EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation — EuropeAid

Evaluation of *Integrated Approaches for Climate Change Adaptation in the East Usambara Mountains*

Region	**Sub-Saharan Africa**
Beneficiary Country	**Tanzania**
Sector **(as defined in CSP/NIP)**	**Enviroment**
Project reference	**Contract number: DCI-ENV/2014/354-255** **(Lot 3: Highlands Cluster)**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Table of contents

1. EVALUATION MANDATE

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[1] of the European Commission[2]. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the **results** of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches**[3]. Evaluations should provide an understanding of the cause and effects links between activities and results.

Evaluations should serve decision making, learning and management purposes.

2. BACKGROUND

The title of the Action is *Integrated Approaches for Climate Change Adaptation in the East Usambara Mountains (Contract number: DCI-ENV/2014/354-255).*The program started in March 2015 and was completed in April 2019 (49 months) and is a component of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) Programme (Phase II) in Tanzania.

The program is implemented in Muheza District, Tanga region, Tanzania. It covers 8 villages from the Misalai and Zirai Wards: Misalai, Mgambo, Kwemsoso, Kazita, Shambangeda, Kizerui, Zirai and Kwelumbizi. The total number of beneficiaries of the project is 10.990 people.

The main challenges on climate change that the East Usambara mountains´region is facing are the instability of rainfall on agricultural production, weak health conditions, lack of energy supply and low number of rural enterprises. The use of traditional agricultural practices increases this negative impact of climate change in the area. Moreover, this is accompanied by a weak natural resources governance; lack of water infrastructure supply and improvable hygiene and sanitation practices; low levels of awareness and education; and scarce opportunities of income generation for the population.

The overall objective of the project is *To demonstrate effective and efficient strategies that support poor, rural households in Tanzania to adapt to the negative impacts of climate change and to alleviate poverty.*

The especific objetive of the project is *To support 8 communities living near to high biodiversity forests in the East Usambara mountains to increase and diversify incomes, strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change-related impacts.*

---

[1] EU Financial regulation (art 27); REGULATION (EC) No 1905/200; REGULATION (EC) No 1889/2006; REGULATION (EC) No 1638/2006; REGULATION (EC) No 1717/2006; COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 215/2008

[2] SEC(2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation"

[3] COM (2011) 637 final "Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change"

Expected results of this program are:

ER1: Integrated ecovillages model extended to 8 communities including efficient management of natural resources, climate-smart agriculture techniques, improved water supply and sanitation services and sustainable energy technologies.

ER2: Institutional capability to assess, plan and implement climate change strategies is enhanced in 8 villages, Misalai and Zirai Wards and within Muheza District Council.

ER3: Knowledge Management system is improved.

The action implementation has been recently finalized. Detailed information about activities, indicators and sources of verification of the project can be found in the logical framework annexed.

The program is implemented by ONGAWA and their counterparts: Muheza District Council and Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG) and it is based on the participation of the beneficiaries. The District authorities are active partners in this program providing support and sustainability. The main departments involved are: Land, Natural Resources and Environment Department (LNRED), District Water Department (DWD), Agriculture Department, Education Department, Health Department, and Community Development Department (CDD). The Nilo Nature Reserve (NNR) and Tanga Fresh Company have been working closely with TFCG in the implementation of the activities of ER1. Pangani Basin Office has been also collaborating positively by supporting the associations and committees at subcachtment level. Leeds University and Sokoine University of Agriculture have supported the implementation of the ER3, through the ensurance of the academic input within the project on livelihood resilience and climate change adapatation.

There were not changes in the context during the implementation of the Action that have put in risk the achievement of the objetives and results of the programme. However, an extension of one month of the implementation period was requested in order to allow cellebrating structured handover sessions in all the communities for better conclusions.

The cost of the action is 1,364,449 euros while the contribution of the European Commision is 1,091,560 euros. The project has covered all the co-financing required with several Spanish public and private donors.

Along the implementation of the project, annual technical and financial interim reports and ROM reports (bi-annually for the first two years, annually for the last two as per GCCA-TZ M&E techincal assistance orientations) have been elaborated. Also, a mid-term external Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) visit and the corresponding report was done in February 2017.

3. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND MAIN USERS

The main objectives of the evaluation are to provide the National Authorising Officer, the Delegation of the European Union to Tanzania, the GCCA M&E Technical Assistance, and, when appropriate, the wider public with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the *intervention (Integrated Approaches for Climate Change Adaptation in the East Usambara Mountains (Contract number: DCI-ENV/2014/354-255)*, paying particularly attention to the results of the project against its objectives;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve current and future action

At project level, the intented use of the evaluation and the users will be:

<u>Primary:</u>
ONGAWA and their partners will use the evaluation as: i) systematization of the learning lesson and experiences in the implementation of the Action, ii) contribute to the design of similar future interventions; iii) to report of the achievements of the intervention to the members of ONGAWA and their partners, donors and any other institutions and groups involved to fulfil the accountability internal requirements of ONGAWA; iv) to use as awareness material in other activities of the organizations.

Local Authorities will use the evaluation to i) improve and contribute to the sustainability of the Action and ii) reply some of the activities in others areas of the country.

<u>Secundary:</u>
Beneficiaries, other local and international NGO and institutions will use the evaluation as source of information about the Action and to design and implement similar future programmes.

4. EVALUATION SCOPE, INTERVENTION LOGIC AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

4.1. SCOPE

The scope of the evaluation will be the whole Action, including all the results above mentioned. It will specially analyze the relevance and effectiveness of the integrated approach adopted, emphazising on the assessment of the components of the project that have been specially successful and the reason.

As regards the geographical scope, a sample of villages over the total will be selected during the inception phase in order to be specifically visited and analyzed under the evaluation. The villages will be chosen taking into account that all the components were implemented in all the villages. However, the evaluation programme will analyse all results and objetives of the Action.

The evaluation will consider the full period of the Action (49 months), although a special analysis will be done about the last year, considering the conclusion of the programme and its future sustainability.

4.2. INTERVENTION LOGIC OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME

The project aims at the achievement of a twofold objective: increase the resilience to negative impacts of climate change (CC) in the population of the 8 targeted villages through community-based activities focusing on improving incomes, livelihoods and living conditions in one hand, and strengthen institutional capacities at village, ward and district levels to address CC issues on the other one. For that purpose the Action proposes a holistic approach working at the same time and in a coordinated way in different sectors, mainly agriculture, water resources, land and capacity bulding. Although these resources are closely linked and the situation of each one depends on another, the proposals of management frequently use a too narrowed focus, forgetting the interactions among them and that communities living near have a key responsibility over the conservation and proper management of all of them.
The Action has worked in the promotion of new initiatives that support adaptation to climate change through the linkage of water resources management with sustainable agricultural production, animal husbandry and forest management. Besides, other components have been developed to increase the awareness and capacity of the Muheza District Council and the improvement of the knowledge management system.

4.3. ISSUES TO BE STUDIED / EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will assess the project/programme using the standard 5 DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact & replication.

The evaluation team should also consider whether the following cross-cutting issues *[gender quality, rights of vulnerable people, environmental protection, good governance]* were taken into account in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the project and its monitoring.

The evaluation criteria are translated into specific evaluation questions. These questions to be studied are indicative; they may be discussed with the experts during the Inception Phase. However, once agreed the evaluation questions are contractually binding.

Relevance

1. What was the quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, What was the appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement?
2. What was the stakeholder participation in the design and the management/implementation of the project? What was the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity?
3. Was the overall project design relevant in the local context and for the intended beneficiaries (communities and local government)?
4. Were there any elements missing in the project design that would likely have led to increased project effectiveness and impact?

5. What was the specific added value of this EU funded project? What is the counterfactual? (What would be the situation without the EU funding)?
6. Were changes made during project implementation to increase the relevance of the activities?
7. Were cross-cutting issues (gender and pro-poor in particular) considered in project design and implementation?
8. What are the main lessons learnt for future similar projects?

