TENDER FILE / TERMS OF REFERENCE
(Competitive bidding procedure / One-off contract)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Purchase of services for an external evaluation of the European Commission and Council of Europe "WE CAN for human rights speech" project
Contract N° DAD-ADD/NHSCU(2020)56

The Council of Europe is currently implementing until 31 January 2022 a Project on "WE CAN for human rights speech". In that context, it is looking for a Provider for the provision of services for the development of a monitoring and evaluation plan and an external evaluation of the European Commission and Council of Europe co-funded project "WE CAN for human rights speech" (See Appendix 1 of this Tender file and Section A of the Act of Engagement).

A. TENDER RULES

This tender procedure is a competitive bidding procedure. **In accordance with Rule 1395 of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe on the procurement procedures of the Council of Europe[1], the Organisation shall invite to tender at least three potential providers for any purchase between €2,000 (or €5,000 for intellectual services) and €55,000 tax exclusive.**

This specific tender procedure aims at concluding a **one-off contract** for the provision of deliverables described in the Act of Engagement (See attached). A tender is considered valid for 120 calendar days as from the closing date for submission. The selection of tenderers will be made in the light of the criteria indicated below. All tenderers will be informed in writing of the outcome of the procedure.

The tenderer must be either a natural person, or a legal person except consortia.

Tenders shall be submitted **by email only** (with attachments) **to the email address indicated in the table below, with the following reference in subject: WE CAN evaluation.** Tenders addressed to another email address **will be rejected.**

The general information and contact details for this procedure are indicated on this page. You are invited to use the CoE Contact details indicated below for any question you may have. **All questions shall be submitted at least <u>5 (five) working days before the deadline for submission of the tenders</u> and shall be exclusively addressed to the email address indicated below with the following reference in subject: Question WE CAN evaluation**

Type of contract ►	One-off contract
Duration ►	Until complete execution of the obligations of the parties (See Article 2 of the Legal conditions as reproduced in the Act of Engagement)
Deadline for submission of tenders/offers ►	**11 January 2021**
Email for submission of tenders/offers ►	**tenders.antidiscrimination@coe.int**
Email for questions ►	tenders.antidiscrimination@coe.int
Expected starting date of execution ►	01 February 2021

[1] The activities of the Council of Europe are governed by its Statute and its internal Regulations. Procurement is governed by the Financial Regulations of the Organisation and by Rule 1395 of 20 June 2019 on the procurement procedures of the Council of Europe.

B. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The expected deliverables are described in **Section A of the Act of Engagement** (See attached).

C. FEES

All tenderers are invited to fill in the **table of fees** as reproduced in **Section A of the Act of Engagement**.

Tenderers **subject to VAT** shall also send **a quote (Pro Forma invoice)** on their letterhead including:

- the Service Provider's name and address;
- its VAT number;
- the full list of services;
- the fee per type of deliverables (in the currency indicated on the Act of Engagement, tax exclusive);
- the total amount per type of deliverables (in the currency indicated on the Act of Engagement, tax exclusive);
- the total amount (in the currency indicated on the Act of Engagement), tax exclusive, the applicable VAT rate, the amount of VAT and the amount VAT inclusive.

D. ASSESSMENT

Exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interests

(by signing the Act of Engagement,[2] you declare on your honour not being in any of the below situations)

Tenderers shall be excluded from participating in the tender procedure if they:

- have been sentenced by final judgment on one or more of the following charges: participation in a criminal organisation, corruption, fraud, money laundering;
- are in a situation of bankruptcy, liquidation, termination of activity, insolvency or arrangement with creditors or any like situation arising from a procedure of the same kind, or are subject to a procedure of the same kind;
- have received a judgment with res judicata force, finding an offence that affects their professional integrity or serious professional misconduct;
- do not comply with their obligations as regards payment of social security contributions, taxes and dues, according to the statutory provisions of their country of incorporation, establishment or residence;
- are or are likely to be in a situation of conflict of interests;
- are or if their owner(s) or executive officer(s), in the case of legal persons, are included in the lists of persons or entities subject to restrictive measures applied by the European Union (available at www.sanctionsmap.eu).

