

Terms of Reference (ToR) for the external evaluation of the European Commission and Council of Europe's Joint Programme on Roma Women's Access to Justice:

Roma Women's Access to Justice – JUSTROM2 (REC-RDIS-ROWO-AG-2018)

Ref. JUSTROM2/2018/Evaluation/01

I. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This document provides the terms of reference for an external evaluation of the European Commission (EC) and Council of Europe's (CoE) Joint Programme on Roma Women's Access to Justice (JUSTROM2), which is currently being implemented in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy and Romania.

The present Terms of Reference (ToR) provide background information about JUSTROM2. Additionally, the ToR describe the purpose of the evaluation, its objectives and scope, the evaluation questions, methodology as well as qualifications and selection criteria for the evaluator.

ABOUT THE JUSTROM2 JOINT PROGRAMME

The JUSTROM2 Joint Programme (REC-RDIS-ROWO-AG-2018) is being implemented over 12 months, from 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019, therefore the evaluation will take place whilst the project is still running. The total budget for the project is €866,222.67 and it is funded jointly by the European Commission (80%) and the Council of Europe (20%), and it is implemented by the Council of Europe.

The project aims to enhance Roma women's access to justice in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy and Romania. It specifically aims to increase awareness of Roma women about discrimination, complaint mechanisms, the justice system and human rights institutions, and further support their empowerment. JUSTROM2 also aims to enhance the capacities of the judiciary, law enforcement and NGOs/human rights advocates in the application of anti-discrimination standards with a focus on multiple discrimination, gender equality and Roma women. As a result, there is an expected increase in the number of cases of discrimination against Roma women admitted by human rights institutions, equality bodies and courts, through the establishment of legal aid clinics. Finally, the project aims to increase synergy and coherence between the institutional frameworks of the European Union (EU) and the CoE, and between national Roma integration strategies and civil society's strategies regarding access to justice, for women in particular.

JUSTROM2 was initially planned as a continuation of an 18-month pilot phase, JUSTROM, which was implemented in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Ireland and Romania. The initially approved project implementation, description and budget therefore included activities in the 5 implementing countries. Due to a new development in Ireland, whereby the Ministry of Justice awarded a grant to undertake similar work done under JUSTROM to a national organisation, the EC and the CoE decided to stop activities and implementation in Ireland. A revision of the budget and project description was then launched in April 2018, and was finally approved in July 2018, with effect in the implementation of the initially planned activities and in the planning of additional activities.

JUSTROM2 is set up with a team coordinating its implementation in Strasbourg, France, with a Project Manager, a Project Officer and a Project Assistant. Additionally, a team made of consultants in each implementing country was set up in the following format: one national coordinator, and, for each legal clinic, a lawyer, a legal assistant and a facilitator (except for Athens and Xanthi, where there are two facilitators). In total, 9 legal clinics were set up: 2 in Bulgaria (Veliko Tarnovo and Plovdiv); 3 in Greece (Athens, Thessaloniki and Xanthi); 2 in Italy (Rome and Naples), and 2 in Romania (Bucharest and Calarasi County).

Among its activities, JUSTROM2 includes legal advice to Roma women, awareness-raising gatherings to empower Roma women and inform them of their rights and redress mechanisms, capacity-building of the judiciary, legal professionals and law enforcement agencies through training on standards on non-discrimination (including multiple discrimination), gender equality and Roma rights, seminars with Equality bodies and National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI).

The JUSTROM2 Joint Programme intends to achieve the following concrete results:

1. Increased awareness of Roma women on discrimination, complaint mechanisms, the justice system and human rights institutions/equality bodies;
2. Increased number of cases of discrimination against Roma women admitted by human rights institutions, equality bodies and courts;
3. Strengthened involvement of existing structures in Member States, such as National Roma Contacts Points (NRCP), National Human Rights Institutions and equality bodies in dealing with anti-discrimination cases related to Roma and/or Travellers;
4. Enhanced professional resources used at national level by the judiciary, law enforcement and NGOs/human rights advocates regarding the application of anti-discrimination standards with a focus on multiple discrimination, gender equality and Roma and Traveller women;
5. Increased synergy between the institutional frameworks of the EU and the Council of Europe, including respective NRCP and CAHROM, and with national and local authorities on national Roma integration strategies and civil society regarding access to justice.

