Appendix I

TERMS of REFERENCE
EVALUATION of ROMACT PROGRAMME

July 2020

A. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation concerns the ROMACT Programme, with focus on the implementation aspects of its methodological process and interventions for capacity building at local level. ROMACT is a joint initiative of the Council of Europe and the European Commission with the main aim to promote the social inclusion of marginalized Roma communities at local level.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of ROMACT and its methodological approach, in order to support the reviewing and improvement of relevant lines of intervention under the Programme, for an optimal impact on the target groups.

Therefore, the evaluation's outcomes are aimed at taking stock on the impact of ROMACT interventions in the field (between January 2016 – December 2019) and at further supporting the possible adjustments of its methodology, after being implemented in various municipalities in Bulgaria and Romania for periods ranging between 18 to 22 months.

The present ToR outlines the parameters of the evaluation exercise to be conducted in selected locations in Bulgaria and Romania.

B. EVALUATION BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

ROMACT was developed out of a need to combine efforts providing technical assistance at the local level to build up political will and sustained policy engagement, to enhance democratic participation and empowerment of local Roma citizens, to design and implement projects and to access national and EU funds. This was determined by the weak political will and lack of capacity of local administrations to develop, implement and monitor effective policies and projects often hamper the implementation of Roma inclusion strategies at local level and in particular an effective use of EU funds for that purpose.

The ROMACT Programme - *Building up political will and understanding of Roma inclusion at local and regional level* was launched in October 2013 with its consecutive projects[1] and aimed at improving local democracy, accountability, inclusiveness and responsiveness towards Roma

---

[1] ROMACT - building up political will and understanding of Roma inclusion at local and regional level (VS/2013/0259); ROMACTbis - extending and completing ROMACT1 (VS/2013/0512); ROMACT2 - pursuing the ROMACT programme (VS/2015/0108); ROMACT3 – _continuation of the programme (VS/2015/0320); ROMACT4 – _pursuing ROMACT Programme (VS/2016/0444); ROMACT 5 - Grant agreement VS/2017/0472 of 20.12.2017 (with Amendment 1 – _VS/2018/0407 of 10.12.2018); ROMACT6 – VS/2018/0332 of 26.10.2018; ROMACT 7 – VS/2019/0315 of 01.10.2019).

citizens and thereby improving delivery of services, building up political will and sustained policy engagement through general capacity development at local level.

In line with the general Programme approach and its methodological handbook[2], different ROMACT projects had the following objectives[3]:

- *To strengthen the capacity of local authorities* to perform their roles and responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner when it comes to designing and implementing plans, policies and projects, in particular active inclusion measures that improve Roma integration;
- *To support the establishment and enforcement of mechanisms and processes* promoting and ensuring good governance standards and ownership by local authorities and administrations of effective integrated development efforts covering education, employment, healthcare, housing, urban development and culture;
- *To equip local authorities with tools, knowledge and skills* enabling them to overcome the challenges and barriers they often face when it comes to taking into account the needs of the Roma, so that they become more citizen-oriented, responsive and accountable;
- *To improve the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability* of local policies, measures and delivery of services.

ROMACT entails the implementation of 4 methodological steps at local level, the process requiring between 18 and 22 months in each municipality.

- *First step: getting local authorities committed to include their Roma population* - The ROMACT team starts by raising the awareness of local authorities of the necessity to integrate the Roma population as well of opportunities, in particular economic opportunities, offered by the inclusion of all, including Roma. Once local authorities are convinced of the need to include Roma and are committed to act for that purpose, the ROMACT team helps them work together with the local Roma community, represented by the Roma Community Action Group (CAG) whose creation and functioning are also assisted by the ROMACT team.

- *Second step: agreeing on what needs to be done to improve the living conditions of the Roma community* - The ROMACT team helps local authorities in identifying the roots of the marginalization of the local Roma community and assessing what needs to be done to address them. This process, which is carried out in partnership with the CAG, feeds into the Local Development Action Plan.

