TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 MANDATE

XXXXXXXXX

2 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

2.1 Background

In recent years there has been a major push to improve the quality and aid effectiveness of Technical cooperation (TC), as demonstrated by agreements such as the 2005 Paris Declarations and 2008 Accra Agenda for Action. This has focused attention on ensuring that TC is more relevant to the needs of partners, is owned by partners and is demand-driven by the needs of beneficiaries.

The EC has made a commitment to implement the targets outlined in the Paris Declarations, including two indicators specifically related to TC. A recent evaluation of the Paris Declaration[1] concluded that TC was still poorly delivered. This assessment was echoed by the 2007 European Court of Auditors Special Report on the effectiveness of EC Technical Assistance[2], which raised many of the same issues.

To improve performance in this area, the EC developed a Backbone Strategy in July 2008 on 'Reforming Technical Cooperation and Project Implementation Units for External Aid provided by the European Commission'[3]. This was based on a number of preparatory reports and a comprehensive internal consultation process.

The Backbone Strategy identifies four purposes of TC:

- Capacity Development of organisations and individuals;
- Provision of policy and/or expert advice;
- Strengthening implementation (of services, investments and regulatory activities); and
- Preparation/facilitation of EC cooperation (or broader donor cooperation).

According to the Backbone Strategy, TC is the provision of know-how in the form of personnel, training and research and associated costs (OECD DAC Statistical Reporting Directives 40-44). It comprises donor-financed:

- Activities that augment the level of knowledge, skills, technical know-how or productive aptitudes of people in developing countries; and
- Services such as consultancy, technical support, or the provision of know-how that contribute to the execution of a capital project.

---

[1] Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declarations, Synthesis Report: http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Subweb/paris_evaluation_web/files/pages/english.html

[2] EU Court of Auditors Special Report on the 'effectiveness of technical assistance in the context of capacity development together with the Commission's replies', No 6/2007 (http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/673583.PDF)

[3] EC Backbone Strategy on 'Reforming Technical Cooperation and Project Implementation Units for External Aid provided by the European Commission': http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/backbone_strategy_technical_cooperation_en.pdf

Implementation of the Backbone Strategy is now underway, as set out within an agreed work plans published in July 2008[4] and October 2009, and according to a set of guidelines publish in March 2009 entitled 'Making Technical Cooperation More Effective'[5].

Capacity Development (CD) being the focus of the RAC, it is important to establish – since the beginning – a clear understanding of its definition and on the key definitions that the RAC exercise implies:

- **CAPACITY:** according to DAC-OECD definition, it refers to the ability of people, organizations, and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully. *Capacity development* is the process by which people, organizations and society as a whole create, strengthen and maintain their capacity over time.

- **PROCESS:** It is the learning path for the exercise of certain capacities. This trajectory is the product of formal knowledge, practice and of the relation among individuals oriented to the creation of knowledge. This last one is characterized by the relational dynamic, different from a process of engineering production by the accent put in the interaction between individuals in different positions and functions.

- **PROCESS OR INDIVIDUAL LEARNING PATH**: It is the personal path in the knowledge and practices acquisition that goes from higher education and college to past and present work experiences. The visualization of the learning process facilitates the distinction between outputs and outcomes. The impact evaluation is focused on the outputs and outcomes seen in the prospect of a process or individual learning path.

- **PROCESS OR ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING PATH**: From the pooling of individual learnings, organizations create a specific way of regeneration and transformation of these knowledges; they are absorb by the organisation and contribute to give her its own identity.

- **CAPACITY OUTPUTS:** These are the changes in the internal competencies that are in the beneficiary institution; they are determined and/or induced directly by the Programme. It is the product or expected service that result from the availability of specific inputs.

  These changes do not represent new capacities by themselves, but they identify areas where it is possible that institutional / individual capacity has been strenghned thanks to the contribution of the Programme at personal and organizational level.

  Example: Establishment of a sectoral monitoring system with indicators and actions plans.

