EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EuropeAid Co-operation Office

General affairs
Evaluation

THEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ASSISTANCE TO THIRD COUNTRIES SUPPORTING GOOD GOVERNANCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final version

2004-10-15

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A THEMATIC EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ASSISTANCE TO THIRD COUNTRIES SUPPORTING GOOD GOVERNANCE

1. INTRODUCTION

Systematic and timely evaluation of its expenditure programmes is an established priority for the European Commission, as a means of accounting for the management of allocated funds and as a way of promoting a lesson-learning culture throughout the organisation. The Commission Services have requested the Evaluation Unit of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office to undertake an Evaluation of the support to institutional strengthening, good governance and rule of law in third countries.[1] The request for this study was endorsed by the Board of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office at its meeting on 23rd October 2003.

The focus of the evaluation has been interpreted and agreed as being Commission support to good governance, including rule of law. Institutional strengthening is understood as a means to promote good governance.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Policy background

In the 1990's there was a growing consensus in the international community of the importance of functioning public institutions and good governance to economic and social development and poverty reduction. This awareness followed mainly on the disappointing effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance. The Millennium Declaration specifically emphasises the importance of good governance to meet the objectives of development and poverty eradication (the Millennium Development Goals, MDGs). This is confirmed in the Monterrey Consensus where it was agreed that good governance is essential for sustainable development, for sustained economic growth and for poverty eradication.

There are also several important international initiatives. The OECD/DAC has created a governance network "GOVNET", working on how to improve the effectiveness of support in a broad range of areas including: the fight against corruption, public sector reform, capacity development, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, and developing indicators for defining governance and good governance. Furthermore, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) emphasises good governance together with human rights, democracy, peace and security and has included it as one of the key topics in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). UNDP has been in the lead in developing the concept of good governance and has contributed to the understanding and development of governance and good governance in particular through *"Governance for Sustainable Human Development"*, a UNDP policy document from 1997, where governance is defined as *"...the exercise of politicial, economic and administrative authority in the management of a coutry's affairs at all levels. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences."[2]*

---

[1] For the EC development cooperation this is the sixth priority area, as presented in the Development Policy (COM 212/2000) and in the Joint Statement of the Council and Commission on the Development Policy of November 2000.

[2] UNDP 1997 "Governance for Sustainable Human Development"

The Commission has been very clear on the commitment to the principal of good governance and on the importance of governance support since the early-mid 1990's. The Commission's commitment to supporting good governance in third countries is articulated for all regions. For ACP, ALA and MEDA the importance of good governance as a principal and as an area of support was articulated early in the 1990's. (Lomé IV, MEDA I, and ALA Regulation 443/92). Later the commitment to institutional, legal and administrative reform was reflected also in the TACIS and CARDS regulations.[3]

The strongest overall commitment to supporting good governance is made in the Joint Statement of the Council and the Commission on EC Development Policy (November 2000), which presents institutional strengthening, good governance and rule of law as one of the six priority areas.[4] This commitment is further emphasised in the Council Conclusions from 30th May 2002, which supports the Commission's proposal to deepen its work on governance as one of the priority area.

It is clear from these different commitments that good governance is seen as a key principal, a priority sector in its own right, and as an issue to be mainstreamed across regions, countries and sectors.

Due to the lack of classification codes it is difficult to get a clear picture of the volumes and allocations of the Commission support to good governance. A review of country and regional strategy papers, conducted by DG DEV, gives a tentative figure of the total volume allocated to governance-related support; € 2 bn of € 10 bn of the total programmable envelope.[5] It also shows that public administration reform seems to be the financially most important governance cluster.

Despite these strong commitments communicated in various regulations and communication, an equivalent strong policy framework for good governance and governance support has not been developed until recently. Since the late 1990's the Commission has developed several Communications on democracy, human rights and rule of law, which are important parts of good governance (see annex 1 the reference list). The specific budget line for the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) was created by the end of the 1990's, focusing mainly on democracy and human

---

[3] For the ACP the importance of good governance is mentioned already in the Lomé IV Agreement. The Cotonou Agreement further strengthens the importance of good governance making the commitment to good governance to a fundamental and positive element of the ACP-EC partnership. The importance of good governance was also stated already in the MEDA I regulation (Council Regulation 1488/1996), which specifies that good governance shall be promoted. This commitment is repeated in the MEDA II regulation (Council Regulation 2698/2000). Good governance is also stressed early in the 1990's for the cooperation with ALA. The regulation 443/92 states the importance of good governance and presents it as an important area of cooperation and support. This commitment to good governance is repeated in the sub-regional agreements and policies for Asia and Latin America. For the TACIS region institutional, legal and administrative reform is one of six focal areas comprising the main issues of governance. The regulation for CARDS (Council Regulation 2666/2000) also clearly states that the focus of the cooperation will be on building up an institutional, legislative, economic and social framework.

[4] The purpose of the priority fields is to refocus priorities in the Community development aid, and to concentrate resources (including human resources in HQ and the Delegations) on these areas.

[5] European Commission, January 2003, "Country Strategy Paper (CSP) assessment of governance, Conclusions", DG DEV

rights activities, but touching in parts directly on good governance. However, it is not until very recently that the Commission has developed a specific Communication on governance and development (COM 615/2003) followed by a handbook on promoting good governance in EC development and cooperation (which is in draft version at the launch of the evaluation).

Hence, the commitment to good governance is strong and has an important history, dating back to the beginning of the 1990's, but a responding policy framework has not been developed until recently. Furthermore, the process of elaboration of the EC policy framework is still ongoing, as regards in particular the links between governance, peace, security and development, and the support to governance in post-conflict situations and in case of difficult partnerships or fragile states.

2.2   Definition of good governance

There is no internationally agreed definition of good governance. The available formal Commission definitions of governance and good governance are given in the COM 615/2003.

Governance:

"Governance refers to the rules, processes, and behaviour by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in society. The way public functions are carried out, public resources are managed and public regulatory powers are exercised is the major issue to be addressed in that context."[6]

Good governance:

"As the concepts of human rights, democratisation and democracy, the rule of law, civil society, decentralised power sharing, and sound public administration gain importance and relevance as a society develops into a more sophisticated political system, governance evolves into good governance."[7]

In order to clearly define the boundaries of the evaluation (the subject and scope) we have, for the purpose of the evaluation, agreed a working definition, which is based on and further concretise the existing definitions of governance and good governance.

Working definitions:

Governance refers to the structure, functioning and performance of the public authorities/institutions at all levels.[8] Governance is about the way public functions are carried out (including public service delivery), public resources (human, natural, economic and financial) are managed and public regulatory powers are exercised (including enforcement) in the management of a country's affairs.

---

[6] COM 615/2003, § 4.

[7] COM 615/2003, § 4.

[8] Public authorities/institutions are understood broadly, including all levels of governance: central-local (decentralisation); and general-sectoral specific (e.g. the finance ministry and sector specific ministries).

Good governance is a **process** and an aspiration towards governance systems adhering to the following values:

–   **Efficient**, **open**, **transparent (non-corrupt)** and **accountable** public institutions at all levels, including clear decision-making procedures.

–   **Sound, efficient and effective management of** human, natural, economic and financial **resources** for the purpose of equitable and sustainable development.

–   A democratic society managed with **respect for human rights and democratic principles**.

–   Civil society **participation in decision-making processes**.

–   The existence of, respect for and enforcement of **rule of law**; the ability to enforce rights and obligations through legal mechanisms.

The evaluation should take into account that good governance is a process, and that countries and regions are on different levels and stages in this process, implying that the emphasise and priority among the issues listed above might differ between countries and with the country context. This implies that different approaches of cooperation are needed for different country contexts. The Communication (615/2003) specifically mentions three different country situations in which specific approaches are needed: difficult partnerships; post conflict; effective partnerships. Hence the working definition should be seen as a general definition setting the frames of the evaluation, but flexibility is needed within these frames when interpreting and understanding good governance in different countries and regions.