- *Third step: translating the Local Development Action Plan into concrete measures and projects* - The ROMACT team assists local authorities in translating the Local Development Action Plan into concrete measures and projects, which are inclusive of all, including Roma. Where necessary the ROMACT team provides expertise and working tools in policy and project design. If needed, a specific programme of training sessions and other capacity building services, including coaching and mentoring, is organised. The

---

[2] ROMACT Handbook - https://issuu.com/romact0/docs/romact_handbook_en
[3] Refering to the ROMACT methodological process at local level. In different ROMACT Project contracts, some objectives refered to a Transnational Cooperarion Component that targeted the EU vulnerable migrants and wich were opened to municipalities of destination in Western EU countries.

ROMACT team also helps local authorities identify available human resources and capacities.

- *Fourth step: funding, implementing and monitoring measures and projects operationalizing the Joint Development Action Plan* - The ROMACT team assists local authorities in identifying available financial resources at the local level and where appropriate in applying for and obtaining national and EU funding. The provision of training sessions and other capacity building services described above is a modular process. It is not necessary to train or capacitate all stakeholders on all topics: it is adapted to the local needs.

Once the measures and projects are funded by local, national and / or international resources, the ROMACT team provides – when appropriate - management expertise to local authorities. ROMACT can also help them in monitoring the implementation of the measures and projects and in assessing their impact. Throughout the whole process the CAG continues to be associated.

Within the process of ROMACT, *capacity building of local authorities and CAGs / Roma citizens* is a permanent provision which is implemented based on the needs on the ground and on the requests from the municipal authorities. Based on the assessments done at the beginning of the ROMACT process, the team of experts propose building measures for the improvement of the capacity of the local authority to address the social inclusion needs of the marginalized communities.

ROMACT launches Calls for pools of experts, according to need, and designates them accordingly to support municipalities and citizens to work better together, to plan and implement actions and projects, to access funding etc. The ROMACT experts provide training and coaching, as well as assist municipal staff in accessing and implementing projects from EU and other sources of funding. ROMACT will ensure the training of the staff delegated by the applicant municipalities to be involved in the process and will allocate the needed consultants within the methodological framework of the Programme. Based on need, pools of consultants will be established / extended by the Programme to ensure support to the needs of the beneficiary municipalities.

Training and coaching is provided to the local level in the ROMACT municipalities based on need and expression of interest and can cover topics as: Community development; Strategic planning; Advocacy; Intercultural communication; Project Cycle Management; Fundraising; Accessing EU funds; Managing EU funded projects; Public procurement; Monitoring & evaluation; Tools & procedures for municipal social protection workers and mediators to address the issues of the most vulnerable / at risk groups within the Roma communities.

Since October 2013, up to date, the ROMACT process has been implememented according to its methodology in a total of 152 municipalities of 6 countries (Romania, Bulgaria, Slovak Republic, Czech Republic, Hungary and Italy). Since January 2018, ROMACT continued to be implemented only in municipalities of Bulgaria and Romania. (See appendix – Table of municipalities and periods of implementation in RO & BG)

C. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of ROMACT and its methodological approach, in order to support the reviewing and improvement of relevant lines of intervention under the Programme, for an optimal impact on the target groups.

The evaluation will help draw lessons on capacity building measures that are aimed at enabling local authorities in given municipalities in Bulgaria and Romania to develop better strategies, plans and projects for the social inclusion of Roma, and the improvement of living conditions of the marginalized communities. The conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will consist the basis for a ROMACT methodology revision that will be made available for replication by local authorities concerned and committed to the social inclusion of marginalized communities.

Furthermore, the evaluation report will contribute to the orientation and development of Council of Europe and European Commission's activities in the field of Roma inclusion in general and of its Joint Programmes in particular.

D. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The focus of this evaluation's objectives is set within the following parameters:

- To assess the overall effectiveness of the ROMACT Programme's methodological approach and of its interventions in contributing to the capacity development of local authorities and the related situation improvement of the targeted local communities;

- To identify lessons that the Council of Europe and the European Commission, as well as other stakeholders of the Programme should learn from its implementation;

E. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will cover the period of ROMACT implementation between January 2016 and December 2019 and will focus on the processes in 20 selected municipalities in Bulgaria and Romania. The effectiveness of ROMACT methodological process and of its interventions will be assessed in municipalities where the full ROMACT cycle was implemented.

F. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The ROMACT Programme with its methodological approach and interventions at local level will be evaluated against criteria of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, reflected in the guiding evaluation questions listed bellow.

G. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following evaluation questions have the aim to guide the evaluation process.
The ToR evaluation questions can be refined as a result of the Inception Phase.

1. *To what extent have the ROMACT methodological STEPS & ACTs been implemented in practice as the they are described in the ROMACT Handbook?*
   a. To which extent were the 4 STEPs and 17 ACTs of ROMACT relevant for the realities and process of the municipalities targeted, in terms of content, sequence and timeframe?
   b. Which of the STEPS / ACTs experienced challenges in being implemented? What were the barriers (internal factors related to the implementing stakeholders or other potential external factors)? What could be the solution / remedial proposals?
   c. What seems to be the most effective CAG componence (who participates and who should also participate in it?) and frequency of meetings of CAGs for the ROMACT process to succeed?
   d. What seems to be the most effective Task Force composition (who participates and who should also participate in it?) and frequency of Task Forces meetings for the ROMACT process to succeed?
   e. How effective are these structures (CAGs and Task Forces) in interacting with local institutions (local councils, administrations, schools, police, etc.)?
   f. What challenges and preconditions can influence the effective establishment and functioning of the CAG and of the Task Force?
   g. To which extent the manner of approval and accountability of the municipality over the Joint (Roma) Action Plans developed during ROMACT influenced the investments made further by the local authority? (Join Action Plans approved by Local Council decision vs. Joint Action Plans included in the mainstream Local Development Strategies etc.; planned actions vs. projects submitted for funding or investments made from local & national funding etc.); How useful was the Joint Action Plan template for the planning period of the municipal process (T5 Annex of the Handbook)?
   h. Was the communication about the Programme done properly at local level by the relevant stakeholders? (See the "Explaining the ROMACT process to the public" in the timeline of the Handbook);

2. *To what extent have the (in situ & off site) training and coaching sessions, conducted within ROMACT, increased the capacity of the representatives of the local authorities?*
   a. To which extent have the training topics addressed by ROMACT responded to the development needs of the local stakeholders?
   b. Which subjects were the most relevant and impactful in supporting local authorities and CAGs to contribute to the social inclusion of marginalized communities, including the Roma, in a given municipality?
   c. Which other training needs of the ROMACT stakeholders at local level should have been addressed to ensure better performance for the purposes of the process?
   d. What were the external and internal factors that contributed to greater effectiveness of capacity building? Were there any incentives that contributed to it?
   e. Where there any challenges / barriers that hindered the success of the capacity building demarch?

f. How are these capacities used by local stakeholders for the social inclusion and the improvement of the living conditions of the marginalized Roma communities?

3. *To what extent did the process, structures and benefits of the Programme continue at local level after the finalization of the ROMACT cycle and exit from the municipality?*
    a. Does the process of cooperation between the local community / Roma / CAG and the local authorities' representatives continue for the development and implementation of the Local Action Plan (Joint Action Plan / Roma Strategy / Local Development Strategy)?
    b. Was the Local Action Plan (Joint Action Plan / Roma Strategy / Local Development Strategy) been revised after its end term or a new strategy been developed covering the needs of the marginalized community / Roma, after the exit of ROMACT? Was this process of revision / elaboration still done in a participatory manner?
    c. To which extent have the measures listed in the Joint Action Plans / Local Development Strategies, developed during the ROMACT process, been implemented for the benefit of the disadvantaged communities including the Roma? What were the challenges in putting these strategies and plans in practice after their approval?
    d. Are the Task Forces for Roma Inclusion[4] functional? What is the frequency of their meetings after ROMACT Programme's exit? Are there challenges encountered in the process?
    e. Are the CAGs functional / members still active? Do they cooperate with the local authority? What are the challenges they might encounter?
    f. What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the ROMACT actions / process?

