

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE for the FINAL EVALUATION OF BUDGET SUPPORT  
PROGRAMME "Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova"**

**FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 5 BUDGET SUPPORT**

**EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi**

<b>1. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2 THE PROGRAMME TO BE EVALUATED .....	4
1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE PROGRAMME(S) .....	6
1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION .....	6
<b>2 DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 GLOBAL OBJECTIVE .....	7
2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE .....	7
2.3 REQUESTED SERVICES, INCLUDING SUGGESTED METHODOLOGY .....	9
2.4 REQUIRED OUTPUTS .....	12
2.5 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT .....	15
<b>3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED.....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 NUMBER OF REQUESTED EXPERTS PER CATEGORY AND NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS PER EXPERT OR PER CATEGORY .....	16
3.2 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING .....	17
<b>4 LOCATION AND DURATION.....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 STARTING PERIOD .....	17
4.2 FORESEEN DURATION .....	17
4.3 PLANNING .....	17
4.4 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT .....	17
<b>5 REPORTING.....</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 CONTENT .....	17
5.2 LANGUAGE .....	18
5.3 SUBMISSION AND COMMENTS TIMING .....	18
5.4 NUMBER OF REPORT (S) COPIES.....	18
<b>6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1 OTHER AUTHORIZED ITEMS TO FORESEE UNDER 'REIMBURSABLE' .....	19
6.2 TAX ARRANGEMENTS.....	19
<b>7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID .....</b>	<b>25</b>

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

#### Country background

Moldova is a lower middle-income country with a population of 3.55 million (estimated 2017)<sup>1</sup>. The population is distributed evenly between men (48.1%) and women (51.9%). In 2017, the National Bureau of Statistics estimated that 42.7% of the population were urban dwellers and 57.3% lived in the rural areas. Moldova ranks 107th out of 188 countries on the Human Development Index (HDI-0.699 - 2016 HDI Report). Moldova remains the poorest country in Europe with a GDP per capita of USD 2,311 according to the latest census results<sup>2</sup>, which is roughly half of average income per capita in the post-Soviet region of USD 5,079<sup>3</sup>. An ENPI-funded project on regional statistics concluded that in 2014 56.32% of GDP was generated in Chisinau. The private sector accounts for 56.6% of GDP.

Sustained economic growth and reforms to the social protection system have helped to reduce poverty, but in 2014<sup>4</sup>, around 11% of the population were estimated as living below the absolute poverty line. The average monthly wage in 2017 was estimated at EUR 228. Absolute and relative poverty is particularly acute amongst the rural population, the elderly living alone and larger (5+) households in the urban areas and while there is little appreciable difference between men and women on the majority of indicators, there is a substantial difference in share of gross national income<sup>5</sup>. Moldova scored 1.010 on the Gender Development Index and 0.248 (rank 50th) on the Gender Inequality Index.

The economy is dominated by the service sector (63.2% of GDP end 2015) and the manufacturing sector (20.7% of GDP) but remittances are also central, amounting to around one quarter of GDP. Agriculture accounts for 16.1% of GDP and 27.5% of the active labour population continue to derive their living from primary agriculture. There is a significant trade imbalance (-2,387 million USD estimated end 2017). The fiscal deficit was 3.1% in 2017. Total external debt now stands at 86% of GDP and public and publicly-guaranteed external debt is currently 40.5% of GDP. Inflation remained steady in 2012-2014 (4.6%-4.7%), rose to 9.6% in 2015, but has subsequently fallen back to 6.5% estimated at the end of 2017.

The official rate of unemployment at the end of 2017 was 4.2% (IMF estimated). However, this disguises the high levels of under employment and employment in the grey economy. Moldova has one of the lowest activity rates: the NBS reports that 35.8% of the population are economically active (1,273,000 persons); the gender differences in activity, employment and unemployment rates are narrow. Women are most active in food processing and textiles/clothing, while men are more likely to be employed in machinery, metals and chemicals. 33.7% of the population are employed in agriculture, 49.2% in services and the remainder (17.1%) in manufacturing and construction. On average, women earn 14.46% less per month than men.

---

<sup>1</sup> All data are derived from the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova ([www.statistica.md](http://www.statistica.md)) unless otherwise stated. The figure is considered to be overestimated, the real population would be around 2.8 million.