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE

A. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The evaluation is an end-of-project evaluation. It is commissioned by the Council of Europe in accordance with the guidelines of the organisation. The evaluation serves the main purpose of identifying lessons from the 10 first months of implementation of the project for its future continuation to be further used by the Council of Europe's Roma and Travellers' Secretariat and the European Commission's DG Justice and Consumers. It should also provide input on how the next project phase should look like and which activities would be required to further consolidate results.

The evaluation process will be guided by the [Evaluation Guidelines](#) and other relevant instruments such as the Council of Europe's [Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2023](#) and the [Thematic Action Plan for the Inclusion of Roma and Travellers \(2016-2019\)](#).

B. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the sustainability, relevance, effectiveness and impact of the JUSTROM2 project at local and national level, in order to contribute to further improving the orientation and approach of the Council of Europe and European Commission under the JUSTROM Joint Programme and beyond on related activities.

Therefore, the objectives of the evaluation include the following:

1. To assess whether the intervention logic of JUSTROM2 remains to be relevant and to make recommendations on what needs to be changed in the future phase;
2. To assess the effectiveness of the JUSTROM2 Joint Programme in contributing to the improvement of the situation of the beneficiaries;

3. To analyse the impact of the JUSTROM2 Joint Programme at local, national and European level, especially in regard to access to justice for Roma women in the targeted countries;
4. To assess the degree to which JUSTROM2 outputs can be expected to continue having an impact with the continuation of the project or lack thereof;
5. To identify mechanisms supported and/or integrated by local, regional or national stakeholders that could ensure sustainability if the intervention were to cease;
6. To identify lessons learnt from the implementation of the JUSTROM2 Joint Programme and to provide recommendations to the Council of Europe and the European Commission.

The recommendations should include, where appropriate, indications on additional tools and resources to be used for more effective and meaningful impact

C. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will assess the project against the criteria of sustainability, impact, relevance, - effectiveness and added value of the processes initiated. It will provide answers to the following evaluation questions:

Question related to the evaluation criterion “**sustainability**” include:

- To what extent did the project establish links with the relevant local, regional, national existing structures to ensure the continuation of the activities in the future?

Questions related to the evaluation criterion “**impact**” include:

- To what extent has JUSTROM2 succeeded in making an impact at national and European level?
- What, if any, have been unintended effects of JUSTROM2?

Questions related to the evaluation criterion “**relevance**” include:

- To what extent does the design of the intervention address the problems identified in the needs assessment phase?
- To what extent do the JUSTROM2 activities address the needs of Roma women in accessing justice?

Questions related to the evaluation criterion “**effectiveness**” include:

- To what extent has JUSTROM2 achieved the expected results? What have been the reasons for achievement and lack thereof?
- What overall lessons can the management team of the project, the Council of Europe and European Commission learn from the implementation of the JUSTROM2 Joint Programme so far?
- How is the principle of gender equality and participation of Roma and Traveller women reflected in the design and implementation of the intervention?

Questions related to the evaluation criterion “**added value**” include:

- How did the implementation of JUSTROM2 ensure complementarities and generate synergies with other programmes and stakeholders at local, national and European level; what are the strengths and weaknesses of having the Council of Europe implement the project?

D. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The evaluator(s) will adhere to the core values of the Council of Europe. The approach will include document review, through the analysis of documents and legal texts; semi-structured interviews or questionnaires and case studies.

An evaluation matrix should be developed during the inception phase (see *Appendix 4: Evaluation Matrix Template* as an example of evaluation matrix).

Document review

The evaluator(s) 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:

- JUSTROM Joint Programme documentation;
- Documentation of the national teams, including reports, Excel case files, visibility material and other related documents for beneficiaries;
- Previous monitoring and evaluation reports;
- Relevant documentation of the Council of Europe, European Commission and other European bodies on the subject (reports, recommendations, conventions, Roma thematic action plan, etc)
- Other relevant Council of Europe and target countries' legal documents and standards

Semi structured interviews and focus group discussions

Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions will be carried out with different relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, including:

- JUSTROM Joint Programme management and team members in Strasbourg;
- The Council of Europe experts contracted in the project (trainers, teams – national coordinators, lawyers, legal assistants and facilitators), supporting the process of developing and implementing the project;
- European Commission representatives of the joint partnership;
- Roma beneficiaries, in particular, women in targeted local communities;
- Local and national stakeholders including: local municipalities/authorities, National Roma Contact Points, CAHROM experts, local bar associations, national legal aid bureaux, ombudsperson's offices, representatives of Ministries of Justice, Ministries of Interior, National Police Inspectorates, judicial authorities (judges and prosecutors), prison authorities, Roma non-governmental organisations, etc.