4. *Which narratives of community transformation and citizens' participation can be highlighted from the implementation of ROMACT?*

5. *How is the principle of gender equality and participation of women reflected in the implementation of ROMACT?*

6. *How effective has been the ROMACT set-up of the field process and of the implementation team?*
    a. How effective were the methods of identification and assessment of the municipalities selected in the Programme? To which extent do the selection criteria of ROMACT municipalities provide sufficient indicators for the environment to address and the prerequisite elements of an effective ROMACT implementation?
    b. How useful has been the ROMACT baseline survey (see Annex T1 of the Handbook) in the implementation of the process?
    c. How useful for the process were the community and municipality capacity assessment templates of the ROMACT handbook (Annexes T1 & T4)? Which other methods of assessing and collecting the needs for support of the local stakeholders have been used by the ROMACT teams during the process?

---

[4] In practice, at local level, case by case, the Task Force might have different names (in the national language and according to the structures prevalent at municipal level): e.g. Municipal Working Group, Mixed Group etc. Moreover, in some cases, the Task Force was set on the basis of / and reinforced the already existing working groups for Roma / minorities inclusion at municipal level.

d. How do the local stakeholders involved in ROMACT evaluate the interaction with and performance of the ROMACT team (as relevant: National Project Officer, (NPO), National Facilitators Coordinators (NFCs), facilitators, experts)?

7. *What overall lessons can the management team of the Programme, the Council of Europe and European Commission learn from the implementation of ROMACT?* (E.g. normative and causal lessons learned from the experience of the Programme, recommendations for sustaining and valorising results achieved, improving its methodological handbook and the effectiveness of the Programme etc.)

H. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation will follow Council of Europe ethical guidelines, by respecting its evaluation approach[5] and data collection and analysis methods that are human rights based and gender sensitive.

The data collection and analysis methods used by the evaluator should be sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of the evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment. There should be sufficient data to address all evaluation questions; there should be logical and explicit linkages between data sources, data collection methods and analysis methods.

1. *Proposed Evaluation process stakeholders*

For the purpose of this Contract, the Council of Europe will establish an Evaluation Reference Group, which will be composed of members of Roma and Travellers Team at the Council of Europe, the ROMACT Team, the Council of Europe's Directorate of Internal Oversight, the ROMACT counterpart at the European Commission.

To facilitate the work of the Evaluator, an indicative minimum list of relevant stakeholders for the evaluation process will be provided (ROMACT management team; ROMACT National Support Team members in Bulgaria and Romania, including relevant experts / trainers; representatives of targeted municipalities – public servants, elected officials and experts; representatives of the CAGs; other local (mediators, schools and other services' representatives relevant for the ROMACT process) and national (relevant Management Autority and ministries' representatives) stakeholders.

The sample case study locations will be decided in cooperation with the Evaluation Reference Group based on the likelihood of the case to provide valuable insights and offer an opportunity for learning about the approach employed and its comparative advantages.

2. *Evaluation phases*

a. *Inception Phase* – This phase refers to a period of desk study implying the *review of relevant documents and sources of information* provided and to be further identified on the topic of the Evaluation Contract. During this period the *content of the field interviews* and

---

[5] Council of Europe Evaluation Guidelines for consultants can be found at https://rm.coe.int/evaluation-guidelines/16807945ab

surveys will be elaborated and the necessary *arrangements (logistics and appointments)* for the planned field research will be made.

b. *Data Collection Phase* – This is a phase involving activities carried in the targeted locations: *field visits in project locations, collecting relevant data and documents, conducting interviews, surveys, meetings with relevant stakeholders* etc. This <u>field phase</u> will also serve to complete the data collection in the areas in which information gaps have been identified in the Inception Phase and for checking the viability of the available information for better triangulation of previous findings. Moreover, less visible aspects related to context and political and institutional processes relevant to the Programme will be identified.