- **CAPACITY OUTCOMES:** These include the acquisition and development from the beneficiary institution side of new levels of capacity. It is the outcome or the sequential effect of the *outputs* within the dynamics of a certain context. Outcomes determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the outputs and their analysis allows understanding the possible problems to solve in the production of outputs.

- **CAPACITY OUTCOMES CATEGORIES:**

  - ✓ *Ability to Survive and Act:* Capacity of an individual and an institution to generate plans (strategic or of other levels) that reflect their needs, their mission and consider the changing contexts; and capacity of mobilization of resources and of management to execute them.

---

[4] Backbone Strategy Work Plan: http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/backbone-strategy-core-documents

[5] EC Tools and Methods Series, Guidelines No. 3, Making Technical Cooperation More Effective: http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/backbone-strategy-core-documents

- ✓ ***Ability to Achieve Results:*** Capacity of an individual and an institution to reach on a sustainable way development results stated in national development policies and sectoral policies.

- ✓ ***Ability to Network:*** Capacity of an individual and an institution to work in a coordinated and efficient manner as part of a larger network of interested stakeholders.

- ✓ ***Ability to Self-renew:*** Capacity of an individual and an institution to constantly adapt in response to changing external environments and conditions. It requires a reflective act.

- ✓ ***Ability to achieve oherence (between the fous previous categories; Linking the strategic and operational levels):*** Capacity of an individual and an institution to put in place policy and management frameworks that build upon one another and provide evidence of a clear chain of results from the strategic to the operational levels.

    These capacities are necessary for the accomplishment of the institutions' mission, beyond the duration of any external aid programme, and are therefore the basis for the continuity of the institution.

    Example: Use of the knowledge of indicators' management and action plans in the implementation of other programmes or elaboration of norms or laws that use indicators or similar action plans.

2.2 Purpose

The role of TC in generating capacity development is the scope of the present study. This evaluation study aims to implement a Rapid Assessment of Capacity Development (RAC) in the framework of XXXXXXXXX

ADD BACKGROUND ON THE EC INTERVENTION TO BE ASSESSED

The objective of the RAC is to assess the impact that the interaction with TITLE OF THE EC INTERVENTION generates at individual and/or organisational level in terms of capacity development and/or strenghnening. It is not an evaluation of the intervention, nor the evaluation of the technical assistance component of the intervention.

Although the RAC focuses on the impact of a specific programme in terms of capacity development, the latter never acts in a typical situation of isolation as in a laboratory. Therefore, in terms of the impact and the contribution of the programme to capacity development, it is necessary to think in terms of a learning process, understood as an individual and organizational open process with a past, a present and a future in which the programme interacts strenghening and valorizing acquired knowledge and/or introducing new knowledge. The program can affect the process but it does not develop the capacities by itself, as other actors like the Government, other donors and the same beneficiaries are also part of the process.

3 THE RAC METHOD

The RAC is not a special methodology; it is only a simplified application of the thorough methodology adopted by the EC for evaluating Capacity development effects of TC interventions. The RAC procedure refers to the standard EQs and JCs and follows the criteria of the thorough methodology available on the web page of the DG DEVCO Evaluation Unit, at the following address:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/index_en.htm.

3.1 Characteristics of the instruments for data collection

The methodology counts on a series of precise instruments for data collection. The instruments are designed to face the difficulties of data collection in different contexts and to give to the programme stakeholders encountered during the RAC exercise a feedback that contitutes a value added to the received information. These instruments present the following characteristics:

✓ They give to the evaluated stakeholder the possibility of being an active part of the exercise, avoiding the dichotomy between the evaluator and the subject of the evaluation, without losing the objectives of the evaluation and the functions of the evaluator.

✓ They give to the evaluated stakeholder, individual or institution, inmediate feedback, giving information that can lead to a greater awareness of the learning process. This feedback provides, in addition, data on the development stage of the profile of capacities of each one of the participants in the evaluation. At the end of the exercise each participant will have elements to respond to two questions:

   o What knowledge and capacities have I acquired?

   o What is still missing in relation to the requirements of the professional career path that I have drawn up for myself and the one that the institution demands?