Eligibility criteria

- university degree in social sciences;
- minimum 10 years' experience in designing, managing and leading evaluations and setting up M&E systems in the context of international cooperation;
- extensive knowledge of, and experience in, applying internationally-recognised evaluation standards (UNEG, OECD-DAC);
- proficiency in English.

Award criteria

- Quality of the offer (60%), including:
  - Methodology proposed;
  - Previous experience in evaluating international projects/programmes in the human rights field;
  - Technical competence and experience in conducting evaluation from a distance/by video conference

- Financial offer (40%).

The Council reserves the right to hold interviews with eligible tenderers.

Multiple tendering is not authorised.

---

[2] The Council of Europe reserves the right to ask tenderers, at a later stage, to supply the following supporting documents:
- An extract from the record of convictions or failing that an equivalent document issued by the competent judicial or administrative authority of the country of incorporation, indicating that the first three above listed exclusion criteria are met;
- A certificate issued by the competent authority of the country of incorporation indicating that the fourth criterion is met;
- For legal persons, an extract from the companies register or other official document proving ownership and control of the Tenderer;
- For natural persons (including owners and executive officers of legal persons), a scanned copy of a valid photographic proof of identity (e.g. passport).

E. NEGOTIATIONS

The Council reserves the right to hold negotiations with the bidders in accordance with Article 20 of Rule 1395.

F. DOCUMENTS TO BE PROVIDED

Tenderers are invited to submit:

- **A completed and signed copy of the Act of Engagement[3] (See attached)**
- For tenderers subject to VAT only: **a quote, describing their financial offer**, in line with the requirements of section C of the Tender File (see above);
- A list of all owners and executive officers, for legal persons only;
- **CV(s) of staff who will be involved in carrying out the monitoring and evaluation;**
- **A proposed methodology for carrying out the monitoring and evaluation**
- **Two examples of M&E plans recently completed in English**
- **Two examples of evaluation reports recently completed in English.**

All documents shall be submitted in English, failure to do so will result in the exclusion of the tender.

If any of the documents listed above are missing, the Council of Europe reserves the right to reject the tender.

The Council reserves the right to reject a tender if the scanned documents are of such a quality that the documents cannot be read once printed.

* * *

APPENDIX 1 – PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy services for 1) the development of a monitoring and evaluation plan, and 2) an external evaluation of the European Commission and Council of Europe co-funded project "WE CAN for human rights speech" (WECANHRS)

The present Terms of Reference (ToR) provide background information about WECANHRS. 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.

1. ABOUT THE WECANHRS JOINT PROJECT

The WECANHRS Joint Programme (REC-RRAC-RACI-AG-2019) is being implemented over 24 months: from 1st February 2019 to 31st January 2021. The total budget for the project is 431,353 Euros. It is funded jointly by the European Commission (78%) and the Council of Europe (22%). The project is implemented by the Council of Europe as the co-ordinator of a consortium of partners: Active Watch based in Romania, Agenzia di Promozione Integrata per i Cittadini in Europa (APICE) based in Italy; A Jewish Contribution to an Inclusive Europe (CEJI) based in Belgium; and Neue Deutsche Medienmacher (NDM) based in Germany.

1.1 The project aims

- to help organisations and young activists fighting hate speech to become more efficient by providing them user friendly tools (developed on evidence-based research and simplified and updated previous materials generated by the CoE No Hate Speech Movement youth campaign) and with trainings
- to consolidate the cooperation among these organisations and activists at the European-level and help develop new connections with social media companies, other networks of NGOs and national authorities.

[3] The Act of Engagement must be completed, signed and scanned in its entirety (i.e. including all the pages). The scanned Act of Engagement may be sent page by page (attached to a single email) or as a compiled document, although a compiled document would be preferred. For all scanned documents, .pdf files are preferred.

1.2 Main activities

- One research study on how to identify situations most likely to generate waves of hate speech and another research study on timing and how to engage in counter and alternative narratives to have a maximum impact. This research aims to help activists and NGOs be prepared for action against hate speech and be more effective.
- Development of three toolkits and two trainings to analyse hate speech, develop human rights-based narratives and communication strategies
- Organising one online and one face-to-face training courses for trainers,
- Organising three thematic seminars on ways to counter some of the most common forms of hate speech, antisemitic, anti-Muslim or anti-Roma discourse.
- Launching ten short human rights-based narrative campaigns.