The targeted locations for the evaluation are selected on the basis of ensuring relevant coverage for the quality of implementation of ROMACT methodological process, for balanced geographical and demographical considerations and institutional commitment for the Programme. Therefore, the evaluation is to be undertaken in two (2) Programme countries - Bulgaria and Romania -, in a number of up to 10 municipalities each.

c. *Reporting Phase* – After the evaluation team will analyse the collected data, a *draft outline report* will be prepared and discussed with the Contracting party from the side of the Council of Europe. A *meeting* with the Evaluation Reference Group should be organized to discuss the findings of the report and relevant inputs could be incorporated in the *Final Evaluation Report* as differing views.

3. **Methodological tools** *(to be revised according to the final list of evaluation questions)*

The evaluation will use the methods listed below which should answer the proposed evaluation questions. Any revision to the methodological tools proposed by the Terms of Reference should be discussed with the Contracting party and the Evaluation Reference Group.

a. <u>*Document Review*</u>:

The Evaluator will carry out a document review at the beginning of the Contract, both from the package provided by the Council of Europe as well as further identified as relevant for the subject. The following documents will be particularly assessed:

i. *ROMACT Programme documentation*
- ROMACT DoAs related to the period to be evaluated;
- ROMACT methodological Handbook;
- ROMACT database with local baseline surveys;
- ROMACT Reports, statistics and reporting tools (tables with training and coaching sessions conducted; tables with projects supported for submission for funding, tables with actions implemented from the Joint Action Plans etc.)

ii.   *Municipal documentation related to the implementation of ROMACT process:*

- Signed Letters of Agreement;
- Action Plans and Strategies adopted at local level;
- Local Councils decisions on various ROMACT process benchmarks (Task Force, CAGs, Action Plans / Strategies etc.);
- Projects submitted for funding in relation to the implementation of Action Plans / Strategies;

iii.   Previous ROMACT monitoring and evaluation reports etc.

iv.   Relevant documentation of the Council of Europe and European Commission (e.g.: Council of Europe's Roma and Travellers Action Plans relevant for the period of evaluation etc.);

v.   Visibility and media records on the Programme.

b. Semi-Structured Interviews and surveys:

Semi-structured interviews and surveys will be carried out with different relevant stakeholders (indicative names and contacts to be provided):

- The ROMACT Programme management team members in Strasbourg;
- The Council of Europe experts who have been working in the Programme (trainers, expert consultants etc.) supporting the process of developing and implementing the Programme approach;
- Field staff of the Programme (NPO, NFCs, facilitators);
- Representatives of the CAGs in the targeted local communities;
- Representatives of Task Forces at municipal level;
- Official representatives of the City Halls (mayors, members of Local Councils, public servants involved in the process, relevant City Hall offices / departments for the ROMACT process);
- Representatives of local Roma and non-Roma NGOs in the targeted municipalities;
- Other relevant local actors (mediators, representatives of schools, police etc. – non-members of the Task Force) and (Roma and non-Roma) citizens who can provide accounts on the ROMACT implementation.

c. Case Studies

- Samples from selected municipalities in Bulgaria and Romania are to be analysed in depth, in the form of case studies, with the purpose of collecting evidence for further revision and development of the Programme's methodology. These should not be, however, the only basis for evaluation. The sample of case studies will be selected during the inception phase of the evaluation. The Evaluator will carry out field missions to the targeted locations in

order to conduct semi-structured interviews, surveys (and potentially focus group discussions) with key individuals / stakeholders.