These same questions can be applied concerning the institution.

✓ They motivate the evaluated stakeholder to actively participate in the evaluation exercises and in the workshop. This helps the application of the methodology in contexts that are not completely propitious to the impact evaluation.

✓ They allow EU delegations to better visualize the objectives and the utility of the results of the methodology and therefore its adoption and periodic application as an instrument with practical utility.

3.2 The initial questions to be asked at the beginning of each phase

As a previous step before data collection starts in each step of the methodology, it is necessary to think about and to ask a specific question. The aim of formulating a question is to orient data collection in a delimited area of possible answers. Focusing the attention in key information avoids the dispersion of information or the distraction in secondary or nonrelevant issues for the goal pursued.

The questions, therefore, must have a high level of specificity with respect to the context and to the impact of the evaluated programme. On the other hand, the questions are not static; they are further developed with gathered information. The question is the light that guides the navigation in data collection.

Herewith the basic questions, to be further adapted and developed in each RAC:

▪ Assessment of the Opportunity framework:

   The preliminar question is:

   Which was the degree of fertilization for the development of capacities at the beginning of the evaluated programme?

   The second question is:

   Which are the contextual factors that have facilitated or negatively affected the Programme actions in the stakeholders' capacity development?

▪ Assessment of capacity outputs:

   The preliminar question is:

> *To establish the value of the different learning sources (university-courses of specialization, previous experiences, experience in present work, experience of work and interaction with the evaluated programme)*

The second question is:

> *What have you, as individual, and your institution, learned in your interaction with the intervention?*

- Assessement of capacity outcomes:

  The preliminar question is:

  > *Of what we learned, both at individual and/or institutional level, in our interaction with the intervention, what are we using in our daily work (also outside the intervention's sphere)?*

  The second question is:

  > *How, when, where are we using it?*

- Capacity outputs and capacity outcomes' correlation:

  The question is:

  > *Which are the specific capacity outputs currently used for the develoment of specific capacity otcomes?*

3.3   Assessement of the Opportunity framework

This assessment should be included in the current instruction and monitoring procedure, according to the QSG. It should be available for each programme. This is the standard case considered for the RAC.

In case it is not be available, the current § presents the methodology to be applied.

The methodological framework for the assessment of the context opportunities distinguishes between the identification of:

1. Facilitating factors, all those that create favorable conditions for the implementation and development of the programme

2. Limiting factors, all those that tend to prevent or to limit the implementation and the normal development of the programme.

The set of factors of the contextual framework allows visualizing both the fertile spaces as well as those that affect or can negatively affect the implementation and development of a programme.

It is necessary, within the contextual framework, to give a particular attention to the temporal variable as it is considered that the development of capacities is part of a complex process with different levels of conditions (societal, institutional and sectoral) within a delimited timeframe. In order to establish the timeframe, it is necessary to establish the continuity line or the discontinuity of the programme evaluated with:

- Previous cooperation initiatives,
- Societal conditions
- Institutional conditions
- Sectoral conditions

The positioning or insertion of the programme in certain context conditions is useful to determine what is the role played or being played by the programme. From a role of catalyst of

initiatives to a role of rupture with respect to previous EC efforts. The same in relation to the role of the programme in social practices, in the governmental and sectoral policies and their incidence or lack of incidence in the capacity development processes in which it is inserted.

