
Financed by



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC



Implemented by

“Strengthening Local Government Structures and Co-operation of Local Elected Representatives in Albania – Phase II”

Project Review

TERMS OF REFERENCE

BACKGROUND

The Council of Europe has made determined efforts to support Albanian authorities in establishing and consolidating local democracy and good governance. Within the context of two consecutive Cooperation Agreements with Albania¹(2012-2014 and 2015-2017), the Council of Europe/Swiss funded project **“Strengthening Local Government Structures and Cooperation of Local Elected Representatives in Albania”**² aims at improving the quality of local self-governance through de-centralisation, as well as increasing the capacity of local government units. In the context of the project, international and local expertise has contributed notably:

- to shaping the criteria, methodology and process pertaining to Territorial Administrative Reform;
- to drafting the Public Administration Reform Strategy 2015-2020 (PAR) and Crosscutting Strategy on Decentralisation and Local Governance 2015-2020 particularly covering local administration, inter Municipal Cooperation and the consultation process between local elected representatives with central government;
- to drafting the Law No. 139/2015 on Local Self-Government and reviewing previous legal framework;
- to building a modern and effective Human Resource Management system and standards at local level;
- to drafting a policy paper on improving the legal framework for Inter-Municipal Cooperation;
- to setting up the Local and Central Government Consultative Council;
- to establishing a platform of dialogue between local elected representatives and central government;

¹ Co-operation document Albania 2012-2014, ODGProg/INF(2012)12-rev
Albania : Programmatic Co-operation Document 2015-2017, GR-DEM(2015)7

²Phase II of the project was granted an extension until June 2017, amounting a total Swiss contribution of over 1.9 million Euro.

- to enhancing and improving personal and professional leadership skills of 100 young political and civic leaders on key aspects of democratic governance;
- to supporting the Territorial and Public Administration and development reforms in close partnership with the Albanian School of Public Administration through empowering leadership and administration capacities at local level;
- to empowering the civic competencies of over 35,000 first time voters at a national level and encouraged their participation in local elections.

The Albanian Government elected in 2013, has undertaken profound territorial and administrative reforms in order to develop a local government system in line with the principles enshrined in the European Charter of Local Self-Government. Decentralisation and Territorial Administrative Reform, complemented by the Public Administration Reform, have resulted in a reduced number of municipalities; increased functional and fiscal competencies laid out in a new legal framework; and increased opportunities for local administration. Assistance provided in the context of the current Project contributes to strengthening the capacities of LGU's and improved policy dialogue between elected authorities.

The present Project (Phase II) comprises three lines of action:

Line of Action I: Support to strengthen local government structures in Albania, through:

1. Improving the conditions for and fostering the implementation of Inter-Municipal Co-operation (IMC) initiatives between Albanian Local Government Units (LGUs);
2. Supporting the creation of standards and benchmarks on Human Resources Management (HRM), transposed into legislation and practices.

Line of Action II: Building a sustainable pluralistic and unified platform of dialogue for elected local government representatives in Albania, under the auspices of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

Line of Action III: Enhancing knowledge of local democracy and improving leadership skills amongst young political and civic leaders in Albania.

The three above lines of action are complementary. The capacity building exercise of the LoA, is largely based on a close and effective cooperation with LGUs themselves and other related central and local institutions. To this extent the role and partnership with LGAs has also contributed towards successful implementation of LoA I objectives. On the other hand, the strengthening of the policy dialogue among local elected authorities themselves, but also between them and the central authorities, is highly beneficial to the strengthening of local government structures. In this context, the empowerment of leadership and administration capacities at local level, further contributed in rendering the above processes more functional and comprehensive.

The initial contract was signed on 26 September 2012 for the period 1 October 2012-31 December 2015. A first addendum signed on 28 September 2015 extended the period of implementation of Line of Action II until 31 December 2015. A second addendum was signed on 7 December 2015 to extend project implementation phase until 30 June 2017.

PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

Appendix I of the initial contract between the Council of Europe and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) indicates that (under #14, page 36) “A project evaluation will be conducted three months prior to the project conclusion with the view to assess project management cycles and its outcomes”.

The evaluation of activities implemented within Lines of Action I, II & III is requested by the Donor. Reasons are explained in Yearly Plan of Operations adopted by SCM in December 2015: (#4.3)

“In line with Chapter 14-Monitoring, Reporting, Reviews and Evaluation of the Project document, a project evaluation will be conducted in the spring of 2016 with a view to assess the project management cycle and its outcomes. The organisation of this exercise in the mentioned period is appropriate, as it comes during a time of an increasingly stable institutional environment of local governance, where LGUs are expected to be fully amalgamated; operating under a new budget and a renovated legal and institutional framework, and their co-operation trends are more clearly defined. At the same time, the external review will better orient potential Council of Europe activities beyond the lifetime of the current project.”