Effectiveness

9. Were the planned benefits correctly delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups)?
10. Was the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders appropriate? Which accompanying measures have been taken by the partner authorities?
11. In how far have the expected results been achieved?
12. In how far are the project outputs effectively used and adopted by beneficiaries?
13. Was there a good balance between capacity building and direct input support?
14. Have the interventions led to behavioural changes amongst target communities that will help build their climate change resilience? Are there any barriers to behavioural change that the project has not addressed?
15. In how far has the project led to behavioural changes amongst supported district and village government staff that indicate an increased recognition of the importance of climate change adaptation?
16. How well are the groups functioning that have been supported? Are they representative of all different socio-economic groups in the communities, including women and the poorer quintiles?
17. Are there signs that plans and by-laws are being implemented and enforced?
18. Are there any unexpected behavioural changes or unexpected developments that may undermine the long term effectiveness?
19. In how far have the activities and outputs benefitted the poor, women and vulnerable households? Have barriers for their adoption of supported interventions been identified and addressed?
20. What are the main lessons learnt for future similar projects?

Efficiency

21. Were the work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs) operational? How was the general management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor)?
22. Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?

23. Were overhead costs reasonable?

24. Was the geographical and activity scope of the project appropriate for the available funding?

25. Were the project management and coordination and M&E systems set-up geared towards efficient results-oriented management?

26. Any signs of adaptive management that increased project efficiency and effectiveness?

27. Was coordination between implementing partners efficient? Did all project partners play their envisaged role in an efficient manner?

28. Were participatory processes used? How efficient and inclusive were these processes?

29. Were all outputs achieved and if not, why not?

30. What is the quality of the project outputs?

31. What are the main lessons learnt for future similar projects?

Impact & Replication

32. Extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.

33. Whether the effects of the project have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.

34. Has the resilience to climate change of the beneficiaries been increased?

35. Has there been a good mix of interventions to optimise resilience impact?

a) direct (like drought tolerant seeds) and indirect (like savings groups) CCA interventions

b) household level interventions and broader ecosystem level interventions

36. Which interventions have had most positive direct impact on target beneficiaries in general, and on FHHs and poor and vulnerable households in particular?

37. Which interventions have had most positive impact on the environment / ecosystems?

38. In how far have national policies contributed to or hampered achieving impact?

39. Was there a replication strategy? What are the prospects for replication of the most successful interventions without further project support?

40. What are the main lessons learnt for future similar projects?

Sustainability

41. Whether if local institutions are agree and continue to remain in agreement with the objectives and results of the Action and they have capacity (e.g through policy and budgetary support)

42. How strong is the sense of ownership at community level for the project interventions?

43. What is the need for, and what are the prospects for continued support for the interventions by (i) local government staff and (ii) other projects / stakeholders.

44. What is the economic viability of supported income generating interventions? Have viable value chains been established?

45. Are there any external developments that affect the sustainability prospects positively or negatively?

46. Was an exit strategy developed and has it helped increase sustainability prospects?

47. What are the main lessons learnt for future similar projects?

Coherence

48. Whether if results and impacts of the Action will mutually reinforce with other action of the local government or other NGO.

5. METHODOLOGY, TOOLS AND MAIN DELIVERABLES

The methodology to be used is based on the DEVCO Evaluation methodology for projects/programmes as set out on the website
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/71165
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/reports/2008/1258_isspap_en.pdf

5.1. EVALUATION APPROACH AND MAIN DELIVERABLES

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases: an Inception Phase (including the desk analysis), a Field Phase, and the Synthesis Phase. The main deliverable will be the final report, while Inception and Field Phases will have briefer specific deliverables that should be should be submitted at the end of the corresponding stages as described in the following table below:

Phases of the evaluation:	***Methodological Stages:***	***Deliverables***
1. Inception Phase	• Structuring the evaluation • Data collection • Analysis	➢ *Inception report*
2. Field Phase (Mission in the country)	• Data collection • Analysis • Verification of hypothesis/preliminary findings	➢ *Slide presentation for debriefing*

Phases of the evaluation:	*Methodological Stages:*	*Deliverables*
3. Synthesis phase	• Analysis and Judgements • Drafting and Finalisation of the report	➢ *Final report*

5.1.1. Inception phase (including the desk analysis)

In the inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex 1). The evaluation team will then analyse the Intervention logic *as set up at the beginning of the programme cycle* On the basis of the information collected the evaluation team should:

- Describe the development co-operation context.
- Comment on /analyse the intervention logic / logical framework.
- Comment on the evaluation questions proposed or, when relevant, propose an alternative or complementary set of evaluation questions justifying their relevance.
- Check the consistency and validity of the evaluation questions, propose judgement criteria and identify provisional indicators and their means of verification
- Present an indicative methodology for the overall assessment of the project/programme.
- Describe the approach for answering each evaluation questions.
- Propose the work plan.
- Confirm the final schedule for the evaluation exercise
- Analyse systematically the relevant available documents
- *Interview with Headquarters Programme Coordinator for Tanzania.*
- Identify and present the list of tools to be applied in the Field Phase

During the inception stage a report/note shall be prepared (see section 6).