The factors of the opportunity framework are identified as follows:

i.   They are treated in the individual and collective interviews. That is to say, the factors are directly identified by the interviewed people; and developed sometimes jointly with the evaluation team.

ii. The factors identified in the interviews are regrouped, if possible, in three areas: societal, institutional and sectoral. For each area a list is made distinguishing between facilitating and limiting factors.

iii. The factors are prioritized during the workshop. First, several groups of persons are created (the number can vary according to the total number of participants). The work with each group has three moments that correspond to each of the three areas (societal, institutional and sectoral). For each of the moments, the work method is as follows:

   a.   distribution by the evaluation team of the list of facilitating and limiting factors, by area.

   b.   prioritization for each area of the three main facilitating factors and of the three main limiting factors. Each participant does this exercise individually.

   c.   group discussion to establish the high-priority factors jointly. They have the possibility to develop and/or to expand the factors previously identified.

   d.   each group writes in post-its of different colors (each color corresponds to each one of the three areas) the main facilitating and limiting factors separately,

   e.   a person of each group places the post-its in the wall papers (before the workshop starts, the evaluation team places three big papers in the wall (one for each area), each one with separarte spaces for the facilitating and the limiting factors).

   f.   For the contextual factors not included in the list presented in the workshop by the evaluation team, the same exercise of prioritization and presentation applies.

3.4   Assessement of the capacity-ouputs

The methodological steps to establish the values of the capacity-outputs are the following:

i.   To identify the capacity output in individual and collective interviews and collective couching sessions (co-couching). Collective couching is addressed to a group of people of a same institution that is part or collaborates with the activities of the programme.

   The couching session needs to be done after an individual interview with the hierarchic person in charge of the relevant institution. It is important to agree with him the terms of the couching. A minimum number of 4 people is required

   It is done as follows:

   a.   the team leader of the evaluation team initiates the meeting with a presentation of the evaluation exercise as a whole and of the specific purpose of the meeting

   b.   Presentation of the participants and the members of the evaluation team

   c.   Introduction by the evaluation team of the modalities of the meeting

   d.   Propose a brief individual exercise that consists of putting in a sheet of paper the distribution (in percentage → 100%) of four learning sources (i. university and specialization courses, ii. Previous work experience, iii. Current work experience

and iv. Interaction with the considered programme). No more than 5 minutes of time.

e. Work in couple (A and B). A and B exchange their respective sheets of paper of the previous exercise. A asks B about the reasoning behind his percentage distribution, focusing on the current work experience and on the programme. A asks B for concrete examples and he writes them in B's sheet. After this 5 minute exercise, A says to B, with concrete examples, what he (A) has observed in B in terms of learning thanks to the interaction with the programme and that was not included in B's sheet. They discuss and if B agrees with the example provided by A, A writes it in B's sheet.

The exercise is repeated changing the roles.

f. Work group. Each participant briefs on what happened in the previous exercise and mentions what he considers to be the most important learning acquired in the interaction with the programme.

g. Again, work in couple (changing partners). For about 5 minutes, they interchange observations and experiences from one or two concrete examples of organizational learning. The question to which they should respond with one or two examples is the following:

What the office or the unit knows to do better since it participates in the programme?

h. Work group. Each participant gives an example of organizational learning. In the end, a brief group discussion is opened on the subject, not more than 5-10 minutes.

i. The evaluation team concludes with a synthesis and if the person in charge of the office or unit has participated in the coaching session, he is asked for a final consideration and he closes the work.

The co-couching session cannot last for more than two hours and the time will depend on the number of people, maximum 15.

ii. To list the capacity outputs mentionned in the coaching session (with concrete examples) and to classify it by categories, if feasible. The categories should be as follows:

a. Individual capacity outputs.

i. Personal and relationships

ii. Organisational and managerial

b. Organisational capacity outputs.

i. Relationships

ii. Organisational and managerial

iii. To prioritize the capacity outputs during the workshop.

a. First. Groups of five people are created (the number can vary according to the total number of participants). They can be the same groups as from the opportunity framework assessment exercise, or different. What it's important is that the groups are mixed, composed by persons coming from different institutions. The list of capacity outputs identified during the previous phases is given to each person.

b. Priorities are established in an individual way.

c. Then they are discussed within the group. The group discussion does not aim at obtaining consensus or unamimity but on the contrary, to listen to the differences and convergences to establish an overview of the priorities.