- The case studies will be of exploratory nature, describing contexts and implementation mechanisms and assessing the changes and impact that occurred, further detailing what may be important to be explored in similar situations. The case studies will look into the different phases of the Programme and its relationship with the context and provide information about reasons for success, challenges and drawbacks. The case studies should be representative and include both more and less successful cases, with their respective contexts and conditionalities, in order to provide a comprehensive picture.

The *lessons learned* from the case studies will feed into the process of formulating the recommendations of the Evaluation report.

The evaluation report should include a list of *recommendations* regarding the orientation and further development of the Programme's methodology, based on findings and lessons learned. The recommendations should also include, where appropriate, indications on additional tools to be used for more effective / meaningful Programme impact.

I. Evaluation Work Plan

1. The deliverables that the Evaluator will be accountable for producing are:

a. *Inception Report* - An Inception Report should be prepared by the Evaluator before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise; this should detail the Evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report has the aim to set the clear parameters over the understanding about the evaluation and to clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The Inception Report shall be submitted to the Evaluation Reference Group and discussed in a joint meeting to be decided upon.

b. *Interim Report*: The interim report should contain horizontal preliminary findings of the evaluation and draft case studies, drawn up on the basis of documentation review, semi-structured interviews, surveys and field visits. The interim report shall be submitted to the Evaluation Reference Group for comments before final delivery.

c. *Draft Evaluation Report* – The Draft Evaluation Report should contain horizontal findings, a short ROMACT methodology implementation assessment for each of the targeted municipalities in the two countries covered and the final case studies. The Evaluation Reference Group will review the Draft Evaluation Report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

d. *Final Evaluation Report* – The Final Evaluation Report shall respect the Quality Assurance Checklist attached to the Technical Specifications and should include the following elements:
> Executive Summary
> Introduction
>> Description of the object of evaluation
>> Purpose of the evaluation
>> Evaluation methodology
>> Challenges encountered during the evaluation
> Findings
>> Horizontal findings related to evaluation questions
>> Country and municipal assessments for the targeted municipalities of the two countries covered, including overall conclusions and recommendations for each country
> Conclusions and lessons learned
> Recommendations
> Appendixes (including the case studies, the lists of people interviewed and of relevant documents reviewed, formats and content of semi-structured interviews etc.)

2. Locations and logistical arrangements

An indicative list of targeted locations / focus areas at country level will be provided to the Evaluator, subject to the approval of the Evaluation Reference Group in the inception phase of the evaluation process.

The evaluation team will be responsible for the necessary logistics of performing the evaluation: office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, printing of documentation, translation and interpretation etc. The evaluator will also be responsible for the dissemination of all methodological tools such as questionnaires and surveys, but the relevant Council of Europe / ROMACT field staff should facilitate this process to the extent possible.

The Evaluator will be responsible to make their own arrangements for the field visits and appointments with relevant stakeholders. The National Support Teams of the Programme could be asked to facilitate the organisation of field visits and appointments, if deemed necessary by the Evaluator.

3. Timeframe for the evaluation process

The indicative timeframe for the evaluation process is set to start on 1 October 2020:

Deliverables and other key-steps	**Deadline**
Desk study – documentation review, finalizing methodologies	Oct 2020
Submitting the Inception report	**1 Nov 2020**
1st Joint meeting with the Evaluation Reference Group	Nov 2020
Field work – Evaluation missions (2-3 weeks)	Between Nov 20 – Feb 21
Draft Case Studies	
Interim Report/Draft Evaluation report	**1 Mar 2021**
2nd Joint meeting with the Evaluation Reference Group	Mar 2021
Final Evaluation Report	**1 April 2021**

4. Budget and payments

The budget of the Evaluation is **set at maximum 40000 €.** A Financial Proposal should be submitted together with the Evaluation Proposal (See PART V, Appendix to the Act of Engagement).

