific evaluation and reflect the appropriate JCs and indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Use the same numbering as in Part A; no need to describe the indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. In case they are available. This column can also be used to record mid-term data (if available). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Score as follows: 0 (no evidence), 1 (some evidence), 2 (sufficient evidence), 3 (conclusive evidence) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Add one column per each evaluator [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. For more information on the 80/20 rule, please refer to 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-26)