It is posible to develop and/or to expand the list of capacity outputs.

d. At the end of the group work, a *rapporteur* presents the results initiating by telling what happened in the group discussion and afterwards presenting the overview of priorities (including, if relevant, the added ones to).

3.5   Assessement of the capacity-outcomes

The distinction between individual and organizational capacity outcomes is elaborated and developed during the workshop. During the interviews and previous work the focus is on the learning process mainly in terms of capacity outputs and secondly on the capacity outcomes. However, the exercise proposed in the workshop invites the participants to distinguish, individually and in-group, the different capacity outcomes.

The newness is that during the workshop the distinction between individual and organisationl capacity outcomes is made more explicit and a third option is added: capacity outcomes that are contemporarily both individual and organisational.

Capacity outcomes are classified as individual, organisational or both, as follows:

i.   Capacity outcomes are identified during individual and collective interviews and during the coaching sessions.

In the co-coaching session the last part of the exercise, before the conclusions, must be devoted to answer to the following question:

> **Which ones of the individual and organizational learnings acquired or further developed through the interaction with the programme have been used or are used outside the programme's sphere?** **Provide examples (*explain* what, *how, when, where*).**

Each participant responds individually and writes down at least one example of individual learning in a sheet of paper and of organizational learning in another one (5 minutes).

Each participant presents to his group the main individual and organisational learning example he has written down. An overview of the main learning processess leading to specific capacity outcomes is established.

ii.   The information collected through previous steps is clasified according to the five categories of capacity outcomes foreseen in the methodology (***Ability to Survive and Act, Ability to Achieve Results, Ability to Relate, Ability to Self-renew and Ability to achieve coherence between the previous capacity-outcomes (to Link the strategic and operational levels)).***

iii.   To prioritize, to specify, to complete and to add in each one of the five capacity-outcome categories. First individually and then in group. In the end a *rapporteur* by category in each one of the groups presents the results of the joit analyses, mentioning the priorities inside each category.

3.6   Capacity output and capacity outcome correlation

The statistical results of the correlations allow illustrating the impact of the programme evaluated in capacity development, as broad trends of a complex and diversified phenomenon.

Indeed, the learning processes are not necessarily sequential and they can not be simply reduced to a mere statistical average. On the contrary, each individual owns its own path, with variations and personalizations that cannot be replicated. Nevertheless, the numerical exercise helps identifying the most important flows between capacity outputs and capacity outcomes.

The correlation exercise is realized as a last activity of the workshop. The steps are as follows:

i. To identify and to list the main capacity-outputs and capacity-outcomes from the results of the individual and collective interviews and from the co-couching sessions.

ii. Two different sheets are created: one for individual capacities and another one for organisational capacities. In each sheet, two different columns are created. The first one lists the capacity-outputs and the second one the capacity-outcomes. These sheets are done before the workshop starts, for distribution among the participants, and therefore do not, cannot, consider the prioritisation exercises carried out in the workshop. The prioritisation exercises focus more on the individual and collective perceptions while the correlatin exercise has the aim of providing quantitave information.

iii. The participants complete the two sheets linking with an arrow the capacity-outputs that have led, based on their experience, to specific capacity-outcomes. Each participant establishes up to 10 correlations (arrows) per sheet. A single capacity-output may lead to one or more capacity-outcomes.

iv. The results of the correlation exercises are synthetised in an excel file. Those capacity-outputs and capacity-outcomes that do not have an arrow are disregarded.

v. The dispersion of correlations is avoided through a coefficient.

The representativeness of the correlation between Outputs and Outcomes is inversely proportional to the level of dispersion: greater the dispersion level is, that is to say, the number of established arrows/correlations, smaller the intensity of the relation of a specific output with a specific outcome is.

Coefficient C is calculated based on the following formula:

$$C = \frac{\text{Total General - N° of correlations}}{\text{Total general}}$$

The coefficient has a value that goes from 0 to 1. The nearest it is to 1, the more representative the correlation is since one would be in the presence of a low dispersion. It is possible therefore to say that the capacity outputs that obtain a result greater to 0.5 are those that have obtained total values with smaller dispersion and therefore they will be more significant for the analysis.