The Project Steering Committee confirmed this evaluation to be launched by spring 2016 “to provide the necessary basis for further decision on project prospects beyond 2016”.

As agreed when the initial project extension was granted, the scope of evaluation covers the whole implementation phase in order to give a full appraisal of the relevance; added-value; effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Council of Europe intervention.

The Terms of Reference of this evaluation have to be agreed between the Council of Europe (CoE) and the Donor. This evaluation is commissioned by the Council of Europe and paid for through the earmarked funds in the project budget. Re-allocation of funds are necessitated to cover the recruitment of the evaluators as available funds might not be sufficient.

I. Overall objective

The overall objective of the review is to offer an independent evaluation of how project activities, across the three lines of action, have achieved expected results and effects as set out in the logframe. A strategic, forward looking part could round up the exercise.

The main objectives of the review are to:

- assess the extent to which the project has attained its objectives based on indicators as defined in the Project Document;
- evaluate the efficiency of the project management set-up, including monitoring and reporting systems;
- assess to what extent the findings and recommendations of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs Internal Audit 2013 related to the contribution to the Council of Europe’s

“Strengthening Local Government Structures and Cooperation of Local Elected Representatives in Albania (2012-2015) Project” have been followed;

- evaluate the relevance and added-value of the tools and standards of the Council of Europe to support local government reform and decentralisation compared with other organisations providing technical assistance in the field;
- assess the sustainability of project deliverables, as well as the implementation and follow-up of its recommendations by Albanian counterparts to-date;
- evaluate impact of the project, noting step change for beneficiaries and identifying best practices and lessons learned;
recommend possible lines of action and further activities for future assistance and improved sustainability.

II. Specific evaluation questions:

This evaluation complies with Evaluation Guidelines of the Directorate of Internal Oversight of the Council of Europe (version: April 2014).

The evaluation should focus on the following specific objectives:

1. Relevance of the intervention

- ✓ To what extent have the interventions been aligned and supportive of the overall reform and policy processes of Albania in these particular sectors?
- ✓ To what extent do the intervention objectives address identified needs of the beneficiaries of LoA I, II and III?
- ✓ To what extent is the intervention design relevant to the mandate of the CoE and priority areas of the Donor?

2. Added value of the intervention

- ✓ To what extent has the Council of Europe a clear comparative advantage vis-à-vis other international actors in the implementation of the intervention? What are the shortcomings compared to other implementers?

3. Effectiveness of the intervention

- ✓ What progress has been made towards the achievement of the expected results?
- ✓ What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?

4. Efficiency of the intervention

- ✓ Have the resources/inputs in terms of funds, expertise, time etc. been converted economically to results?

5. Sustainability of the intervention

- ✓ What is the likelihood that the benefits from the intervention will be maintained when the project ends? What are the most important factors?

6. Recommendations

- ✓ Provide recommendations related to improvement of the project methodology, structure and management set-up in the future, and
- ✓ Provide recommendations for future potential actions.

III. Methodology

A gender responsive methodology should be applied throughout the various stage of the project review.

Initial briefing with Project Team in Strasbourg and Tirana.

Analysis of core project documents including:

- ✓ Project Document (Logical framework and document published in the Council of Europe Programme - External Resources Database);
- ✓ Contract and Annexes to the Contract: Budget for the Project, Special Conditions, General Conditions;
- ✓ Work-plan;
- ✓ Inception report;
- ✓ Annual progress reports;
- ✓ Steering Committee meeting minutes;
- ✓ External Review report phase 1;
- ✓ News items published; and
- ✓ Technical Papers and publications.

Structured and semi-structured interviews (face to face; focus group meeting; by phone or Skype) with the following stakeholders:

- ✓ Representatives of the Embassy of Switzerland to Tirana;
- ✓ Representatives of local and regional authorities, relevant government ministries and local and regional associations;
- ✓ Long and/or Short-Term international and local Consultants/Lecturers (APS) that have been involved and engaged in delivering activities, interventions, and providing legal and technical expertise;
- ✓ Other donors and international organisations involved in local government development; and
- ✓ Representatives of the major administrative entities of the CoE involved in the implementation of the project.

Evaluators will decide about the format of interviews.