5.1.2. Field phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Phase report by the evaluation manager.

Before going to the field, the evaluation team must submit its detailed work plan, including the list of people to be interviewed, and other data collection tools to be used, dates of visit, itinerary, and name of team members in charge. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these should be immediately discussed with the evaluation manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with *ONGAWA programme manager of the Action, representatives of its stakeholders (Muheza District Council, Tanzanian Forest Conservation Group) and local authorities.*

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; working closely with the relevant government authorities and agencies; using the most reliable and appropriate sources of information.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team shall summarise its work, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with *ONGAWA Programme Manager.*

5.1.3. <u>Synthesis phase</u>

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report. The evaluation team will present in a single document their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (Annex II).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluation team (*Team Leader)* will present the draft final report to the reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. On the basis of comments expressed by the reference group members, the evaluation team has to amend and revise the draft report. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team should explain the reasons in writing.

5.2. MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is managed by *Headquarters Programme Coordinator for Tanzania (Evaluation manager)* and *ONGAWA Programme Manager of the Action* with the assistance of a Reference group consisting of members of *ONGAWA Muheza and Headquarters Teams and local partners´s representatives* under the supervision of *ONGAWA Executive Director* who oversees the evaluation on behalf of the Commission.

The reference group member's main functions are:

- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the project/programme.

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the evaluation manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.

6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the project's area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).
The evaluation manager will evaluate the main report based on the 'Quality assessment grid' (see Annex III) and on the additional specific areas of improvement detected if any.

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*	Main Content	Timing for submission *(please refer to section 8 for a timetable)*
Inception report	*10* pages	• Evaluation questions, Judgement criteria and Indicators • Encountered and anticipated difficulties • Detailed evaluation approach and workplan • Issues still to be covered and the assumptions to be tested • Full description of the methodology used to answer the questions • Field phase detailed plan	End of Inception phase
Draft Final report	*60* pages	• **Cf. detailed structure in Annex 2** • Answer to the evaluation questions • Synthesis of all findings, conclusions and recommendations into an overall assessment	End of Synthesis phase
Final report		• Same specifications as above, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted	

All reports will be in *English* using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing. Each report will be submitted first in electronic version as a draft.

For each report/output, the Evaluation manager will submit comments within *5* calendar days. The revised reports/outputs incorporating comments received from the concerned parties shall be submitted within *10* calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

The Final Report (final version) will be provided in *2* paper copies and in electronic version.

7. The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team should hold extensive and relevant **experience with development programmes evaluations**, and fully **conversant with the principles and working** methods of project cycle management and **EC aid** delivery methods. University education with **relevant experience in climate change adaptation and/or environment and/or natural resources management sector** (5 years), together with experience (3 years) and good understanding of economic development processes in rural areas. Solid and diversified experience in developing countries, **desirable specific background in Tanzania**. **Full** working **knowledge of English** and excellent report writing; desirable working knowledge of Swahili, at least for assisting during the field phase.

8. Technical Offer

All offers should comprise a description of the methodology proposed for implementing the evaluation in a range of 4-10 pages, comprising at least the understanding of the assignment, the approach to be used for the evaluation and the evaluations tools to be used.

Criteria which will be used to evaluate the technical offers are the following ones:

Criteria	**Maximum**
Total score for Organisation and methodology	
Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
Organization of tasks including timetable	10
Sub Total	**45**
Expertise:	
Expert(s) expertise	55
Sub Total	**55**
Overall total score	**100**

9. FINANCIAL OFFER

The estimated budget considered for this evaluation is 5,000 euros.

10. THE INDICATIVE WORK PLAN & TIME TABLE

Provisional start of the assignment: 1st of July.

Maximum duration of the assignment: *30* calendar days.

