

## **COUNCIL OF EUROPE PROJECT**

### **“DECENTRALISATION AND TERRITORIAL CONSOLIDATION IN UKRAINE”**

#### **CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR ONE INTERNATIONAL AND ONE LOCAL EVALUATOR**

The purpose of this call is to select senior evaluators to conduct the review of the project “Decentralisation and territorial consolidation in Ukraine”.

Date of publication: 19 October 2017

Deadline for applications: 3 November 2017

Address for applications: decentralisation.ua@coe.int

Documents to apply: Please see VIII

Duty station: Home-based, with visit to Ukraine and Strasbourg

Duration: Maximum 5 weeks (13 November 2017- 18 December 2017)

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **BACKGROUND**

The project “Decentralisation and Territorial Consolidation in Ukraine” was launched in July 2015 and will continue till the end of 2017. It is set in the context of the 2015-2017 Council of Europe’s Action Plan for Ukraine, having an important number of member States as contributors.

Local self-government and decentralisation reforms have been on the top of the political agenda in Ukraine since 2014. The political commitment to the reform of local self-government and the territorial reorganisation at the national level has been reiterated in strategic documents<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The reform goals and priorities are framed by the Concept “On the Reform of Local Self-government and Territorial Organisation of Power” adopted by the Government on 1 April 2014 and its Action Plans for 2014, 2015 and 2016; the Strategy of Sustainable Development “Ukraine – 2020” approved by the President on 12 January 2015; the Parliamentary Coalition Agreement; and the Government Action Plan of 11 December 2014, “ On Priority Actions Concerning Local Self-government

The project aims at establishing a sustainable local governance system in Ukraine through decentralisation, territorial amalgamation or intermunicipal co-operation, increasing the capacity of amalgamated local authorities, launching of a reform of the national training system for public officials, modernising the human resource management in local government.

The main but not exclusive beneficiaries of the project are: the Ministry of Regional Development, Construction, Housing and Utilities of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada Specialized Committee, and mayors of newly amalgamated communities.

The project comprises 2 pillars of action:

1. Support to central and local authorities to design and to implement decentralisation and territorial amalgamation/ intermunicipal co-operation, as well as the necessary institutional arrangements, sectorial policies and reform of the human resources training and management ;
2. Capacity-building proposed to local authorities, in particular local elected and appointed officials and pilot amalgamated communities, to strengthen their leadership skills and their efficiency to deliver services to the citizens.

The two pillars are designed to be complementary and mutually reinforcing and contribute to the large-scale local self-government and territorial reforms underway in Ukraine. Moreover, the central and local authorities from the Donetsk and Luhansk regions are involved and benefit from some activities.

## **PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW**

The project has been running for 2.5 years during which time significant changes and reforms have taken place in the local government sphere in Ukraine.

The main objectives of the review are to:

- how the project activities have achieved the expected results as set out in the project document;
- evaluate the efficiency of the project management set-up, including monitoring and reporting systems;
- 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 Ukrainian counterparts to-date;
- evaluate impact of the project for beneficiaries and identifying best practices and lessons learned;

---

Development in Ukraine for 2017", and the Government draft "Medium-term Action Plan of the Governmental Priorities till 2020".

- recommend possible lines of action and further activities for future assistance, improved sustainability, improved project methodology.

The results of the review will serve to contribute to the overall evaluation of the 2015-2017 Action Plan for Ukraine, as well as to the reshaping, if necessary, of the new project under the next Action Plan 2018-2021. The review is commissioned by the Council of Europe and paid for through the earmarked funds in the project budget.

## **SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

This evaluation should comply 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 questions:

### **1. Relevance of the intervention**

- ✓ To what extent the interventions have been relevant to the mandate of the Council of Europe and priority areas of the 2015-2017 Action Plan for Ukraine?
- ✓ To what extent have the interventions been aligned and supportive of the reform and policy processes of Ukraine in the particular sectors?
- ✓ To what extent have the interventions addressed identified needs of the beneficiaries in the particular sectors?

### **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 interventions? What are the shortcomings compared to other implementers?

### **3. Effectiveness and efficiency of the intervention**

- ✓ What achievements have been made by the project?
- ✓ What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?
- ✓ To what extent the project has contributed to gender equality?
- ✓ To what extent have the resources/inputs in terms of funds, expertise, time etc. been converted economically to results?

### **4. 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?

## **METHODOLOGY**

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

### **1. Preparatory work**

- ✓ Project Document;
- ✓ Action Plan for Ukraine 2015-2017;

- ✓ Work-plans;
- ✓ Inception report;
- ✓ Annual progress reports;
- ✓ Steering Committee meeting minutes;
- ✓ Website;
- ✓ Technical Papers and publications.

**2. Initial briefing with the project team in Strasbourg/Kyiv (face to face; by phone or Skype)**

**3. Structured interviews, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions (face to face; by phone or Skype) with the following stakeholders:**

- ✓ Representatives of the relevant ministry and parliamentary commission;
- ✓ Representatives of local and regional authorities, and their associations;
- ✓ International and local consultants that have been engaged in delivering activities, interventions and legal or technical expertise;
- ✓ Representatives of Donor(s) to the Action Plan, present in Ukraine;
- ✓ Other international organisations involved in local self-government development in Ukraine;
- ✓ Representatives of the major administrative entities of the Council of Europe involved in the implementation of the project in Strasbourg and Ukraine.

The evaluators will decide on the format of interviews.

The project team is at the evaluators' disposition throughout the assessment to assist with information requests and any relevant questions they might have.