2.3   Supporting good governance: key issues, lessons and developments

Good governance is a very broad area covering many different issues and areas of international support. The six clusters of support presented in the Governance Handbook cover **the main areas of governance support**:

(1)   Support to democratisation;

(2)   Promotion and protection of human rights;

(3)   Reinforcement of the rule of law and the administration of justice;

(4)   Enhancement of the role of civil society (as partner and actor of public policy);

(5)   Public administration reform, management of public finances and civil service reform;

(6)   Decentralisation and local government reform/capacity building.

It has been agreed to use these clusters as a basis for the evaluation together with the agreed working definitions.

EC-financed governance assistance is channelled through different instruments and types of support, and different approaches are used depending on the specific country/region situation.[9]

A large part of the governance support is capacity building activities including **technical assistance (TA)** and **twinning** targeted to public institutions and/or civil society groups. These activities are often criticized for not providing enough positive incentives to partner countries to engage in institutional reform programs, not being based on local capacities, being fragmented, and leading to "islands of excellence" rather than systemic changes. A recent study from DANIDA says that *"...donors have provided resources for decades without substantial evidence of long-term sustainable capacity development."*.[10]

The introduction and increased importance of **sector policy support programmes (SPSPs) and budget support** has resulted in more emphasise on governance issues and a slightly new and complementary approach. Firstly, the purpose of budget support and SPSPs is to increasingly work through the partner countries own budgetary and planning systems/procedures and by doing that empowering and improving these systems and procedures and the Government's capacity.[11] Secondly, most of the SPSPs and budget support programmes are accompanied by technical assistance targeted to mainly the finance ministry and/or to sector ministries, depending on the target sector for the programme.

The Commission-partner **dialogue** (the political and policy dialogue), is also a very important channel/instrument in supporting and encouraging good governance processes, approaches and practices.

Good governance is seen as a key issue for the effectives of development cooperation and for progress on the main objectives of development; hence good governance is also supported more indirectly through being **mainstreamed** into country and regional strategy papers and interventions and strategies.

It is emphasised in several documents that **good governance is a long-term and gradual process**. Good governance is also very **context specific** as specifically emphasised in the Communication on governance and development indicating that good governance should be approached on a country-specific basis and not on a one-size-fits-all model. However, it has been shown that donors in many countries have failed to treat countries differently and according to their conditions, e.g. the IMF and WB Evaluations of the PRSP and PRGF.[12]

---

[9] See for example COM 615/2003 which identifies three different approaches in different country situations.

[10] N Boesen et. al., June 2004, "Between Naivety and Cynicism: A Pragmatic Approach to Donor Support for Public-Sector Capacity Development", DANIDA

[11] Budget support is linked to good governance by incentives for improved public financial management; giving the Commission a stake in the dialogue on budget systems; strengthening domestic accountability; promoting Parliamentary accountability; reducing the pressure on national budgets; providing accompanying capacity-building support (COM 615/2003).

[12] World Bank, July 2004, "The Poverty Reduction Strategy Initiative. An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Support Through 2003", World Bank Operations and Evaluation Department

IMF, July 2004, "Report on the Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)", IMF Independent Evaluation Office

The Commission Governance support is planned and implemented in different regional contexts/frameworks. The **"European Neighbourhood Policy" (Wider Europe[13])** provides a framework (and possibly incentives) for the Commission and for the partner countries in TACIS and MEDA to work in areas of good governance and institutional strengthening in particular in relation to immigration and border control, security related issues (e.g. reform of justice and police), trade-related issues (e.g. customs) and public administration. The Barcelona Agreement and the Communication 294/2003 *"Reinvigorating EU actions on human rights and democratisation with Mediterranean partners, Strategic guidelines"* also sets the framework for the MEDA cooperation. The CARDS countries are seen as **pre-accession countries**, which makes this region different from other regions and creates different demands (and possibly incentives) to reform and improve governance. The ACP governance context is guided by the strong commitment to good governance in **the Cotonou Partnership Agreement**, presenting it as a fundamental element of the cooperation.

Partner country **ownership** and **partnership** processes are general principals of EC cooperation with third countries, and of particular importance in the good governance context. Good governance cannot be imposed from without, it can only happen if it is demanded and wanted by the citizens, hence partner country commitment to the values of good governance, and partner country capacity to involve in good governance processes, are very important for any progress on the subject. The notions of ownership and partnership have also been further emphasised since the introduction of the PRSPs.

3. THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

3.1 The purpose and scope

The **purpose** of the evaluation is to assess to what extent the Commission assistance (strategies, programmes/projects) has been relevant, efficient and effective in supporting sustainable impacts on good governance processes, and in encouraging and promoting good governance approaches and practices, in third countries.

The evaluation should be **forward looking**, providing lessons and recommendations for the continued support to good governance in particular as regards: the use of the dialogue in supporting good governance; the efficiency and effectiveness of CB activities (including TA and twinning); the potentials of supporting good governance through budget support and SPSPs; the Commission as a change agent in the good governance process; the Commission's capacity to adapt its support and its approaches to different types of country situations. The evaluation shall lead to a set of conclusions (based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings) and related lessons and recommendations, which should be expressed clearly enough to be translatable into operational terms by the Commission.

The evaluation should come to **a general overall judgement** of the extent to which Commission strategies, programmes and projects have contributed to the progress towards

---

[13] The Wider Europe Initiative follows on the enlargement creating new boarders of EU with Russia, the WNIS (Westerly Newly Independent States: Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus) and the Southern Mediterranean (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia) and thereby strengthening the Union's interest in enhancing relations with these countries.

good governance and to the encouragement and promotion of good governance approaches and policies, based on the answers to the evaluation questions set out in section 4.

To get a feasible **scope** for the evaluation it has been agreed that the evaluation shall focus on the support targeted to cluster 5 (public administration reform including public finances) together with cluster 6 (decentralisation and local government reform), on cluster 3 (rule of law) and also on cluster 4 (empowerment of the civil society related to good governance processes). Hence, while democracy and human rights are key issues in good governance, the evaluation will not specifically focus on the projects/programmes targeting these areas.

The evaluation should cover activities that take place in the context of sectoral (governance is included in health, education and/or transport programmes) and budget support programmes and specific projects/programmes in the four governance clusters. The evaluation should cover activities that fall within the above listed clusters that are financed from thematic and geographical budget lines/instruments including the specific budget line for democracy and human rights (the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)).

The evaluation should cover the period 1994-2004, with a particular focus on the development of the approach to good governance from 2000 (before-after 2000). Furthermore, the evaluation will include a comprehensive desk phase (see section 5) followed by country case studies in:

ACP: Angola, Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic;
ASIA: Indonesia;
LA: To be decided in the inception phase following on the first review and suggestion of the evaluation team;
MEDA: A combination of two of these three countries: Algeria; Tunisia and Jordan; to be decided in the inception phase following on the first review and suggestion of the evaluation team;
TACIS: Ukraine;
CARDS: Will be covered from the desk possibly combined with a limited mission to Albania.

These countries cannot be seen as a representative sample of the different regions or of all partner countries where the Commission has governance support, but they *illustrate* different experiences in the governance area and different country contexts and they have been selected to maximise the lesson learning opportunities from the evaluation.[14] This selection can possibly be changed in the inception phase of the evaluation following on the evaluation team's more detailed statistical review, but requires strong and justifiable reasons.