The estimated work plan is as follows (dates are only indicative) :

Activity	Location	Indicative Duration	Indicative Dates
Inception phase		**5 days**	**1 - 5 July**
• Briefing Session	**Remote (Skype)**	**1 day**	**1 July**
• Preparation & submission of the inception report	**Remote**	**3 days**	**2 – 4 July**
• Evaluation manager Meeting and reception of feedback of the inception report	**Remote (Skype)**	**1 day**	**5 July**
Field Phase		**11 days**	**8 to 20 July**
• Field mission	**Tanzania**	**9 days** *(including arriving trip)*	**8 to 16 July**
• Debriefing	**Tanzania**	**2 days** *(including leaving trip)*	**17-18 July**
Synthesis Phase		**14 days**	**19 July–1 August**
• Drafting provisional final report	**Remote**	**10 days**	**19 - 28 July**
• RG meeting - Presentation of the report	**Remote (Skype)**	**1 day**	**29 July**
• Revision of the draft of the report by ONGAWA		**7 days**	**30 July-5 August**
• Finalisation of the report	**Remote**	**3 days**	**6 – 8 August**
TOTAL (maximum)		**30 days**	**1 July – 8 August**

The offer will include travel costs (transport and allowances) from the origin of the team till Muheza town and allowances for the field phase. Local transport to the communities will be covered by ONGAWA.

11. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

11.1. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The evaluation team members must not have had a direct role in the planning or implementation of the Action *Integrated Approaches for Climate Change Adaptation in the East Usambara Mountains*.

11.2. INTERMEDIATE PAYMENT(S)

The payment of the evaluation services will be done in two parts:

- 50% that will be paid after approval of the Inception report
- 50% that will be pay after the approval of the Final Report

ONGAWA will do the payments using bank transfers, assuming its cost. The evaluator will request the payment attaching an official receipt in each case.

12. Annexes

12.1. Annex I: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

- MOUs between ONGAWA and its partners for the implementation of the project.
- Governmental national and sector policy documents
- Project identification study (formulation of the Action and documents of reference used during its definition).
- Project financing agreement and addendas
- Project's Annual Operational Plans
- Project's annual narrative progress reports, and internal technical reports (quarterly).
- EC's Result Oriented Monitoring Reports, and eventual other external and internal monitoring reports of the project
- Project's mid-term evaluation report and annual audits reports.
- Relevant documentation elaborated along the implementation of the project in each of the components.

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through its interviews with people who are or have been involved in the design, management and supervision of the project / programme. Resource persons to collect information and data are to be sought in the EC services, implementing body and / or public service in the partner country.

12.2. ANNEX II: STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & FINAL REPORT

The final report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated. Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

The cover page of the report shall carry the following text:
‘’ This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission’’.

The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:

Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

1. Introduction

A description of the project/programme and the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions/ Findings

A chapter presenting the evaluation questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment

A chapter synthesising all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the project/programme. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the evaluation questions, the logical framework or the seven evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter introduces the conclusions of the evaluation. The conclusions should be organised in clusters in the chapter in order to provide an overview of the assessed subject.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communicating the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.
If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the project/ programme in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new intervention for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes of the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)
- Map of project area
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures)
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators (evaluation matrix)

12.3. Annex III: Quality assessment grid

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager using the following quality assessment grid where the rates have the following meaning:

Legend: ■ *very weak* = criteria mostly not fulfilled or absent ■ *weak* = criteria partially fulfilled ■ *good* = criteria mostly fulfilled ■ *very good* = criteria entirely fulfilled ■ *excellent* = criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is:	*Very weak*	*Weak*	*Good*	*Very good*	*Excellent*
1. Meeting needs :					
• Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic? • Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme? • Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process? • Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given?					
2. Appropriate design :					
• Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.? • Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail? • Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context? • Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?					
3. Reliable data :					
• Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design? • Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed? • Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report? • Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards? • Have the collected data been cross-checked?					
4. Sound analysis :					
• Is the analysis based on the collected data? • Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic? • Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis? • Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way? • Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any?					
5. Credible findings :					
• Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses? • Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised? • Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?					
6. Valid conclusions :					
• Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings? • Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria? • Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?					
7. Useful recommendations :					
• Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions? • Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action? • Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation? • When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?					
8.Clear report :					
• Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary? • Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences? • Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms? • Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?					
	Very weak	**Weak**	**Good**	**Very good**	**Excellent**
Considering the 8 previous criteria what is the overall quality of the report?					

…