## **FORMAT OF THE REPORT**

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

The report is logically structured in a clear and coherent manner (e.g. background and objectives are presented leading to the findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations are drawn from what precedes). The report follows the proposed structure:

- Executive Summary (maximum two pages);
- Description of the intervention; evaluation methodology and scope, limitations, difficulties encountered during the evaluation;
- Findings related to each evaluation question; to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation;
- Conclusions;
- Recommendations;
- Lessons learnt;

- Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.).

The report shall be addressed to the Council of Europe project team in two original copies signed and dated by the consultant.

## WORKING TIME/SCHEDULE

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

<b>International Evaluator</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Local Evaluator</b>	<b>Task</b>
20%	for preparatory desk review	30%	for preparatory desk review and collecting the required information as agreed with international evaluator
10%	for initial briefing discussion with the project team in Strasbourg to clarify general and specific questions regarding the project, necessary for an efficient conduction of the on-site visit	10%	for initial briefing discussion with the project team in Kyiv to clarify general and specific questions regarding the project, necessary for an efficient conduction of the on-site visit
30%	for on-site mission in Kyiv – the agenda is finalised and approved by evaluators based on a contribution of the project team	40%	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.
25%	for writing first draft report to be submitted for feedback to the CoE Secretariat.	15%	for contributing to the preparation of the first draft report by delivering tasks assigned by the international evaluator.
5%	for discussion, Q&A and feedback from CoE		
10%	for finalising the report after feedback from the project team.	5%	For helping the international evaluator to finalise the report by providing local insights and comments.

## **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 projects. Experience of projects dealing with local democracy is required;
- ✓ Previous work experience with the Council of Europe is appreciated
- ✓ Previous work experience in Ukraine 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 or evaluation of projects.
- ✓ Experience of projects 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;
- ✓ Knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian will be appreciated.

## **TIMEFRAME OF THE REVIEW**

The international evaluator is responsible for delivering the review products on the timeframe below, in co-operation with the local consultant:

- Week 46 and 47: preparatory work and initial briefing with project team in Strasbourg;
- Week 48: on-site mission in Kyiv;

- Week 49 and 50: draft report shared with the project team in Strasbourg and final report sent to the project team in Strasbourg.

## **PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS**

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

Interested candidates are requested to send their application with:

- A CV highlighting the experience of the applicant in conducting similar assessments (document format required) and a short expression of interest/motivation (email format accepted);
- A short document outlining the approach for the project review will be appreciated. The document should not be longer than 1500 words;
- The all-inclusive remuneration requested (fees, travels and stays in Ukraine incl. related insurance for maximum 5 days). Prices must be in EUR, VAT included;
- 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 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

- ☐ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ :

- 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 ~~Yerevan~~ Kyiv 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 services<sup>2</sup>

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

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2</sup> 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. <b>understanding</b> of the evaluation object					
b. <b>attentiveness</b> to my needs/organization's needs					
c. <b>quality</b> of reports/products produced					
d. <b>appropriateness</b> of reports/products for my needs/organization's needs					
e. <b>timeliness</b> in delivering reports/products					
f. <b>accessibility</b> to me/my organization					
g. <b>communication</b> with me/my organization					
h. <b>other</b> , 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 <b><i>negotiate honestly</i></b> 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 <b><i>shortcomings</i></b> and the <b><i>strengths</i></b> of different ways to evaluate the intervention?				
c. Did the evaluator record all <b><i>changes</i></b> 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 <b><i>dignity</i></b> and <b><i>self-worth</i></b> of everyone involved?				
e. Did the evaluator identify and respect <b><i>differences among participants</i></b> (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 <b><i>perspectives and interests</i></b> of all interested parties?				
g. When the evaluator presented his/her work, did he/she <b><i>communicate</i></b> accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret, and critique the work?				
h. Did the evaluator report <b><i>negative findings</i></b> 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 Evaluators<sup>3</sup>**

**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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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		
<b>Evaluation Title:</b>		
<b>1. The Report Structure</b>		
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"> <li>• Executive Summary (maximum two pages)</li> <li>• Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 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</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Findings related to each evaluation question; Findings related to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Conclusions</li> <li>• Recommendations, possibly including suggested modalities of implementation</li> <li>• Lessons learnt</li> <li>• Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.)</li> </ul>	
1.3	<p>The title page and opening pages provide key basic information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report</li> <li>• Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Names and/or organizations of evaluators</li> <li>• Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation</li> <li>• Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes</li> <li>• List of acronyms.</li> </ul>	
1.4	<p>The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Evaluation objectives and intended audience</li> <li>• Evaluation methodology</li> <li>• Most important findings and conclusions</li> <li>• Main recommendations</li> </ul>	

1.5	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: <sup>2</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TORs</li> <li>• List of persons interviewed and sites visited.</li> <li>• List of documents consulted</li> <li>• More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity</li> <li>• Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition</li> <li>• Evaluation matrix</li> <li>• results framework</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Object of Evaluation</b>		
2.0	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.	
2.1	The <b>logic model and/or the expected results chain</b> (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is/are clearly described.	
2.2	The <b>context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors</b> 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	The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The number of components</b>, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly.</li> <li>• <b>The geographic context and boundaries</b> (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant</li> <li>• The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object</li> <li>• The <b>total resources</b> from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions.</li> </ul>	
2.4	The <b>key stakeholders involved</b> in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
2.5	The report identifies the <b>implementation status of the object</b> , 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.	
<b>3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.</b>		
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.	
<b>4. Evaluation Methodology</b>		
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.	
<b>5. Findings</b>		
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.	
<b>6. Conclusions</b>		
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.	
<b>7. Lessons learnt and best practices</b>		
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	
<b>8. Recommendations</b>		
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.	