3.2   The evaluation users

The evaluation should serve policy decision-making and project management purposes. This requires addressing the principal concerns of the Board of the EuropeAid Co-

---

[14] Criteria for country selection: 1) Importance of Commission governance support in the country (since preferably end-90's); 2) Covering all major regions; 3) Broader learning potentials; 4) Country coverage of earlier and ongoing evaluations; 5) The political and economic context (stable, post conflict etc.); (6) Existence of budget support cooperation (not applicable to all regions).

operation Office, as well as those relevant to the Relex family services. DGs DEV and Relex, the EuropeAid Office, and the EC Delegations in the countries covered by this exercise will be the main users of the evaluation. However, the evaluation should also generate results of interest to governmental and civil society partners.

4. THE ASSIGNMENT: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

4.1 Introduction to evaluation questions

A number of specific evaluation questions have been elaborated. The evaluation team is expected fully to address each one as far as possible. These questions serve firstly as a way of articulating the key requirements of the evaluation, secondly to articulate the key strategic issues of the good governance area, and thirdly as a means of ensuring that the relevant objectives, obligations and activities in the good governance area are covered.

The following questions reflect the Commission's principal fields of interest at the time of commissioning the evaluation. The evaluation team is expected to further develop question eight following on the assessment of the specific objectives (see 5.2.1). If needed the evaluation team might also fine tune and further develop the other questions listed below, during the preparatory phase, with the formal acceptance of the Evaluation Unit.

A. Good governance in Commission cooperation with third countries: mainstreaming and priority area.

(1)   To what extent has good governance been prioritised and incorporated in European Commission cooperation with third countries since 2000 and how has the approach to good governance evolved during this period?

Coverage of question:

– This question is a follow up to the EC commitments to support good governance in third countries, and in particular the Joint Statement on EC Development Policy to further prioritise institutional strengthening, good governance and rule of law in EC development cooperation.

– It refers to the extent and how good governance (including institutional strengthening and rule of law) has been mainstreamed into CSPs/NIPs, RSPs, sector policies, and into programmes and projects and how it has been treated in the mid-term review process (see the governance handbook on mainstreaming of good governance).

– This question should assess whether agreed definitions and approaches to this priority area have been elaborated and communicated within the Commission and how the approach to good governance has evolved.

– The question covers the trends in financial volumes and number of projects/programmes targeted to good governance objectives.

– The question should cover changes in the Commission staffing related to good governance: Is the Commission staffed to handle the question of good governance (human resources in Delegations and in HQ)? Capacity of staff to deal with the question of good governance; Levels of understanding of the concepts of governance and good governance.

B. Tools and working practices, financial mechanisms and instruments

Questions two to four; which represents three levels 1) projects/program approach; 2) budget support, sector program approach; 3) political and policy dialogue at country and sector levels, should form the basis for a more general assessment of the extent and how the design and implementation of Commission-financed strategies, programmes and activities, especially the choice of funding instruments, budget lines and channels, affected the achievement of specific objectives established for the sector?

(2)   To what extent and how have the Commission-financed projects and programs, and in particular CB activities, including TA and twinning programs, efficiently and effectively contributed to the progress towards good governance and to the encouragement and promotion of good governance approaches and policies?

Coverage of question:

– The question targets the project/program approach and specifically focuses on the efficiency and effectiveness of CB activities, including TA and twinning programmes, in supporting good governance processes.

– The question should include an assessment of how these (CB, TA and twinning) activities are incorporated in the partner organisations and the extent to which this support results in, or has the potential to result in, long-term, sustainable, systemic effects.

– The assessment should include an evaluation of the extent to which the partners' capacity to implement and absorb the assistance has been taken into account in the design of the support, including technocratic aspects, but also including aspects of power, interests and other "political" aspects of capacity.

– The assessment should take into account the source of financing, i.e. whether it is a thematic (including EIDHR) or a geographical budget line, and its importance to the effectiveness and efficiency of the support.

(3)   To what extent and how have Commission-financed SPSP (all three financing alternatives as outlined in the SPSP guidelines), and budget support efficiently and effectively contributed to the progress towards good governance and to the encouragement and promotion of good governance approaches and practices, in particular through improved public finance management, through improved accountability and transparency, and through improved public service delivery?

This question should mainly be assessed from the desk using existing information including the findings of the joint evaluation of general budget support and other existing material within the Commission and externally.

Coverage of question:

– Given the increasing importance of budget support and SPSPs, the question should give a view of the effectiveness and efficiency of

supporting good governance processes through these modalities and a view of <u>the potentials</u> for supporting good governance through budget support and SPSPs.

- The effectiveness and efficiency of the technical assistance attached to these programmes in promoting good governance processes, approaches and practices.

- Budget support and SPSPs are expected to support good governance values, as the support is channelled through the partner countries own budget systems using their procedures. The question should also cover this more general effect on good governance (e.g. accountability, transparency, effectiveness in the management of public resources) of budget support and SPSPs.

(4)   To what extent and how has the Commission efficiently and effectively used the political and policy dialogue (at sectoral and country levels) to encourage and promote good governance approaches and practices?

Coverage of question:

- The question should include an assessment of how the Commission has used the political and policy dialogue on the overall country level and on the sector level, including the dialogue linked to budget support and SPSPs, to promote and encourage good governance approaches and practices.

C. Partner-country ownership, relevance of Commission governance support, and flexibility in adapting to different country contexts

(5)   To what extent has the Commission assistance been sensitive to specific partner country needs, and priorities, and to what extent and how has the Commission been flexible, in the programming process and in implementation, in adapting to different country contexts (e.g. post-conflict, difficult partnerships, effective partnerships)?

Coverage of question:

- The questions covers the extent to which the Commission governance support has been relevant to partner country needs, problems and demands, and priorities including the extent to which it is relevant to the national development plans (e.g. PRSPs) and specific sector priorities.

- Governance and good governance is very context specific, different countries have different needs, demands and priorities depending on e.g. what the capacity or incentive problems are, depending on in which situation they are (pre-, post-, ongoing conflict) etc. The question should cover the extent to which the Commission has been able to understand and adapt to these changing and differing situations/contexts.

- The question also refer to the extent to which partner country ownership has been respected and ensured in the programming processes and in implementation so as to ensure the sustainable development/progress towards good governance?

D. The three Cs: Coherence, Complementarity and Coordination

(6)   To what extent and how has the Commission ensured coordination with other donors, active in the governance area, and ensured coherence and complementarity with EC policies, with other donors' policies and activities, and with the partner Governments' priorities and activities?

Coverage of the question:

–   The question addresses the extent to which the Commission policies and approaches are coherent with other donors' policies and approaches; the extent to which the programming process is coordinated with other donors; and the extent to which the Commission activities and implementation are coherent, complementary and coordinated with other donors' activities and with the partner country's plans and activities.

–   The question should also address the coherence and complementarity with other relevant EC policies.

E. Cross-cutting issues

(7)   To what extent and how have cross cutting issues (social and environmental) been incorporated in the provision of governance support, and to what extent do the resulting good governance processes successfully take these issues in to account?

Coverage of question:

–   The question covers the extent to which cross-cutting issues: gender equality, environment, democracy and human rights and conflict prevention, have been satisfactory mainstreamed into the governance projects and programmes.

–   The question should also assess, to the extent possible, to what extent these issues are taken into account in the resulting good governance processes.

F. Achievement of objectives

(8)   To what extent and how have Commission strategies and programmes and projects, targeted to the four key clusters (public administration reform, rule of law, decentralisation and capacity building for the civil society), contributed to the progress towards good governance and to the encouragement and promotion of good governance approaches and practices?

The evaluation team is expected to further develop this question into several questions (e.g. three), following on the review of objectives including regional-specific objectives. Following on this review the evaluation team should agree on the precise scope of the question with the evaluation unit and the reference group, and agree on the approach to answer this question.