<sup>2</sup> World Bank, Economic update for Moldova, May, 2017 - <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/moldova/brief/moldova-economic-update>

<sup>3</sup> IMF Country Report No 17/102 <https://www.imf.org/external/country/mda/index.htm?type=42>

<sup>4</sup> This is the latest date for which reliable poverty data exists.

<sup>5</sup> The number of women entrepreneurs in rural areas is significantly lower than in urban areas (14.9 % compared to 27.5%). Women in rural areas tend to have more children and due to the lack of sufficient social services have to resort to part-time work in the informal economy or unpaid care-work.

## **EU-Republic of Moldova Reform agenda**

The EU policy framework is supportive of the Government's PFM reform efforts. Moldova signed an Association Agreement (AA) with the European Union, which entered into force on the 1st July 2016, after being applied provisionally from September 2014. The AA commits Moldova to a gradual approximation of legislation, regulations and processes with those of the EU. The relevant provisions include:

- within Title IV "Economic and other Sectoral Cooperation":
  - Chapter 2 "Economic Dialogue" of (articles 24, 25 and 26);
  - Chapter 7 "Management of public finances: budget policy, internal control, financial inspection and external audit" (article 47 dealing with a modern public finance management system in the Republic of Moldova, compatible with basic EU and international principles of transparency, accountability, economy, efficiency and effectiveness; Budget and accounting systems, article 48; Internal control, financial inspection and external audit, article 49;
  - Chapter 8 "Taxation", articles 52-56 (improvement of good governance in the tax area and implementation of these principles.);
- as well as Chapter 8 Public Procurement of Title V of the AA.

## **PFM Reforms**

Over the last few years, Moldova has been improving its public finance management (PFM) system and the PFM Reform Strategy 2013-2020, updated in 2017, is being implemented satisfactorily.

The guiding Public Finance and Fiscal Responsibility Law, adopted in 2014, aims at improving key public finance areas including through the progressive implementation of improved fiscal rules and via constraints imposed on in-year budget revisions.

Positive progress against annual targets of the Strategy have been observed with sustained good performance for each of the reform components, including progress related to the timeliness and comprehensiveness of the budgetary documentation; improvements in MTBF sectoral consultations, methodology to improve revenue forecasting; development of IPSAS based national standards and revision of chart of accounts (in process); improvements of the quality and timeliness of monthly, mid-year and annual reports. The IMF indicates that Moldova's risk of debt distress remains low. Tax and customs performance was stronger in 2017.

The public procurement reform strategy is an ambitious one and the GoM needs to enhance capacities in order to implement it. The legislative approximation has been progressing satisfactorily, restructuring of the Public Procurement Agency (PPA) was initiated, introduction of a new e-procurement system is on-going and a new agency for complaint settlement in public procurement became operational in September 2017. Professionalisation of procurement officers has started with the development of a curriculum. This is an ambitious reform and its pace should be accelerated. Critical issue is the development and introduction of standardised procedures, documentation, templates. A very high number of contracting authorities is an issue. Priorities for 2018 include: further restructuring of PPA, e-procurement implementation, and professional development/training of procurement specialists.

The new Law on Court of Accounts, which entered into force in 2018, introduced several improvements: enhancing institutional independence, specifying the relationship with the Parliament, introducing a certification of auditors and a mandatory annual statutory audit of all the ministries. The entire certification scheme needs revision, the design of the certification process is on-going with EU technical support. Quality of the audits needs to be further improved to be better aligned to ISSAI standards.

There is lack of appropriate parliamentary budget scrutiny, however, public hearings of CoA's reports were held in 2017 in plenary on annual report and in sector committees. Establishment of a full-fledged Public Accounts Committee for the upcoming Parliament (legislative elections will take place at the end of 2018) was decided in 2018, as a requirement of the EU Macro Financial Assistance Programme.

The main challenge in the implementation of the Reform Strategy remains the capacity limitations within the public sector which is being addressed within the overall Public Administration Reform and substantial capacity building with external, mainly EU, support.

The EU is currently the most important international partner in PFM area. The portfolio of assistance includes the on-going technical assistance to the Ministry of Finance and the Court of Accounts, a twinning project on public internal control and audit, a planned joint EU-World Bank project on financial governance of State Owned Enterprises, asset management and financial management of the Road Fund as well as a proposed new Programme on Economic Governance building upon the achievements of PFPR programme.