In addition to the above-mentioned documentation, additional project information and any other relevant documentation related to the chronology of interventions will be provided to the evaluators as they deem relevant.

The Council of Europe Project Team is at the evaluators' disposition throughout the assessment to assist with information requests and any relevant questions they might have.

A briefing with the Swiss Embassy in Albania is requested.

A debriefing with the Council of Europe and the Swiss Embassy in Albania is requested on the last day of the mission to Albania.

IV. Format of the report

The assignment will result in a report, which should not exceed 20 pages (not including any possible annexes).

Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). The report follows the proposed structure:

- Executive Summary (maximum two pages);
- Introduction;
- Purpose and scope of the evaluation (what is the intended use of the evaluation?); Description of the intervention; Evaluation methodology incl. limitations; Difficulties encountered during the evaluation
- Findings;
- Findings related to each evaluation question; Findings related to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation;
- Lessons learnt;
- Recommendations;
- Conclusions; and
- Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.).

The report shall be addressed to both donors, the CoE and the Swiss Embassy in Albania, in two original copies signed and dated by the consultant.

V. Working Time/Schedule

The duration of the assignment shall be broken down as follows between evaluators:

International Evaluator	Task	Local Evaluator	Task
22%	for preparatory desk review	25%	for preparatory desk review and collecting the required information as agreed with international evaluator
4%	for initial briefing discussion with the project management team in the CoE headquarters in Strasbourg via teleconference to clarify general and specific questions regarding the project and its activities, necessary for an efficient conduction of the on-		

	site visit Propose relevant stakeholders for interviews and submit it to the Project team in CoE Office in Tirana		
22%	for on-site mission in Tirana, Albania (at least 5 interviews per day). The agenda is finalised and approved by evaluators based on a contribution of the Project Team.	42%	for accompanying the international evaluator during the on-site mission to facilitate exchange with stakeholders. He/she will manage the smooth running of meetings and assist the international evaluator in the drafting of the report with local insights and context analysis. Both evaluators are contributing to briefing and debriefing meetings.
8%	mission to the CoE headquarters in Strasbourg to discuss the comparative advantage vis-à-vis other international actors.	-	
27%	for writing first draft report to be submitted for feedback to the CoE Secretariat.	25%	for contributing in the preparation of the first draft report by and delivery of tasks assigned by the international evaluator.
4%	for discussion, Q&A and feedback from CoE and Embassy of Switzerland to Tirana on the 1 st draft report		
13%	for finalising the report after feedback from the project management team.	8%	For helping the international evaluator to finalise the report by providing local insights and comments.

VI. Eligibility Requirements for the choice of the evaluators

Choice of the international evaluator

Qualifications:

- ✓ Higher education degree in a relevant domain (equivalent to the first cycle of the Bologna process framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area).

Experience:

- ✓ At least 5 years of professional experience in the evaluation of project. Experience of project dealing with local democracy is required;

- ✓ Previous work experience with the Council of Europe is appreciated
- ✓ Previous work experience in Albania is appreciated;
- ✓ Familiarity with gender concepts is an asset.

Language requirements:

- ✓ Very good knowledge of English.

Choice of the local evaluator

Qualifications:

- ✓ Higher education degree in a relevant domain (equivalent to the first cycle of the Bologna process framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area).

Experience:

- ✓ Sound professional experience in the management and evaluation of project.
Experience of project dealing with local democracy is required;
- ✓ Previous work experience with the Council of Europe is appreciated;
- ✓ Familiarity with gender concepts is an asset.

Language requirements:

- ✓ Very good knowledge of English.

VII. Timeframe of the review

The international is responsible for delivering the review products on the timeframe below:

- Week 31 to 36, preparatory work and initial briefing with project team of the CoE in Strasbourg;
- Week 36 to 37, on-site mission in Tirana;
- Week 38, mission to Strasbourg;
- First draft report shared with the CoE and the Embassy of Switzerland to Tirana by 30 September 2016;
- Final report sent to both the CoE and the Embassy of Switzerland to Albania by 14 October 2016.

VIII. Procedures for submission of applications

A call of offers is organised to comply with CoE rules on public procurement.

Interested candidates are requested to send their application with:

- A Letter of interest highlighting the experience of the applicant organisation/institution in conducting similar assessments;

- A document outlining the approach and methodology for the project review. The document should not be longer than 1500 words);
- The duration of the process and the remuneration requested;
- The CVs of experts working directly on the review highlighting their experience in similar assessments;
- The fee (a maximum of 15,000.00 EUR for the international evaluator and 2,400.00 EUR for the local evaluator) is all-inclusive for the nominated personnel, including allowances for overhead costs and charges incurred by the service provider as part of normal business operations, including the cost of management. Prices must be in EUR without VAT. The evaluators will travel under Council of Europe travelling and insurance rules and procedures, as referred in the contract to be signed with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe;
- Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interest and consent form in Annex 1 and 2 are signed and dated.