5. *Qualifications of the evaluator*

The criteria for selecting the evaluator are:
- o Strong record in designing, managing and leading evaluations in the context of international cooperation;
- o Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying standard evaluation principles, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- o Technical competence in the field of social inclusion of disadvantaged groups, including the Roma in Europe;
- o Experience with similar contracts in Romania, Bulgaria or the region;
- o Language proficiency relevant for the countries targeted by evaluation;
- o Knowledge of the role of the Council of Europe and of the European Commission and their programming tools;
- o Independence and absence of conflicts of interests;

The evaluator(s) are asked, if possible, to submit two or three examples of evaluation reports recently completed when submitting their proposal. If possible, one or more of the reports should be relevant, or similar to, the subject of evaluation.

The application file should include References of previous employers.

ANNEXES

Annexes to ToR include:
- o Annex 1 - Quality Assurance Checklist for Final Report;
- o Informational Resources
    - a. The following documents are available on the website of the ROMACT Programme
        - i. ROMACT Join Programme website: http://www.coe-romact.org
        - ii. ROMACT Methodological Handbook: https://issuu.com/romact0/docs/romact_handbook_en

Annex 1: Quality Assurance Checklist for Final Evaluation Report

1. **Report Structure**

a. The report is well structured, logical, clear, concise and complete.
b. The report is logically structured with clarity and coherence, based on the guidelines provided and according to the proposed structure.
c. The title page and opening pages provide key basic information:
   - Name of the evaluation object;
   - Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report;
   - Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object;
   - Names and/or organizations of evaluators;
   - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation;
   - Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Appendixes;
   - List of acronyms.
d. The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes:
   - Overview of the evaluation;
   - Evaluation objectives and purpose of use;
   - Evaluation methodology;
   - Most important findings and conclusions;
   - Main recommendations.
e. Appendixes may include, inter alia:
   - The agreed proposal of evaluation implementation;
   - List of stakeholders / persons interviewed and sites visited;
   - List of documents consulted;
   - More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their
   - reliability and validity;
   - Evaluator's related information and justification of team composition;
   - Evaluation matrix;
   - Results framework.

2. Object of Evaluation
a. The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.
b. The expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the evaluation are clearly described.
c. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation is properly described.
d. The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described.
e. Key stakeholders involved in the Programme implementation and their roles.
f. Implementation status of the Programme and implications for the evaluation.

3. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives
a. Evaluation purpose and objectives are fully explained.
b. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who and why needs the information and how the information will be used.
c. Evaluation questions are described and justify what the evaluation did and did not cover.
d. The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the Evaluator.

4. Evaluation Methodology

    a.   The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, to obtain answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

    b.   The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.

    c.   The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. Moreover, the report should include information on how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy (triangulation) and overcome data limits.

    d.   The report describes the sampling frame – area and population / stakeholders to be represented, rationale for selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.

    e.   The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.

    f.   The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.

    g.   The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender equality and human rights responsive and appropriate.

    h.   The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools, etc.)

5. Findings

    a.   The findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the purpose and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.

    b.   Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.

    c.   Reported findings address the evaluation criteria and questions defined in the Terms of Reference.

    d.   Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence.

    e.   Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.

    f.   Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.

    g.   Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.

6. Conclusions

    h.   Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.

    i.   The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.

    j.   Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.

    k.   Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users.

    l.   Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the Programme evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.

7. Lessons learnt

The Lessons learned are to be informed by the general findings of the evaluation and from the Case Study samples analyzed. The Case Studies should be included as Appendix to the section. The Lessons learned described by the report should be:

    a.   Specific and relevant to the topic of the evaluation.

    b.   Clearly linked to specific findings.

    c.   Tied to clearly identified external factors.

    d.   Replicable in the organizational context.

8. Recommendations

    a.   Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.

    b.   The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.

    c.   Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.

    d.   Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation.

    e.   Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.

    f.   Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.

    g.   Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.

    h.   Recommendations are supplemented with suggested modalities of implementation and opportunities for improvement.