Coverage of question:

– This is a key question to the purpose of the evaluation, i.e. to arrive at a general overall judgement of the Commission's contribution to the progress towards good governance and to the encouragement and promotion of good governance approaches and policies.

– The assessment should cover the degree to which the Commission has supported the structure, function and performance of public institutions/authorities, encouraging the practices and approaches supporting the values of good governance as listed in section 2.2.

– The assessment should cover the extent to which the Commission has contributed to systemic changes.

– The question should address the respective roles of public authorities (the state) and the civil society in these processes and to what degree and how these actors have been supported in their roles by the Commission.

– The focus of this question should be adjusted to the specific objectives and the specific focus of the support in the different countries/regions.

– The assessment should focus on four of the six clusters: public administration reform[15]; decentralisation processes; the rule of law[16]; and the enhancement and of the role of civil society organisations (CSOs) in governance processes[17] and show the results of the support to each of the clusters as well as a whole.

– The evaluation should take into consideration the specific country context to understand the reasons behind the development of the governance processes in the countries.

5. APPROACH AND METHODS: EVALUATION PHASES AND REPORTING

5.1 Approach and methods

Evaluations address both accountability and learning; given the absence of a clear policy framework for governance and good governance covering the evaluation period, the learning objective is specifically important in this evaluation. The evaluation is expected to contribute to learning about the Commission governance support (approach, methods and delivery) and how it can be improved. Hence the evaluators are expected to apply an

---

[15] The search for public service structures that respond to the needs of citizens and deliver appropriate public goods and services efficiently, responsively and impartially, including macro-economic and public policy formulation, definition and implementation

[16] A legislature that enacts laws which respects the Constitution and human rights; and independent judiciary; effective, independent and accessible legal services; a legal system guaranteeing equality before the law; a prison system respecting the human person; a police force at the service of the law; and effective executive which is capable of enforcing the law and establishing the social and economic conditions necessary for life in society; and whish is itself subject to the law; a military that operates under civilian control within the limits of the Constitution.

[17] Empowerment of CSOs to participate in social and political debates and in decision-making; enabling a constructive relation between CSOs and government authorities

analytical approach not only assessing the extent to which objectives have been reached but also analysing the reasons and determining factors behind the observed successes and failures. It is important to take into account the importance of context specific factors and to respect the problems of attribution to Commission support focusing on the Commission's <u>contribution</u> to the observed changes/developments/trends. The team is also expected to take into account the effects of the ongoing Relex reforms.

The evaluation should take into account that good governance is a process, assessing achievements by **focusing on changes/developments and trends** rather than on assessing achievements against fixed and standardised targets. The evaluators are expected to be familiar with the literature on organisational and institutional change, as well as the analysis of "drivers of change" and "change agents".

The evaluation also needs to be sensitive to **the context-specific nature of good governance**, and the different frameworks within which the cooperation is conducted for the five regions. It is particularly important that the evaluators assess the importance of the different regional frameworks to the efficiency and effectiveness of the support and to partner country ownership, e.g. the importance of the "New Neighbourhood Policy" with TACIS and MEDA, the importance of pre-accession in CARDS, and the importance of the Cotonou agreement in ACP, for the incentives to progress and priorities good governance issues.

Given the lack of a clear, overall framework for good governance covering the evaluation period, and given the regional differences, the evaluation should asses the European Commission's cooperation activities supporting good governance, **relative to the general and specific objectives of the different regional cooperation and development programmes.** This approach needs to be balanced with the need to keep a level of coherence between the different case studies so as to facilitate the synthesis of the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations in the final report.

The team is expected to **make efficient use of the existing sets of governance indicators**.[18]

5.2   Evaluation phases

The evaluation will be divided in four phases – an <u>Inception Phase</u>, mainly devoted to structuring and preparing the evaluation approach and methodology, a <u>Desk Phase</u>, which goes partly in parallel to the Field Phases, focusing on gathering and analysing existing data and information (through literature/document reviews and interviews) and focusing specifically on questions one and three, a <u>Field Phase</u>, including preparation of field missions, visits to the case study countries and drafting of country notes, a <u>Synthesis Phase</u>, focusing on drafting the Final (synthesis) Report.

5.2.1.   Inception phase

Shortly after the submission of the Terms of Reference the Contractor will prepare a **Launch Note** setting out 1) the understanding of the ToRs, 2) the proposed general approach to the evaluation, 3) the proposed composition of the Evaluation Team (with CVs), and 4) a budget proposal.

---

[18] EUROSTAT has together with UNDP put together a "user guide" giving information on existing governance indicators.

On the acceptance of the launch note the evaluation team will examine relevant key documentation on the past and current Commission actions concerning good governance. This material would include data on the relevant Communications, strategy documents and instruments, evaluations, and discussions with Commission officials. During this documentary work, the consultants shall also take into consideration the methods that are currently being used by other donors.

With the information obtained the consultants will produce **a Draft Inception Report** to be delivered to the Evaluation Unit, including, as a minimum, the following elements:

1. Given the vague policy framework of good governance it will be difficult to develop a proper impact diagram relevant for the evaluated period. However, it is important that the evaluation team **reviews the key objectives** and that it examines the regional specific objectives related to governance. The result of this exercise should be presented in a structured way in a diagram(s) or similar with an accompanying explanatory text, supporting in particular the more specific focus of question eight.

2. A final set of **evaluation questions**; appropriate **judgement criteria** for each evaluation question; and relevant quantitative and qualitative **indicators** for each criteria (this in turn will determine the scope and methods of data collection).

3. The **final country selection**, i.e. also suggesting case study countries in Latin America and a final selection for MEDA.

4. Suitable methods of **data and information collection** both for the Desk and the Field Phases - literature reviews, interviews both structured and unstructured, questionnaires, seminars or workshops, case studies, etc. - indicating any limitations and describing how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis. The consultants will also propose a list of activities/projects/programmes that could be retained for in depth analysis.

5. Appropriate **methods of analysis** of the information and data collected, again indicating any limitations.

6. The basis to be used for making the **judgements**, which should be directly related to the Judgement Criteria but adaptable should the field findings so dictate.

7. The system to **ensure a common approach across the case study countries**, and hence that the findings of the case study countries can be easily synthesised.

8. The approach to ensure **quality assurance** throughout the different phases of the evaluation.

9. The detailed **work plan**, specifying the organisation and time schedule for the evaluation process.

Following comments on the draft Inception Report from members of the Reference Group (see section 6) and from the Evaluation Unit, the evaluators will present **the Final Inception Report**. The evaluation will not continue before the proposed approach and methodology have been approved by the Evaluation Unit, and the Final Inception Report has been accepted.

5.2.2.   Desk phase

The Desk Phase starts after the Inception Phase and goes partly in parallel to the Field Phase. The purpose of this phase is to make sure that existing relevant information (including data), within and external to the Commission, is gathered and taken into account in the evaluation. Three specific tasks for the Desk Phase: 1) Collect information to answer to question one on the prioritisation and mainstreaming of governance in Commission cooperation with third countries; 2) Collect information to answer to question three on the effectiveness and efficiency of budget support and SPSPs in supporting good governance processes; 3) Ensure a broader coverage of the different regions than the case study countries allow. It is important to plan for how to collect the information, experience and knowledge of the Commission staff in HQ (e.g. a series of structured interviews, focus group discussions)

The Desk Phase and the Inception Phase <u>partly</u> overlap, but they have different purposes, the Desk Phase is part of the actual evaluation exercise and ensures that relevant information in HQ, and accessible from the desk, is gathered and taken into account, while the purpose of the Inception Phase is to prepare the evaluation and in particular the method and approach of the evaluation.

A Desk Phase Report (draft and final) should be prepared at the end of the phase to be submitted to the Evaluation Unit and discussed with the Reference Group.