The application must be submitted to Localdemocracy.tirana@coe.int by 25 July 2016.

The Terms of reference with Annexes will constitute one of the parts of the contract between the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and the independent consultants.

Annex 1: Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interest

The undersigned (name of the signatory of this form)

- ☐ in his/her own name (*if the economic operator is a natural person or in case of own declaration of a director or person with powers of representation, decision making or control over the economic operator*)

or

- ☐ representing (*if the economic operator is a legal person*)

official name in full (*only for legal person*):

official legal form (*only for legal person*):

official address in full:

VAT registration number:

declares that the company or organisation that he/she represents:

- a) is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not entered into an arrangement with creditors, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, and is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- b) has not been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of *res judicata*;
- c) has not been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authorities can justify;
- d) has fulfilled all its obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions and the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established, with those of the country of the contracting authority and those of the country where the contract is to be carried out;
- e) has not been the subject of a judgement which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity;
- f) is not a subject of the administrative penalty for being guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by the contracting authority as a condition of participation in the procurement procedure or failing to supply information, or being declared to be in serious breach of his obligation under contract covered by the budget.

In addition, the undersigned declares on his/her honour:

- g) that he/she has no conflict of interest in connection with the contract. A conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest;
- h) that he/she will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest;
- i) that the information provided to the Council of Europe within the context of this invitation to tender is accurate, sincere and complete.

Full Name

Date

Signature

Annex 2: Consent Form

I hereby give my consent for information in the below form to be kept by the Office of the Council of Europe in Tirana for its internal use only. The form will not be shared with persons outside Congress service. The storage will comply with Council of Europe's Regulation outlining a data protection system for personal data files in the Council of Europe (CM/Del/Dec(89)425/59bE).

Please print name below in block letters and sign the consent form.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Review Form for external consultant's services³

Form number: _____

This form is to assess the services and/or products that the external evaluation consultant provided to you or your organization for the specific evaluation identified. When responding to the items, be sure to consider only the evaluation named, not other evaluations on which you may have worked together.

Name of Evaluation: _____

Date: ____/____/____

1. Name of CoE staff member responsible for review:

2. Based on your experience with the evaluator in this evaluation exercise, what is your **overall assessment** of the quality of the work? (check one only)

() Poor () Fair () Good () Very good () Excellent

³ Based on American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators.

3. How **useful** to your organization was the work performed by the evaluator?
(check one only)

☐ Not at all
useful

☐ Somewhat
useful

☐ Very
useful

☐ Extremely
useful

4a. Would you **recommend** this evaluator to your colleagues? (check one only)

☐ Yes

☐ No

4b. If Yes, why? If No, why not?

5. How would you rate the evaluator in the following areas of performance? For each area, check the one column that best represents your opinion. If an area does not apply or you do not know, check the first column.

The Evaluator's:	NA/Don't Know	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
a. understanding of the evaluation object					
b. attentiveness to my needs/organization's needs					
c. quality of reports/products produced					
d. appropriateness of reports/products for my needs/organization's needs					
e. timeliness in delivering reports/products					
f. accessibility to me/my organization					
g. communication with me/my organization					
h. other , specify:					

6. What are the **strengths** of the evaluator?

7. Please rate the evaluator's adherence to each of these principles during the project by checking the *one* column that best represents your opinion. If a principle does not apply or you do not know, check the first column.

Guiding Principle	NA/Don't Know	No	Partially	Completely
Did the evaluator <i>negotiate honestly</i> with your organization concerning:				
1) <i>costs</i> ?				
2) <i>tasks</i> to be undertaken?				
3) <i>limitations</i> of methods?				
4) <i>scope</i> of results likely to be obtained?				
5) <i>uses</i> of data resulting from the evaluation?				
b. Did the evaluator explore with your staff both the <i>shortcomings</i> and the <i>strengths</i> of different ways to evaluate the intervention?				
c. Did the evaluator record all <i>changes</i> made in the original evaluation plan and the reasons why the changes were made?				
d. Did the evaluator conduct the evaluation in a way that clearly respects the <i>dignity</i> and <i>self-worth</i> of everyone involved?				
e. Did the evaluator identify and respect <i>differences among participants</i> (e.g., age; gender; ethnicity; etc.) when planning, conducting, and reporting the evaluation?				
f. In planning and reporting the evaluation, did the evaluator <u>consider</u> including the <i>perspectives and interests</i> of all interested parties?				
g. When the evaluator presented his/her work, did he/she <i>communicate</i> accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret, and critique the work?				
h. Did the evaluator report <i>negative findings</i> in a sensitive manner without compromising the integrity of the findings?				