Case studies

Context-based developments from the four implementation countries will be studied in depth in the form of case studies with the purpose of collecting evidence for further revision and development of the project. There should be one case study per country, limited in scope and focused on one particular issue. This will be discussed during the inception phase of the evaluation with the JUSTROM Joint Programme management.

The case studies will be of explanatory nature, describing contexts and implementation mechanisms and assessing the legal, policy and practical changes that have occurred, further detailing what may be important to be explored in similar situations. The case studies will look into the different dynamics and its relationship with the context and provide information about reasons for success, challenges and drawbacks. The case studies should include both more and less successful cases, with their respective contexts and conditionalities.

The evaluation report should include a list of **recommendations** regarding the orientation and further development of the project, based on findings and lessons learnt. A set of specific recommendations will be provided for each country of implementation in addition to a list of recommendations pertaining to the project in general.

E. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The deliverables that the evaluator(s) will be accountable for producing are:

- a. **Inception report** – the evaluator(s) shall prepare an inception report prior to the fully-fledged data collection exercise. The inception report shall present a structured evaluation plan, containing the methodology that will be used for answering to the evaluation questions (proposed methods, sources and data collection procedures). The inception report provides the project management and the evaluator an opportunity to clarify that they share a common understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding.
- b. **Draft evaluation report** – A draft evaluation report which should be delivered with adequate time to allow discussion of the findings and formulation of comments. It should contain draft findings of the evaluation and draft case studies, drawn on the basis of literature review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and field visits.
- c. **Final evaluation report** – the final evaluation report shall respect the Quality Assurance Checklist in *Appendix 2*.
 - i. Executive Summary
 - ii. Introduction
 - a. Description of the intervention
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation
 - c. Evaluation methodology
 - d. Challenges encountered during the evaluation
 - iii. Findings
 - a. Findings related to each evaluation question
 - b. Country assessments, including overall conclusions and country-specific recommendations
 - c. Case studies
 - d. Additional findings
 - iv. Conclusions
 - v. Recommendations
 - vi. Lessons Learnt
 - vii. Annexes

The Project Management team will have ten (10) days to comment on factual accuracy, the relationship between the findings, conclusions, recommendations, as well as the relevance, usefulness and implementability of recommendations. The evaluator(s) will then have 2 days to submit the final evaluation report. The comments of the management team shall be integrated into the final evaluation report either directly in the report or in the form of an annex (management response) in case of disagreement between the project management and the evaluator(s).

The deliverables will be written in English.

F. EVALUATION LOCATIONS AND LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

Field work (evaluation missions) is envisaged in the four implementing countries: Bulgaria, Greece, Italy and Romania. At least one implementing location per country will be included in the evaluation mission. The locations of the visits will be discussed and agreed with the JUSTROM2 Management Team. The evaluator(s) will be responsible to make their own arrangements for the field visits and appointments with relevant stakeholders that

will be arranged in co-operation with the JUSTROM2 National Coordinators, if deemed necessary by the Evaluator.

G. TIMEFRAME AND WORK PLAN

The estimated duration of the contract is from 1 January - 20 March 2019.