Please note that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the mode of delivery of the activities have been adapted in agreement with the European Commission. This unforeseen external factor should be taken into account in preparation of the monitoring and evaluation plan, and final evaluation.

1.3 Outcomes

Short term, 40 activists benefit of trainings, 105 from seminars, 1 000 people consult the toolkits and methodologies developed and 10 000 people are reached through short campaigns.

Medium term project results will become an integral part of the No Hate Speech Movement (NHSM) arsenal to combat hate speech and fuel further research on the optimiation of these tools.

Long term, the network of organisations involved in NHSM will become independent and will work in synergy with other networks that aim at combating hate speech.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.1 Monitoring objectives

The Provider will provide expertise for the collection and analysis of data and the development of monitoring methodology in view of the project activities.

A selection of up to three project activities should be monitored to assess the quality of the outputs and to show progress in achieving outcomes and ultimately results that may lead to change and impact. The monitoring data analysis is to be used to adjust and adapt the project where necessary, and feed into the final evaluation

2.2 Monitoring and evaluation plan

The provider is to propose a complete monitoring and evaluation system for the Project team, including proposal for regular monitoring of outputs and outcomes which can feed into the final evaluation. The monitoring methodology should be gender sensitive.

2.3 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 should identify key lessons from the implementation of the project for its possible follow-up and to be further used by the Council of Europe's No Hate Speech and Co-operation Unit, and the European Commission's DG Justice and Consumers and the consortium partners. 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

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the sustainability, relevance, effectiveness and impact of the WECANHRS project

2.4 The objective and scope of the evaluation

The final evaluation shall assess:

- Has the Project been implemented as planned, what obstacles were faced and how were they addressed during implementation?
- What results were achieved by the Project?
- What lessons can be learned from the way in which the Council of Europe and the consortium partners managed the implementation of the Project?

The ultimate beneficiaries of this evaluation are the donors of the Project, the EC Directorate General Justice and Consumers as well as the consortium partners. The primary beneficiary is the Council of Europe as the co-ordinator of the Project.

2.5 Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation questions will be based on the five criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC: relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as well as three additional criteria: Council of Europe coherence/complementarity, and added value. An indicative list of the questions is provided below. The evaluation questions can be further refined by the Provider.

Relevance
- To what extent do the intervention objectives address identified needs of the target group(s)?
- How far did the design of the intervention address the problems identified?

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

Efficiency
- How efficient was the Project architecture, processes, and mechanisms in addressing the different areas of intervention? What possibly hampered its efficiency?
- To which extent the management of the relationships among stakeholders was effective in establishing a real partnership aiming at the success of the intervention?

Impact
- To what extent has the project helped organisations and young activists fighting hate speech become more efficient
- To what extent has the project helped consolidate cooperation among the organisations and young activists at Europe-level?

Sustainability and ownership
- To which extent are the outcomes of the Project likely to continue producing effects after the end of its funding?
- To which extent are NGOs being involved in the Project implementation process?
- What are the factors that hampered the impact and sustainability of the assistance?

Coherence and complementarity
- To what extent are the activities implemented within the Project coherent with those implemented in other sectors of the Council of Europe as also other international organisations?
- To what extent were coordination mechanisms established and how have they contributed to coherence and efficiency of the project implementation?

Added Value
- How did the implementation of the Project ensure complementarities and generate synergies with other programmes at national and European level?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses from having the Council of Europe implement the project?

The evaluation questions and methodology for this assignment may need to be further elaborated by the Provider. The Provider may suggest additional questions and should indicate success criteria, relevant indicators and the sources for the indicators/methodology for gathering necessary evidence.

2.6 Evaluation methodology

Apart from comparing actual results to initially planned ones, to the possible extent looking at relevant indicators set out at the design stage, the assessment of impact has to provide concrete quantitative indications of the impact brought about by Council of Europe assistance, to the extent possible. This means also that when comparing the impact, it should be taken into account the average costs and efforts incurred to achieve that level of impact.