8. Do you have any other comments about your experience working with the evaluator on this particular project? If yes, please comment.

Annex 3: Council of Europe Code of Conduct for Evaluators⁴

Council of Europe, November 2013

1. The conduct of evaluators in the Council of Europe (CoE) should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the CoE itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.
2. The CoE Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the CoE.
3. The provisions of the CoE Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.
4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the CoE, all CoE staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for CoE are required to commit to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, specifically to the following obligations:

Independence

5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality

6. Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated.

Conflict of Interest

7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any recent or current situation of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work with CoE, each evaluator will complete a conflict of interest form (see [Declaration of Honour with respect to the Exclusion Criteria and Absence of Conflict of Interest](#)).

Honesty and Integrity

8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their behaviour, when determining the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained and presenting their procedures, data and findings, including any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence

9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

⁴ Drafted on the basis of UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>.

Accountability

10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

Obligations to participants

11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the European Convention of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm

13. Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and avoid harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

Transparency

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

Annex 4: Quality assurance checklist for evaluation reports

Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Reports		
This checklist is intended to help evaluation managers and evaluators to ensure the final product of the evaluation - evaluation report - meets the expected quality. It can also be shared as part of the TOR prior to the conduct of the evaluation or after the report is finalized		
Evaluation Title:		
1. The Report Structure		
1.0	The report is well structured, logical, clear, concise and complete.	
1.1	The report uses gender sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.	
1.2	<p>Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). The report follows the proposed structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary (maximum two pages) • Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Purpose and scope of the evaluation (what is the intended use of the evaluation?); Description of the intervention; Evaluation methodology incl. limitations; Difficulties encountered during the evaluation • Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Findings related to each evaluation question; Findings related to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation • Conclusions • Recommendations, possibly including suggested modalities of implementation • Lessons learnt • Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.) 	
1.3	<p>The title page and opening pages provide key basic information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Annexes • List of acronyms. 	
1.4	<p>The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the evaluation object • Evaluation objectives and intended audience • Evaluation methodology • Most important findings and conclusions • Main recommendations 	

1.5	<p>Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TORs • List of 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 • Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition • Evaluation matrix • results framework 	
2. Object of Evaluation		
2.0	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.	
2.1	The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is/are clearly described.	
2.2	The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.	
2.3	<p>The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of components, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly. • The geographic context and boundaries (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant • The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object • The total resources from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions. 	
2.4	The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
2.5	The report identifies the implementation status of the object , including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.	
3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.		
3.0	The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained.	
3.1	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	
3.2	The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did	

3.3	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	
3.4	As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights.	
4. Evaluation Methodology		
4.0	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, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.	
4.1	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.	
4.2	The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.	
4.3	The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.	
4.4	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.	
4.5	The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.	
4.6	The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender equality and human rights responsive and appropriate for analyzing the gender equality and human rights issues identified in the scope.	
4.7	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.)	
4.8	The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach.	
5. Findings		
5.0	Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope 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.	
5.1	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
5.2	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope.	

5.3	The report assesses if the design of the object was based on a sound gender analysis and human rights analysis and implementation for results was monitored through gender and human rights frameworks, as well as the actual results on gender equality and human rights.	
5.4	Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence.	
5.5	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
5.6	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.	
5.7	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.	
6. Conclusions		
6.0	Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	
6.1	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.	
6.2	Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	
6.3	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.	
6.4	Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	
7. Lessons learnt and best practices		
7.0	Lessons learnt are specific and relevant to the topic of the evaluation	
7.1	Lessons learnt and best practices are clearly linked to specific findings	
7.3	Lessons learnt and best practices are tied to clearly identified external factors	
7.3	Lessons learnt and best practices are replicable in the organizational context	
8. Recommendations		
8.0	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.	
8.1	The connection between findings, conclusions and recommendations is demonstrated through graphic means;	
8.2	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	
8.3	Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.	
8.4	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation.	
8.5	Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.	
8.6	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.	

8.7	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.	
8.8	Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender equality and human rights aspects.	
8.9	Recommendations are supplemented with suggested modalities of implementation and opportunities for improvement.	