Deliverables and other key-steps	Deadline
Desk review	6 January 2019
Submission of inception report	13 January 2019
Field work – evaluation missions	17 January – 24 February 2019
Draft evaluation report	28 February 2019
Feedback from CoE	15 March 2019
Final Evaluation Report	20 March 2019

The estimated working days needed for the evaluation is as follows:

- Desk review and first reading of framework documents, preparation of methodology and questionnaires – 5 days
- Collection of data, including field days, data analysis and first draft: 14 days
- Revision of first draft and clarifications: 4 days
- Final version: 2 days

H. BUDGET AND PAYMENTS (INVOICING)

The budget of the evaluation is set at €15,000. This sum includes the evaluator's remuneration and all expenses for the services described above, including for example, travel, board and lodging, communication expenses and potential interpretation costs and will be paid in instalments linked to the deliverables being accepted (See Act of Engagement).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATOR(S)

The consultant(s) should have the following qualifications and competences:

- Proven record in leading evaluations in the context of international co-operation;
- Knowledge of, and experience in applying standard evaluation principles, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- Ability to draft concise evaluation reports of high quality in English;
- Proven expertise in issues related to the fields of social inclusion (ideally related to work on Roma issues), gender issues and/or access to justice;
- Independence and absence of conflict of interests by not having been in any way involved in any stage of JUSTROM Joint Programme design, implementation, monitoring, etc.
- Availability to travel to the target countries.

J. SUBMISSION OF BIDS

Applicants shall submit the following documents

1. A cover letter with a brief description of relevant previous experiences in evaluation and monitoring of projects;
2. At least 2 final reports of comparable evaluations recently carried out;
3. Contact details of 2 references expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience;
4. A Curriculum vitae (CV), including references to licences, certifications, accreditations, etc.
5. A proposed work plan;
6. A completed and signed Act of Engagement

K. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Council of Europe Code of Conduct of Evaluation

Appendix 2: Quality Assurance Checklist for the final report

Appendix 3: Declaration of Honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and Absence of conflict of interest

Appendix 4: Evaluation Matrix Template

Appendix 5: Review Form for external consultant's services with consent

Tender Rules

How to send tenders

Tenders must be sent to the Council of Europe in the form of:

- **1 electronic copy/scanned copy** to be sent **only** to the following address justrom@coe.int. Tenders submitted to another e-mail account will be excluded from the procedure.

Deadline for submission of tenders

The deadline for submission of tenders is **17 December 2018 (midnight – GMT+1)**.

Language of the tenders

Tenders shall be submitted in English.

Award criteria:

- Demonstrated understanding of the needs of the assignment (40%);
- Relevant qualifications and experience of the evaluator(s) including consistency of their experience with eligibility criteria and knowledge of languages covered by the evaluations and Romani (40%);
- Adequacy of the work plan with the technical specifications (20%).

Appendix 1: Council of Europe Code of Conduct of Evaluation

Council of Europe Code of Conduct for Evaluators¹

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.

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

¹ Drafted on the basis of UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>

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.

Appendix 2: Quality Assurance Checklist for the final report

Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Reports		
<p>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 finalised to assess its quality.</p>		
<p>Evaluation Title:</p>		
<p>1. The Report Structure</p>		
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name of the evaluation object; 2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; 3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object; 4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators; 5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation; 6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes; 7. List of acronyms. 	
1.4	<p>The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of the evaluation object; 2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience; 3. Evaluation methodology; 4. Most important findings and conclusions; 5. Main recommendations. 	

1.5	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TOR; 2. List of persons interviewed and sites visited; 3. List of documents consulted; 4. More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity; 5. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition; 6. Evaluation matrix; 7. 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	The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: <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 and did not cover.	
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.	

Appendix 3: Declaration of Honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and Absence of conflict of interest

DECLARATION OF HONOUR WITH RESPECT TO THE EXCLUSION CRITERIA AND ABSENCE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Title of Evaluation

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

Appendix 4: Evaluation Matrix Template

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Question	Measure(s) / Indicator(s)	Data Collection Instrument(s)	Data Source(s)	Data Analysis	Evaluator(s) Responsible

Appendix 5: Review Form for external consultant's services with consent

Consent Form

I hereby give my consent for information in the below form to be kept by the Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe for its internal use only. The form will not be shared with persons outside DIO 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 services²

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 DIO 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

² 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

a. Did the evaluator negotiate honestly 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 shortcomings and the strengths of different ways to evaluate the intervention?				
c. Did the evaluator record all changes 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 dignity and self-worth of everyone involved?				
e. Did the evaluator identify and respect differences among participants (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 perspectives and interests of all interested parties?				
g. When the evaluator presented his/her work, did he/she communicate accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret, and critique the work?				
h. Did the evaluator report negative findings 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.