5.2.3.   Field phase

Following satisfactory completion of the Inception Phase and formal acceptance of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Team can start preparing the field missions. The fieldwork, the duration of which shall be cleared with the Evaluation Unit and the Reference Group, shall be undertaken on the basis set out in the Inception Report and agreed with the Evaluation Unit and the Reference Group. If during the course of the field phase any significant deviations from the agreed methodology or schedule are perceived as being necessary, these should be explained to, and agreed by, the Evaluation Unit and the Reference Group.

At the conclusion of each of the field missions the team should give a detailed *on-the-spot de-briefing to the Delegation and relevant stakeholders* to validate the data and information gathered.

At the conclusion of each field mission the team will proceed to prepare **Country Notes,** for each of the country case studies, for delivery to the Evaluation Unit no later than ten working days after returning from the field (see annex 2 for an outline structure of the notes). These notes (which will appear in annex to the final report) should be written in the predominant working language of the Delegation in the country concerned.

When all field missions have been conducted, and before the start of the synthesis phase, the Evaluation Team should prepare a **Synthesis Note,** summarising the data and information collected and presenting preliminary findings. This note should also account for the information gathered during the Desk Phase. The note should be succinct and mainly constitute a basis for a Reference Group meeting to prepare the synthesis phase. The note will not be published as a self-standing report.

The Evaluation Team should also present a proposed **table of content and structure for the Final Report**, based on the structure set out in Annex 3, to be agreed with the Evaluation Unit and the Reference Group.

5.2.4. *Synthesis phase and final report*

The Evaluators will submit a **First Draft Final Report**, in accordance with the agreed time schedule, and agreed structure, taking due account of comments received during de-briefings and earlier meetings with the Reference Group. It should be noted that the report should include answers to the evaluation questions, and also an overall assessment – on the basis of these answers – of the Commission performance, approaches and strategies in the governance area.

On acceptance, the first draft final report will be circulated for comment to the Reference Group, which will convene to discuss it in the presence of the Evaluation Team.

On the basis of comments expressed by the Reference Group and the Evaluation Unit, the Evaluation Team should make the appropriate amendments and present a **Second Draft Final Report**. Again the report will be circulated to the Reference Group through the Evaluation Unit, for final comments. The Reference Group will be given a minimum of two weeks to provide their comments. On the basis of the comments received the Team will prepare the **Final Version**, in accordance with the agreed time schedule.

The evaluators may either accept or reject the comments made by the Reference Group, the Delegation, or relevant stakeholders, but in case of rejection they shall motivate and explain their reasons in writing.

The final report (as well as previous reports and notes) must be of very high quality, the written quality in the reports and notes must be outstanding. It is important that the findings of the country case studies are effectively used when drafting the final report. The final report should clearly account for the observations and evidences on which findings are made so as to support the reliability and validity of the evaluation. The report should reflect a rigorous, methodical and thoughtful approach. See Annex 4 for further information on the quality standards. The findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations should be thorough and the link between them should be clear.

The recommendations should be concrete and realistic and presented in a logical structure following on their importance and level of details.

The final version of the Final Report shall be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

The Final Report shall be drafted in English.

6.   RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING OF THE EVALUATION

The primary responsibility for the management and monitoring of the evaluation will rest with the Relex Family Evaluation Unit at the EuropeAid Cooperation Office. The evaluation manager and first point of contact will be Ms. Federica Petrucci (tel: 02 29 66111).

The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by a Reference Group consisting of members of the Relex Family Services as well as other relevant Directorate Generals and concerned Delegations under the chairmanship of the Evaluation Unit.

The Reference Group will act as the main professional interface between the Evaluation Team and the Commission Services. The Group's principal function will be:

- to advise on the scope and focus of the evaluation and the elaboration of the terms of reference;

- to advise on the quality of the work of the consultants;

- to facilitate access to information and documentation;

- to facilitate and assist in feedback of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

Proposed Reference Group meetings are indicated with a *** in paragraph 8.1 below.

7.   EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation is to be carried out by a multi-disciplinary team with experience in at least the following fields: good governance as a concept and in practice, the different aspects of rule of law, public finance management, democracy and human rights, institutional and organisational analysis, country strategy analysis, PRSPs, and development cooperation in general terms. Consultants should also possess an appropriate training and documented experience in the management of evaluations, as well as evaluation methods in field situations. The team should comprise consultants familiar with the selected case study countries and the regions covered.

The overall team-leader shall have considerable experience of managing evaluations of a similar size and character. The team leader shall also be experienced in the international debates on these issues and be aware of the different approaches. Furthermore, each country team should be led by an experienced team-leader.

The Evaluation Unit expects that also consultants from partner countries (national or regional) are included in the team as early as possible in the evaluation process.

Regarding conflict of interest, experts who have been involved in the design or implementation of projects covered by this evaluation, are excluded from this assignment.

8.   TIMING AND BUDGET

8.1   Time schedule

The evaluation should start in October 2004 with completion of the final report on the main study scheduled for November 2005.

The following is the indicative schedule:

– Launch Note	End-October 2004
– Draft Inception Report	December 2004
– *** Reference Group Meeting	January 2005
– Final Inception Report	End-January 2005
– Desk Phase	Starts in January 2005
– Field Phase (including preparation of missions and drafting of field mission notes)	February-April 2005
– Draft Desk Phase Report	March 2005
– Final Desk Phase Report	May 2005
– Final Country Notes	May 2005
– Synthesis Note	June 2005
– *** Reference Group Meeting	End-June 2005
– First Draft Final Report	1st September 2005
– *** Reference Group meeting on Draft Final report	Mid-September 2005
– Second Draft Final Report	Beginning October 2005
– *** Reference Group consultation	Mid-end October 2005
– Final Version	15th November 2005
– (***) Dissemination Seminar	January 2006

8.2   Cost of the Evaluation

The overall cost of the evaluation is expected to fall in the range € 390 000. The payment modalities shall be as follows:

30% at acceptance of the Final Inception Report;

20% at acceptance of the Final Desk Phase Report;

30% at acceptance of all Country Notes;

20% at acceptance of Final Report (Final Version).

Annexes:

Annex 1. Key references for the evaluation

Annex 2. Guidance on the country notes for the country case studies

Annex 3. Outline Structure of the Final Evaluation Report

Annex 4. Quality Grid

Annex 1: **Key references for the evaluation**

Commission Communications, Regulations etc. on governance, democracy and human rights and rule of law

Communication 373/2004 "European Neighbourhood Policy, Strategy Paper" (12.05.2004)

Handbook on promoting good governance in EC development and cooperation

Communication 615/2003 "Governance and Development

Council conclusions 19 November 2003, 14453/03 "Governance in the Context of Development Cooperation"

Communication 294/2003 "Reinvigorating EU actions on human rights and democratisation with Mediterranean partners, Strategic guidelines" (21.05.2003)

Communication 104/2003 "Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A new framework for relations with our eastern and southern neighbours" (11.03.2003)

Minutes Council meeting 30th May 2002 on Development, including conclusions on democracy and good governance

Commission staff working document "European Initiative on Democracy and Human Rights Programming Document 2002-2004"

Communication 703/2002 "Integrating migration issues in the European Union's relations with Third Countries"

White Paper on Governance "Report of Working Group 'Strengthening Europe's Contribution to World Governance'", May 2001

Commission staff working paper: Report on the implementation of the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights in 2000, 22 May 2001

Communication 211/2001 Conflict prevention

Communication 252/2001 "The European Union's role in promoting human rights and democratisation in third countries"

Communication 428/2001 "European Governance a White Paper" (25.07.2001)

Communication 212/2000: "The European Community's Development policy"

Council and Commission Joint Statement, 10 November 2000, "The European Community's Development policy"