The evaluation methodology will include documents review, surveys and semi-structured interviews with the Council of Europe staff in Strasbourg as well as consortium members, co-operation partners and the donor (via videoconference).

The evaluation will rely on data collected as part of the monitoring exercise led by the Provider. Further information on the Project activities' implementation, available in the Project Management IT tool of the Council of Europe and collected by the Project staff (such as media/social media outreach) will be made available. The Provider is to propose other means of collecting information such as, but not limited to, focus groups, questionnaires, online surveys.

2.7 Expected deliverables

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

Deliverable 1: An inception report, including a fine-tuned evaluation and monitoring plan developed on the basis of the proposal submitted by the evaluator, containing the methodology, phases, etc., and including the schedule with key dates and related details, the proposed data collection methods and data sources to be used for answering each evaluation question (i.e. in form of an evaluation matrix, if feasible). The report should meet the standards listed in Appendix 2 Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Inception Report.

Deliverable 2: A draft final evaluation report which should be delivered with adequate time to allow discussion of the findings and formulation of comments.

Deliverable 3: The final evaluation report should contain a satisfactory response to the evaluation questions in the Terms of Reference. The recommendations should be supported by the findings and conclusions and their implementation should be feasible. The final evaluation report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, recommendations and – if applicable - lessons learnt, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should meet the standards listed in Appendix 3 Quality Assurance Checklist for Final report.

A tentative outline of the evaluation report could include the following:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
    - o Purpose of the evaluation
    - o Description of the objectives of the evaluation
    - o Evaluation methodology
    - o Difficulties encountered during the evaluation
- Findings
    - o Findings related to evaluation questions
    - o Additional relevant findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learnt
- Annexes (including list of interviews, questionnaires and documents reviewed, etc.)

The timeframe for the deliverables will be confirmed during the first meeting between the selected Provider(s) and the Project team.

All the reports and expected outputs shall be produced in English, using the appropriate style and structuring the text in a clear and concise way. All draft reports will be submitted to the project management in electronic form by e-mail and in a format compatible with MS Office software. The

Council of Europe reserves the right to request the necessary additional revisions of the reports in order to reach an appropriate outcome and quality control requirements. The final report should be usable for publication.

2.8 Other considerations

i. Location of assignment

The desk research will be performed at the Provider’s office. The field research will be organised and carried out by the Provider online.

ii. Budget

The maximum budget for the monitoring and evaluation of the project, covering all the deliverables to be achieved by the contractor as listed above, is EUR 15 000. The allocated budget includes consultancy fees, and travel and subsistence required for field interviews, interpretation and translation costs, if any.

iii. Risk and assumptions

Risks and assumptions cannot be listed exhaustively. It is assumed that services within both the Council of Europe and the implementing authorities of the beneficiaries accept the evaluation as an integral part of the programme/project cycle management and are committed to provide the necessary information, and will subsequently act on recommendations and findings, as well as provide the follow-up information to the Council of Europe.

The following are additional relevant assumptions for the above evaluations:
- Access to requested documentation and information on the programmes is ensured by the Council of Europe, national authorities and the project beneficiaries;
- The Council of Europe staff and implementing parties are regularly informed on objectives and methods of this evaluation, in order to ensure their full cooperation.

In the event that one or several of the above assumptions prove to be untrue, the Provider should immediately inform the Project management. The Provider will also report in advance any limitations to the evaluations due to insufficient collaboration from key stakeholders.

iv. Conflict of interests

The Provider must be strictly neutral. Conflicts of interests must be avoided. The expert(s) carrying out the evaluation shall have no involvement with the project subject of this exercise. More specifically, the expert(s) must fulfil the following criterion:

- No previous involvement in programming and/or implementation of Council of Europe assistance which will be evaluated as part of this evaluation.
- No previous or current involvement with project stakeholders.

The Council requests the signed objectivity confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration to be submitted before the evaluation is launched.

During all contacts with stakeholders, the Provider will clearly identify themselves as independent consultants and not as an official representative of the Council of Europe.