4   OUTPUTS

At the end of the RAC exercise, the evaluation team will prepare a RAC note, as per the standard format provided in Annex.

5   TIMING AND ORGANISATION OF THE WORK

The RAC must be finalised by XXXXXXXXX.

The RAC is implemented in five stages:

1. PRE-MISSION WORK (TEAM LEADER)

    ✓ Reading of basic programme documents (Financing proposal, monitoring and/or evaluation reports).

    ✓ Elaboration of the programme's Intervention Logic

✓ Agenda prepared in collaboration with the programme's staff and updated, if needed, *in situ*.

2. FIRST MISSION (ALL TEAM)

✓ Training of the national expert

✓ Focus on the assessment of the Enabling factors:

  o Opportunity framework: facilitating and limiting factors

  o Quality criteria

This is done via:

  o a briefing session with EU delegation and with the programme's staff

  o individual and collective interviews with key stakeholders (beneficiaries and people with direct interaction with the programme)

  o individual interviews with actors that have an indirect interaction with the programme (other agencies working in the area, academia, etc.)

✓ Focus on a first overview of capacity outputs and capacity outcomes generated or further developed thanks to the interaction with the programme.

This is done via:

  o individual and collective interviews, as well as co-couching sessions, with key stakeholders (beneficiaries and people with direct interaction with the programme)

3. ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE (NATIONAL EXPERT)

✓ The standard questionnaire (see Annex) is adapted based on the first missions' interviews' findings. It has to be tailored to the specific context and institution(s). The adaptation of the Questionnaire will take no more than one day of work.

✓ The questionnaire is used as a guide for interviews and aims at going far beyond on the capacity development analysis while poviding specific examples on the capacity outputs and cpacity outcomes generated.

✓ The interviewees should be selected among a few relevant persons (or groups of persons) within and outside the targeted institution: within the institution, the interviews should involve the heads and/or the key staff of the few departments involved in the targeted areas and other staff with more general responsibilities. Outside the institution, representatives of the civil society (users) and the political world (Parliament commissions, etc.)

✓ the number of interviews may range from 5 to 8 internal staff and 4 to 6 external people, with a total of 9 to 15 key interviews.

✓ the duration of the interview should range from one to two hours, so as to allow the national expert to complete the whole task in a maximum of three days, beside the preparation and processing. In situations where the expression of the opinions is supposed to be relatively free, the questionnaire may be given to the interviewees a few days or hours before the interview, to facilitate replies.

✓ After the interviews, findings will be analysed and classified, according to the various CD outputs and outcomes. For each group of outputs and outcomes, findings will be presented in a tabular form, and will be ranked according to the strength of their evidence (strong, medium, weak). Examples will be highlighted as a complement to

the tabular presentation. Findings will be presented in an anonymous way, although the distinction between inside/outside the institution will be kept.

4. SECOND MISSION (ALL TEAM)

✓ Synthesis analysis of the first mission's results & of the results from the administration of the questionnaire.

✓ Preparation of the workshop (material to be presented and disseminated).

✓ Workshop.

The workshop is intended as an in-depth and joint (all key stakeholders: EUD, national institutions, beneficiaries) analysis of the Enabling factors and of the capacity-outputs and capacity-outcomes (STEP 1 and STEP 2 of the methodology).

The workshop concludes on the correlation analysis between capacity outputs and capacity outcomes (STEP 3 of the methodology).

5. ELABORATION OF THE RAC NOTE (ALL TEAM)

✓ Elaboration of the RAC note as per standard format.

✓ The RAC note presents the findings of the different stages of the RAC and uses the results of the workshop to complete the analysis, mainly on the prioritisation of the capacity outputs and capacity outcome generated or further developed thanks to the interaction with the programme and their correlation.

6 SUMMARY OF THE NECESSARY INPUTS AND TIME

The RAC exercise will require the inputs of:

– for a standard RAC: both an international (TL) and a national expert.