Communication 726/2000: "On the implementation of measures intended to promote observance of human rights and democratic principles in external relations for 1996-1999"

Communication 240/1999 "Cooperation with ACP Countries Involved in Armed Conflicts" (May 1999)

Council regulation 975/1999 (29 April 1999) "Laying down the requirements for the implementation of development cooperation operations which contribute to the general objective of developing and consolidating democracy and the rule of law and to that of respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Council regulation 976/1999 (29 April 1999) "Laying down the requirements for the implementation of development cooperation operations which contribute to the general objective of developing and consolidating democracy and the rule of law and to that of respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Communication 146/1998 "Democratisation, the rule of law, respect for human rights and good governance: the challenges of the partnership between the European Union and the ACP States

Communication 567/1995 "The external dimension of the EU's Human Rights Policy: From Rome to Maastricht and beyond" (22 November 1995)

Communication 216/1995 "On the inclusion of respect for democratic principles and human rights in agreements between the community and third countries" (23 May 1995)

<u>Commission Regional Communications, Regulations etc.</u>

Communication 373/2004, "European Neighbourhood Policy", Strategy Paper (12 May 2004)

Communication 104/2003, "Wider Europe – Neigbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours", (March 2003)

<u>Commission Evaluations, Studies, Reviews etc.</u>

Court of Auditors Special Report No 12/2000 "on the management by the Commission of European Union support for the development of human rights and democracy in third countries, together with the Commission's reply"

European Commission, EuropeAid, May 2004 "Reinforcement of the Rule of Law. Division of Competencies and Interrelations between Courts, Prosecutors, the Police, the Executive and Legislative Powers in the Western Balkan Countries", Strategic Studies in CARDS 2003, Intermediary Report, A.R.S.

European Commission, EuropeAid, Evaluation Unit, May 2004, "Evaluation of the Assistance to Balkan Countries under Regulation 2666/2000", Development Research Network (DRN)

European Commission, EuropeAid, Evaluation Unit, November 2003 "Evaluation of Economic Cooperation between the European Commission and Mediterranean Countries", Final Report, ADE

European Commission, September 2003 "Programming Study on the Future of TACIS: Synthesis of Evaluations Findings", Development Strategies

European Commission, July 2003, "Report on the Seminar on promoting the Rule of Law as part of sustainable development"

European Commission, January 2003, "Country Strategy Paper (CSP) assessment of governance, Conclusions", DG DEV

European Commission, EuropeAid, Evaluation Unit, May 2002, "Evaluation of ALA Regulation 443/92", Development Research Network (DRN)

European Commission, EuropeAid, Evaluation Unit, August 2001, "Synthesis Report on EC Activities in the Field of Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance", Particip

European Commission, SCR F5, August 2000, "External Evaluation of Community Aid Concerning Positive Actions in the Field of Human Rights and Democracy in the ACP Countries", Synthesis Report, Franklin Advisory Services, Channel Research Ltd, SEPIA

? "Better Governance for Development in the Middle East and North Africa" ?

Other important international references

http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/

http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/data.html#dataset2001 (WB governance data)

http://www.undp.org/governance/index.htm

http://www.undp.org/eo/index.htm (evaluation office)

http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/

http://www.grc-exchange.org/g_themes/politicalsystems_drivers.html (DFID "Driver's of Change")

S Barrett et. al., October 2003, "Member State and Other Donor Approaches to Good Governance in Development Cooperation", Final Report

N Boesen et. al., June 2004, "Between Naivety and Cynicism: A Pragmatic Approach to Donor Support for Public-Sector Capacity Development", DANIDA

DANIDA, October 2003, "Capacity Development Evaluation. Step 3: Draft Methodology for Evaluation of Capacity Development", Evaluation Department

IMF, July 2004, "Report on the Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)", IMF Independent Evaluation Office

D Kaufmann, March 2003, "Rethinking Governance, Empirical Lessons Challenge Orthodoxy", the World Bank

OECD/DAC, July 2004, "Good Practice Paper on Capacity Development in Public Financial Management", First Draft, DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices

D Rodrik, 2004, "Getting Institutions Right", CESifo DICE Report 2/2002, pp10-15

UNDP, January 1997, "Reconceptualising Governance", Discussion Paper 2, Management Development and Governance Division, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support

UNDP, "UNDP and Governance, Experiences and Lessons Learned", Management Development and Governance Division, Lesson-Learned Series No. 1.

UNDP, January 1997, "Governance for sustainable human development", A UNDP Policy Document

UNDP, January 2000, "Governance Foundations for Post-Conflict Situations: UNDP's Experience", Management Development and Governance Division Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP

UNDP, 2002, "Post-Conflict Assistance of the Government of Japan through UNDP in Kosovo and East Timor", UNDP Evaluation Office

UNDP, 2002, "World Development Report, 2002. Deepening democracy in a fragmented world"

World Bank, November 2000, "Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance", A World Bank Strategy

World Bank, September 2003, "Structuring Aid to Sustain Governance Reform in Low-Income Countries under Stress"

World Bank, January 2004, "Low-Income Countries Under Stress", Implementation Overview

World Bank, July 2004, "The Poverty Reduction Strategy Initiative. An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Support Through 2003", World Bank Operations and Evaluation Department

Unspecified references

Regional and Country Strategies

Regional Regulations and Communication

Partnership and cooperation agreements

Annex 2. Guidance on the country notes for the country case studies

Length: The country note should be maximum 20 pages (excluding annexes).

This evaluation is partly based on a number of country case studies. These case studies allow the evaluation team to gather information on the EC support (to the sector/theme of the evaluation) at the country level, which together with the desk phase findings should feed the global assessment reported in the synthesis report. This reporting is needed for transparency reasons, i.e. to clearly account for the basis of the evaluation, and also to be able to have a factual check with the concerned EC Delegations and other stakeholders.

This reporting should be seen as building blocks for the evaluation and as documents to be circulated with the Reference Group and the Delegations involved. In the end of the evaluation the country notes will be published as part of the overall evaluation exercise in annexes to the synthesis report (so editing is required). These notes should be prepared after the missions, they should respect the agreed structure and they should go further than the oral presentations conducted at the end of the missions. Furthermore, the evaluation questions are formulated to be answered on the global level using the sum of the information collected from the different case studies and the desk study, and should hence not be answered at the country case study level.

Indicative structure:

1. Introduction:
   - The purpose of the evaluation;
   - The purpose of the note;
   - The reasons for selecting this country as a case study country.

2. Data collection methods used (its limits and possible constraints)

3. Short description of the sector in the country

4. Findings on the sector (focused on facts and not going into analysis)

5. Conclusions at two levels: (1) covering the main issues on this sector in the context of the country and (2) covering the elements confirming or not confirming the desk phase hypothesis.

Annexes:
- The list of people interviewed;
- The list of documents consulted;
- The list of the projects and programmes specifically considered;
- All project assessment fiches;
- All questionnaires;
- Acronyms and abbreviation.

Annex 3. Outline Structure of the Final Evaluation Report

Length: All reports should be succinct whilst capturing sufficient evidence to justify the findings. Additional and more detailed information on the overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes (which however should be restricted to the important information).

---

1. Executive Summary

Length: approximately 5 pages

This executive summary should include the following information:

1.1 – Purpose of the evaluation;
1.2 – Background to the evaluation*;*
1.3 – Methodology (brief);
1.4 – Analysis and main findings for each Evaluative Question; short overall assessment;
1.5 – Main conclusions;
1.6 – Main recommendations.

---

2. Introduction

Length: *approximately 5 pages*

2.1. Purpose of, and background to the Evaluation

2.2. Synthesis of the Commission's Strategy and Programmes: the objectives and the intended impacts of the Commission's interventions.