Appendix 2

Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Inception Report		
Evaluation Title:		
1. Evaluation Purpose - The Inception Report specifies the purpose of the evaluation and how it will be used.		
2. Evaluation Objectives - The Inception Report includes clearly defined, relevant and feasible objectives.		
3. Evaluation Context - The Inception Report includes sufficient and relevant contextual information.		
4. Evaluation Scope - The Inception Report includes the scope of the evaluation.		
5. Evaluation Criteria		
5.0	The Inception Report specifies the criteria that will be utilised to guide the evaluation.	
5.1	The Inception Report specifies the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated will be assessed, including, for example, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability.	
5.2	The Inception Report spells out any additional criteria of relevance to the particular type of evaluation being undertaken, such as evaluations of development, humanitarian response, and normative programmes.	
5.3	The scope of the evaluation is feasible given resources and time considerations.	
5.4	The Inception Report includes an assessment of relevant human rights and gender equality aspects through the selection of the evaluation criteria.	
6. Tailored Evaluation Questions		
6.0	The Inception Report includes a comprehensive and tailored set of evaluation questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria.	
6.1	The Inception Report contains a set of evaluation questions that are directly related to both the objectives of the evaluation and the criteria against which the subject will be assessed.	
6.2	The set of evaluation questions adds further detail to the objectives and contributes to further defining the scope.	
6.3	The set of evaluation questions is comprehensive enough that they raise the most pertinent evaluation questions, while at the same time being concise enough to provide users with a clear overview of the evaluation's objectives.	
6.4	Factoring in the information that will be collected and the context of the evaluation, evidence backed answers to the set of evaluation questions is achievable.	
6.5	The Inception Report includes an assessment of relevant human rights and gender equality aspects through the selection of the evaluation questions.	

7. Methodology		
7.0	**The Inception Report specifies the methods for data collection and analysis, including information on the overall methodological design**	
7.1	The Inception Report contains a clear and accessible methodological plan. Preferably, a standalone section, such as an Evaluation Matrix that is clearly delineated from other information contained in the Inception Report.	
7.2	The Inception Report states the overall methodological approach and design for the evaluation. Examples of approaches include participatory, utilization-focused, theory-based and gender and human rights responsive. Examples of overall design include non- experimental, quasi- experimental and experimental.	
7.3	The Inception Report specifies how a human rights and gender perspective will be incorporated in the evaluation design.	
7.4	The Inception Report specifies an evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods that are human rights based and gender sensitive and for evaluation data to be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, etc.	
7.5	The data collection and analysis methods in the Inception Report are sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of the evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment. For example, there will be sufficient data to address all evaluation questions.	
7.6	The evaluation methodology includes multiple methods (triangulation); preferably with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and with a range of stakeholders covered by the data collection methods.	
7.7	Logical and explicit linkages are provided between data sources, data collection methods and analysis methods. For example, sampling plans are included.	
7.8	The evaluation methodology takes into account the overall purpose of the evaluation, as well as the needs of the users and other stakeholders.	
7.9	The evaluation methodology explicitly and clearly states the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods.	
7.10	The Inception Report specifies that the evaluation will follow CoE ethical guidelines.	
8. Evaluation Work Plan		
8.0	**The Inception Report includes a work plan**	
8.1	The Inception Report work plan states the outputs that will be delivered by the evaluation team, including information on the degree to which the evaluation report will be accessible to stakeholders, including the public.	
8.2	The Inception Report work plan describes the key stages of the evaluation process and the project time line.	
8.3	The Inception Report work plan establishes clear roles and responsibilities for evaluation team members, the commissioning organization and other stakeholders in the evaluation process.	
8.4	The Inception Report work plan describes the evaluation quality assurance process.	
8.5	The Inception Report work plan describes the process, if any, for obtaining and incorporating evaluand comments on a draft evaluation report.	
8.6	The Inception Report work plan includes an evaluation project budget.	

APPENDIX 3

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 finalised to assess its quality.		
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	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; • 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	The title page and opening pages provide key basic information: 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	The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes: 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: 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: • **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.	

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.	