– for an upgraded RAC (with couching sessions): two international (one being the TL) and one national expert.

ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION	TL	SENIOR INT. EXPERT	NATIONAL EXPERT	PLACE OF DUTY
PRE-MISSION WORK					
Programme rationale	Reading of basic programme documents Elaboration of the programme's Intervention Logic	2			Home based
Agenda	Identifying and organising the interviews			1	Country
FIRST MISSION					
International traveling		2	2		
Training	Training of the TL on the application of the methodology	1	1	1	Country
Enabling Factors	Completing with the available data the findings on the Enabling Factors and the inputs of the support programme	2	2	2	Country
Capacity outputs and capacity outcomes	Reconstruct a first overview of the programme's CD effects at individual and organisational level				Country

Adaptation of the questionnaire	Interviews with EUD and targeted institutions, and reformulation of the standard questionnaire	2	2	2	Country
ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE					
Administration of the Questionnaire	Preparation of the meetings agenda			1	Country
	Administering max 15 Questionnaires to the interviewees			3	Country
Summarising the findings	Summarising and classifying in tabular form the findings. Structuring the examples. Preparing and organising the workshop			2	Home based / Country
SECOND MISSION					
International traveling		2	2		
Workshop	Preparation of the invitations			1	Country
	Synthesis analysis of the first mission's results & of the results from the administration of the questionnaire	2	2	2	Country
	Elaboration of workshop material	2	2	2	Country
	Effective implementation	1	1	1	Country
RESTITUTION					
Conclusion	Drafting of the RAC report	4	2	2	Home-based
	TOTAL P/D	**20**	**16**	**20**	

7 RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND THE MONITORING OF THE RAC

XXXXXXXXX

8 THE EVALUATION TEAM

This RAC exercise requires an ET, composed by (**ONE OR TWO)** international experts and one national, with advanced knowledge and experience in:

- Capacity development and institutional strengthening issues, preferably with experience in individual and organisational couching;
- Evaluation of capacity cooperation and capacity development;
- Sector and thematic expertise (**TO BE ADAPTED**); and
- Data collection and analysis (especially qualitative).

The team should have a good mix of experts in order to complete the different tasks. The team will need to work in **XXXXX**, and possess excellent drafting skills.

The team leader must have sound understanding of EC evaluation methodology and possess considerable experience in managing evaluations of a similar size and character.

Evaluators must not have any direct involvement with the programme under consideration.

9 COST OF THE RAC

ANNEXES

10   ANNEX 1: STANDARD RAC QUESTIONNAIRE

The standard version of the Questionnaire, as presented below, needs a quick adaptation to the specific countries and programmes, and includes two parts: one on the CD outputs and another one on the CD outcomes. The questionnaire uses the standard EQs, in a simplified version.

1.   QUESTIONNAIRE ON CD OUTPUTS:

a- STAFF & RELATIONSHIP: during the last X years, has the institution shown any significant change in terms of staff capacities, thanks to the interaction with the Programme?

- new sectoral/ thematic competencies (provide details)
- knowledge of and links with the experience of similar institutions in other countries (provide details)
- better career opportunities (provide details)
- other

b- ORGANISATION AND FUNCTIONS: during the last X years, has the institution shown any significant change in terms of organisation, procedures and responsibilities thanks to the interaction with the Programme?

- strengthened units/functions for data processing, policy and financing (provide details)
- improved consultation of the stakeholders (surveys, consultation with civil society organisation, dialogue with political representatives and parliament) (provide details)
- other significant changes in organisation, procedures, functions (provide details)
- any change in the decision making process, such as improved evidence based decisions (provide details)

c- UNEXPECTED: during the last X years, has the institution shown any other significant change in terms of capacities acquired? (provide details)

2.   QUESTIONNAIRE ON CD OUTCOMES:

a- INITIATIVE: do you think that, compared to X years ago, the institution is

- capable of producing more initiatives (plans, laws, operations)? (Y/N and examples)
- capable of managing more financial, technological and technical means? (Y/N and examples)
- appearing socially and institutionally stronger? (Y/N)

b- RESULTS: do you think that the institution, compared to X years ago, is capable of