2.3. Context: brief analysis of the political, economic, social and cultural dimensions, as well as the needs, potential for and main constraints.

---

3. Methodology

Length: approximately 10 pages

In order to answer the evaluative questions a number of methodological instruments must be presented by the consultants:

3.1. Data and Information Collection: can consist of literature review, interviews, questionnaires, case studies, etc. The consultants will indicate any limitations and will describe how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.

3.2   <u>Methods of Analysis:</u> of the data and information obtained for each Evaluation Question (again indicating any eventual limitations);

3.3.   <u>Methods of Judgement</u>

This chapter should include a presentation of the judgement criteria and indicators.

---

4. Main findings and analysis

Length: approximately 20-30 pages

4.1.   Answers to each Evaluative Question, indicating findings and conclusions for each;

4.2.   Summary of main findings

---

5. Main conclusions and lessons

Length: approximately 7 pages

This chapter should account for the overall assessment of the Commission governance support. The structure and content is dependent on the main conclusions and lessons.

---

6. A Full Set of Recommendations

Length: approximately 10 pages

A full set of Recommendations* capturing the main findings, conclusions and lessons.

**All conclusions should be cross-referenced back to the appropriate findings, lessons or conclusions. Recommendations must be presented in a logical order with the overriding and fundamental recommendations first followed by the more detailed recommendations. The recommendations should also be ranked and presented in the order of importance.*

Annex 4. Quality Grid

The draft and final versions of the Final Report will be assessed using the below "quality grid". The completed quality grid for the final version of the report will be published on the Internet along with the report http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/index.htm.

Jugement de qualité des rapports d'évaluation - Application de la grille MEANS

La grille "MEANS" est une grille synthétique d'appréciation de la qualité des travaux d'évaluation. Elle a pour but de juger la manière dont l'évaluation a été conduite et en conséquence de savoir si les conclusions et éventuellement les recommandations de l'évaluation peuvent être prises en compte.

Par rapport à la grille MEANS classique qui comporte 8 critères, nous avons ajouté un 9ème critère pour tenir compte des rapports dans lesquels les évaluateurs auraient proposé des recommandations; ce 9ème critère n'est donc pas toujours applicable. La grille MEANS classique comporte 4 niveaux de jugement, nous avons introduit un 5ème niveau, correspondant au jugement pauvre ou faible.

La grille synthétique est présentée à la page suivante. Nous précisons ensuite le référentiel pour porter le niveau de jugement pour chacun des critères de la grille. D'une manière générale, le niveau acceptable signifie que le travail d'évaluation est tout à fait correct. Le niveau "excellent" ne doit être utilisé que de façon exceptionnelle. Le niveau "inacceptable" signifie que pour le critère concerné le rapport est refusé.

EVALUATION DE

Grille synthétique d'appréciation de la qualité des travaux d'évaluation

Concernant ce critère, le rapport d'évaluation est:	Inacceptable	Médiocre	Bon	Très bon	Excellent
1. La satisfaction des demandes : L'évaluation traite-t-elle de façon adéquate les demandes d'information formulées par les commanditaires et correspond-elle au cahier des charges ?					
2. L'adéquation du champ : La raison d'être du programme[19], ses réalisations, ses résultats et ses impacts sont-ils étudiés dans leur totalité, y compris ses interactions avec d'autres politiques et ses conséquences imprévues ?					
3. L'adéquation de la méthodologie : La conception de l'évaluation est- elle adaptée et adéquate pour fournir les résultats nécessaires (avec leurs limites de validité) pour répondre aux principales questions évaluatives ?					
4. La fiabilité des données : Les données primaires et secondaires collectées ou sélectionnées sont-elles adaptées ? Offrent-elles un degré suffisant de fiabilité par rapport à l'usage attendu ?					
5. La solidité de l'analyse : L'analyse des informations quantitatives et qualitatives est-elle conforme aux règles de l'art, complète et adaptée afin de répondre correctement aux questions évaluatives ?					
6. La crédibilité des résultats : Les résultats découlent-ils logiquement et sont-ils justifiés par l'analyse des données et par des interprétations basées sur des hypothèses explicatives présentées avec soin ?					
7. La valeur des conclusions: Les conclusions sont-elles justes, découlent-elles de l'analyse et sont-elles non biaisées par des considérations personnelles ou partisanes ?					
8. L'utilité des recommandations : Les recommandations sont-elles compréhensibles, utiles, applicables et assez détaillées pour être concrètement mises en œuvre ? Les recommandations découlent-elles des conclusions ?					
9. La clarté du rapport : Le rapport décrit-il le contexte et le but du programme évalué ainsi que son organisation et ses résultats de façon telle que les informations fournies soient aisément compréhensibles ?					
Compte tenu des contraintes contextuelles spécifiques qui ont pesé sur cette évaluation, le rapport d'évaluation est considéré comme					

---

[19] Le terme programme est générique. Il peut s'agir également de politique publique, ou de plusieurs programmes.

Critère 1 : La satisfaction des demandes

Bon: Les demandes formulées dans le cahier des charges ont reçu une réponse de manière correcte. En particulier, les questions évaluatives ont été traitées de manière satisfaisante.

Très bon :   Le rapport d'évaluation a bien exposé une vue d'ensemble de la manière dont les objectifs annoncés ont été atteints et a clarifié la logique d'intervention. Le rapport d'évaluation a été au-delà des demandes du cahier des charges et a abordé d'autres sujets d'intérêt.

Médiocre :   Certaines questions du cahier des charges ont été traitées de manière inadéquate ou n'ont été que partiellement abordées.

Inacceptable : De trop nombreuses questions du cahier des charges n'ont pas été abordées ou n'ont été que partiellement abordées.

Excellent :   Les questions abordées couvrent non seulement les demandes du cahier des charges mais replacent l'évaluation dans un cadre beaucoup plus général en liaison avec les bases de la politique de développement, de coopération ou de la politique extérieure et de toute autre politique communautaire ou nationale.

<p align="center">* * *</p>

Critère 2 : La pertinence du champ d'évaluation

En général le champ d'évaluation a trois composantes : le champ temporel, le champ géographique et le champ réglementaire (en particulier les groupes cibles concernés).

Bon :   Les 3 champs, temporel, géographique et réglementaire sont correctement pris en compte. Les principaux effets non attendus ont été relevés.

Très bon :   Au-delà des 3 champs concernés, l'évaluation s'est intéressée aux interactions de la politique avec d'autres politiques, structurelle ou agricole au niveau national ou communautaire. Tous les effets non attendus ont été traités.

Médiocre :   L'un des 3 champs d'évaluation est insuffisamment ou mal traité.

Inacceptable : Deux des trois champs sont mal ou insuffisamment traités.

Excellent :   En plus des remarques sur le niveau bon, le rapport a systématiquement étudié en détail les effets non attendus de la politique.

<p align="center">* * *</p>

Critère 3 :   L'adéquation de la méthodologie

Bon :   La stratégie d'évaluation est clairement explicitée et est effectivement appliquée au cours de l'étude. Les choix méthodologiques ont été adéquats pour répondre aux demandes du cahier des charges.

Très bon : Les limites inhérentes à la stratégie d'évaluation ont été clairement précisées et les choix méthodologiques ont été discutés et défendus par rapport à d'autres options.

Médiocre : A la lecture du rapport d'évaluation, il apparaît que des choix méthodologiques ont été faits mais ils n'ont été ni explicités ni défendus.

Inacceptable : Il n'existe aucune stratégie d'évaluation et les choix méthodologiques apparaissent souvent en inadéquation par rapport aux résultats recherchés.

Excellent : Au-delà du niveau bon, l'évaluateur fournit les critiques à sa stratégie globale et à ses choix méthodologiques et indique les risques courus dans la prise d'autres choix méthodologiques.