- better monitoring the development results? (Y/N and examples)
- better provide performance records? (Y/N and examples)
- playing a stronger leadership in policy development? (Y/N and examples)

c- NETWORKING: do you think that the institution, compared to X years ago, is capable of

- being better recognised and trusted by stakeholders and counterparts (social and political)? (Y/N and examples)
- being more listened to by politicians when addressing relevant policy issues? (Y/N and examples)

- establishing better relations and networking links inside (other institutions, e.g. universities, other ministries) and outside (sister institutions abroad – excluding donors) the country? (Y/N and examples)

d- SELF-RENEW: do you think that the institution, compared to X years ago, is capable of

- better learning from the experience (feed-back mechanisms: results are analysed and discussed and decisions are taken accordingly)? Y/N and examples)
- better negotiating, selecting and managing donors' inputs? (Y/N and examples)
- better identifying changes in the context and propose 'innovations' (reports, policy proposals, raising awareness) to address them? (Y/N and examples)

e- COHERENCE (BETWEEN THE FOUR PREVIOIS CAPACITY-OUTCOMES. LINK THE STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL LEVELS): do you think that the institution, compared to X years ago, is capable of

- better adapting the management structure to the policy mission and tasks, by increasing staff dynamics, results' based careers, decentralisation, etc.? (Y/N and examples)
- better governance, in terms of accountability, transparency of decisions, coordination, human resources management? (Y/N and examples)
- better systematised and transparent strategic, regulatory and operational framework? (Y/N and examples)

f- UNEXPECTED: do you think that the institution, compared to X years ago, has acquired other new capacities apart from the ones you have mentioned above?

- Can you just mention and shortly explain the most significant changes that you would like to stress, apart from the ones mentioned above?
- Aprt from the mention of any additional change, can you just briefly express an overall opinion on capacity change responding to the following question: can you mention the one, or two, or more important things that the institution is now able to do that it could not do X years ago?

g- CAUSALITY: can you mention a couple of key internal and/or external factors (or more) that have most contributed to the main changes identified so far?

11   ANNEX 2: RAC NOTE STANDARD INDEX

1.   Introduction

1.1   Objectives and scope of the RAC exercise

1.2   Purpose of the RAC Note

SECTION 1: INTERVENTION LOGIC OF THE PROGRAMME AND OPPORTUNITY FRAMEWORK IN WHICH IT INTERVENES

2.   Brief presentation of the programme

2.1   Objetives and expected results

2.2   Capacity Development component(s) of the programme

2.3   Intervention logic

3.   Quality criteria

4.   Assessment of the opportunity framework

4.1   Enabling factors (Societal, Institutional and Sectorial Context)

4.2   Limitating factors (Societal, Institutional and Sectorial Context)

SECTION 2: IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPACITY-OUTPUTS AND OF CAPACITY-OUTCOMES

5.   Assessment of the capacity-outputs

5.1   List of capacity-outputs

5.2   Unexpected effects

6.   Assessment of the capacity-outcomes

6.1   Capacities Developed at the Individual and Organizational Levels, and in Both Simultaneously

6.2   Developed Capacities - Organized by Category of Capacity-Outcomes

7.   Correlation between capacity-outputs and capacity-outcomes

7.1   Value of Capacity-Outputs

7.2   Value of the Capacity-Outcomes that Result from the Capacity-Outputs

8.   Conclusions

SECTION 3: ANNEXES

9.   Annex 1: methodological overview

9.1   Organisation of the mission

9.2   Adaptation of the RAC methodology to the specific case study

10.   Annex 2: list of people met

11.   Annex 3: sources of information

12.   Annex 4: correlation fiches

13.   Annex 5: list of capacity-outcomes

12   ANNEX 3: BACKGROUND KEY DOCUMENTATION

XXXXXXXXX