* * *

Critère 4 : La fiabilité des données

Ce critère ne juge pas de la validité intrinsèque des données disponibles mais de la manière dont le consultant a trouvé les données et comment il les a utilisées.

Bon : Les sources de données quantitatives et qualitatives sont identifiées. La fiabilité des données a été testée et discutée par le consultant. Les méthodes de collecte ont été clairement explicitées et sont adaptées aux informations recherchées.

Très bon : Les données ont été systématiquement croisées à travers des sources ou des méthodes de recherche indépendantes les unes des autres. Les limites de validité des données et des méthodes de collecte des données sont clairement exposées.

Médiocre : Les informations quantitatives et qualitatives fournies sont peu représentatives au regard de la question posée. Les méthodes de collecte de données sont discutables (par exemple échantillon ou étude de cas mal ciblés).

Inacceptable : Les données sont manifestement fausses. Les méthodes de collecte sont incorrectes ou fournissent des renseignements biaisés ou inutilisables.

Excellent : Tous les biais découlant des informations fournies sont analysés et corrigés par des méthodes reconnues.

* * *

Critère 5 : La solidité de l'analyse

Bon : Les méthodes d'analyse des données quantitatives et/ou des données qualitatives sont faites rigoureusement suivant des méthodes reconnues et pertinentes par rapport aux types de données analysées. Les relations de cause à effet entre une mesure et les différents effets sont explicitées. Les comparaisons (par exemple : avant/après, bénéficiaires/non bénéficiaires ou contrefactuelles) sont réalisées de manière adaptée.

Très bon : Les méthodes d'analyse sont explicitées et leur limite de validité précisée. Les hypothèses sous-jacentes aux effets causals sont explicitées. Les limites de validité des comparaisons effectuées sont indiquées.

Médiocre : Un des trois éléments (méthode d'analyse, relations causales, comparaisons) est mal traité ou 2 de ces éléments sont traités de manière insuffisante.

Inacceptable : 2 des 3 éléments sont mal traités.

Exceptionnel : Tous les biais d'analyse (à travers les 3 éléments) ont été systématiquement analysés et présentés avec leur conséquence sur la limite de validité de l'analyse.

* * *

Critère 6 : La crédibilité des résultats

Ce critère est objectivement le plus difficile à juger.

Bon : Les résultats produits par l'analyse apparaissent fiables et équilibrés, notamment au vu du contexte dans lequel le programme est évalué.
Les hypothèses interprétatives et les extrapolations faites sont acceptables.
Les résultats reflètent un compromis acceptable entre la réalité décrite par les données et les faits constatés ou estimés et la réalité du programme telle qu'elle est perçue par les acteurs et les bénéficiaires.

Très bon : Les limites des hypothèses interprétatives et des extrapolations faites sont explicitées et discutées.
Les effets propres aux mesures évaluées sont isolés des effets dus au contexte et aux contraintes dans lesquels elles sont appliquées.
L'équilibre entre la validité interne (absence de biais au sein de la méthode) et la validité externe (représentativité des résultats) est satisfaisant.

Médiocre : Les résultats de l'analyse apparaissent déséquilibrés.
Le contexte n'est pas explicité.
Les extrapolations faites et les hypothèses retenues sont peu pertinentes.

Inacceptable : Les résultats de l'analyse apparaissent très peu crédibles.
Le texte contient des affirmations qui ne sont pas étayées.
Les extrapolations faites et les généralisations de l'analyse ne sont pas pertinentes.

Exceptionnel : Les déséquilibres entre la validité interne et la validité externe des résultats sont systématiquement analysés et leurs conséquences sur l'étude d'évaluation explicitées.
Les effets contextuels ont été isolés et ont pu être démontrés grâce à des indicateurs pertinents.

Les biais apportés dans le choix des hypothèses interprétatives et dans les extrapolations faites sont analysés et leurs conséquences explicitées.

* * *

Critère 7 : La validité des conclusions

Ce critère ne juge pas de la valeur intrinsèque des conclusions mais de la manière dont les conclusions ont été atteintes.

Bon : Les conclusions découlent de l'analyse.
Les conclusions sont argumentées par des faits et des analyses facilement identifiables dans le reste du rapport.
Les limites et le contexte de validité des conclusions sont indiquées.

Très bon : Les conclusions sont discutées au regard du contexte dans lequel l'analyse a été faite.
Les limites de validité des conclusions sont explicites et argumentées.

Médiocre : Les conclusions proviennent d'une généralisation hâtive de certaines analyses faites.
Les limites de validité des conclusions ne sont pas indiquées.

Inacceptable : Les conclusions ne s'appuient pas sur une analyse pertinente et rigoureuse.
Les conclusions se basent sur des données non prouvées.
Les conclusions sont partiales car elles reflètent plus les a priori de l'évaluateur que l'analyse des faits.

Excellent : Les conclusions sont hiérarchisées, elles sont faites en rapport avec la globalité du programme évalué et elles tiennent compte des relations de ce programme avec le contexte dans lequel il se situe, en particulier en tenant compte des autres programmes ou politiques publiques affectant ce programme particulier.

* * *

Critère 8 : L'utilité des recommandations

Ce critère ne juge pas de la valeur intrinsèque des recommandations mais de leur pertinence par rapport à la manière dont a été conduite l'étude et notamment au regard des conclusions.

Bon : Les recommandations découlent logiquement des conclusions.
Les recommandations sont impartiales.

Très bon : En plus du référentiel précédent, les recommandations sont hiérarchisées et elles sont présentées sous forme d'options d'actions possibles.

Médiocre : Les recommandations sont peu claires ou sont des pures évidences qui enfoncent des portes ouvertes, leur opérationalité est discutable. La relation avec les conclusions n'est pas évidente.

Inacceptable : Les recommandations sont déconnectées des conclusions.

Les recommandations sont partiales car elles reflètent de façon prépondérante les points de vue de certains acteurs ou de certains bénéficiaires ou elles reflètent la pensée propre de l'évaluateur en référence à un système de valeur socio-économique et un objectif par rapport au programme étudié.

Excellent : Outre le référentiel du niveau bon, les recommandations sont testées et les limites de validité de celles-ci sont indiquées.

* * *

Critère 9 : La clarté du rapport

Bon : Le rapport est lisible facilement et la structure du rapport est logique ou reflète les demandes des lignes directrices.
Le résumé court reflète le rapport.
Les concepts spécialisés et les démonstrations techniques sont présentées en annexe avec des références claires dans le corps du texte.

Très bon : Le corps du rapport est court et concis, de lecture fluide.
La structure du rapport est mémorisable facilement.
Le résumé est clair et présente de façon équilibrée et impartiale les conclusions et recommandations principales.

Médiocre : Le rapport est difficilement lisible et/ou sa structure est complexe.
Les références croisées sont peu compréhensibles ou rendent la lecture difficile.
Le résumé est trop long ou ne reflète pas le corps du rapport.

Inacceptable : Absence de résumé.
Rapport illisible et/ou de structure désordonnée.
Absence de chapitre de conclusions (et de recommandations).

Excellent : Le rapport se lit "comme un roman" et sa structuration est d'une logique inattaquable.
Le résumé est opérationnel en lui-même.

* * *

Appréciation générale

La qualité générale du rapport découle de l'ensemble des niveaux accordés à chacun des 9 critères. A partir de 4 "inacceptables", le rapport doit être considéré comme inacceptable.

Lorsque l'évaluation est jugée "inacceptable" ou "excellente" pour un critère donné, l'appréciation devra être étayée par au moins deux exemples argumentés.

Lorsque l'évaluation est jugée "médiocre" ou "très bonne" pour un critère donné, l'appréciation devra être appuyée par au moins un exemple ou une référence explicative.