The latest PEFA assessment was carried out in 2015 based on 2012-2014 data, a repeater PEFA is planned for 2019.

Overall, the core PFM systems have improved over time as documented by the successive PEFA assessment reports 2011 and 2015, although the progress was uneven in terms of the delivery of key PFM functions - fiscal discipline, strategic allocation of resources and operational efficiency.

As regards the first one, 2014 banking and ensuing fiscal crises have been external to PFM systems in the sense that they have not been due to imprudent fiscal management. The robustness of budget and treasury management systems has to some extent allowed absorption and possibly reducing some of the effects of the crisis. The fiscal deficit was limited and public debt sustainability was preserved in spite of fiscal distress.

Concerning the strategic allocation of resources, improvement is needed in order to establish a long-term horizon and consistency with the National Development Strategy. Costed strategies currently cover the 3-year MTBF period, whereas long-term policy strategies exist in parallel, with no or insufficient costing. The fiscal crisis has had a considerable impact on strategic expenditure plans as the government was forced to drastically cut expenditures and, in particular, capital investment.

In terms of the use of resources for service delivery, as pointed out by a 2016 WB Review of Public Finance in Moldova<sup>6</sup>, public spending is far from being efficient. According to the Public Sector Performance Indicator referred to in the report, more efficient peer countries achieve similar outcomes using 40 percent lower revenues. The document pointed out that Moldova needs to do more to contain current expenditures and to secure critical public investment. Operational efficiency continues to be undermined by persistent high level of corruption.

## **1.2 The Programme to be evaluated**

The programme to be evaluated is "Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova" (PFPR), CRIS no. ENI/2014/033-684 (EC Implementing Decision of 16.07.2014), budget EUR 37 million. The programme included a budget support component (EUR 33 million, 3 years) and a complementary support in the amount of EUR 4 million including technical assistance (EUR 3,327,500.00 contracted amount, 3 years duration, service contract CRIS no. ENI/2015/367-275) and a call for proposals "Strengthening role of civil society in economic governance and public finance management" (EUR

---

<sup>6</sup> Republic of Moldova Public Finance Review : Towards More Efficient and More Sustainable Public Finances, World Bank, 2016 <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28330>

232,105.00 contracted amount, 30 months duration – CRIS no. of the grant contract ENI/2017/383-476).

The activities under the budget support were implemented in 2014-2017 (the disbursement of the last tranche is pending), technical assistance project from November 2015 – November 2018, grant project is still ongoing from March 2017 to September 2019.

The main areas covered by the budget support programme and the complementary TA included: fiscal governance / Independent Fiscal Institution (pre-feasibility assessment), macroeconomic forecasting, multi- and annual budget planning, budget execution and reporting, public accounting standards, debt management, transparency of the budget as well as budgetary oversight and scrutiny. The Policy matrix was modified in 2017 to update some indicators to the new legal framework as well as to better focus the intended reforms.

The disbursement rate is estimated to reach around 80% (the disbursement of the last tranche is pending), the amounts per tranche are reflected in the table below:

**Figure 1: Annual disbursements under PFPR budget support programme**

	2014	2016		2017		2018	Total
	Paid (fixed tranche)	Foreseen	Paid	Foreseen	Paid	Foreseen	Foreseen
<b>Amounts in million €</b>	<b>8</b>	8	<b>5.8</b>	8	<b>6.4</b>	9	33

While the compliance with the conditions under the responsibility of the MoF and the Court of Accounts was satisfactory, although for a less extent for the latter as far as it concerns the quality of the outputs, the implementation of the activities by the Parliamentary Committee on Economy, Budget and Finance (PCEBF) lagged behind. This can be attributed to various factors among them the discontinuity of the commitment by the Moldovan counterpart following the change of the leadership of the Committee, weaknesses in the design of the policy matrix, lack of complementary support.

The complementary TA focused mainly on the activities under the responsibility of the MoF. Small scale assistance was provided to the PCEBF to make an assessment of the current system for parliamentary scrutiny and oversight of the budget and recommend improvements. That was not followed by further assistance mainly because of the lack of commitment by the PCEBF. The CoA benefitted from an EU twinning project in 2014-2016 which was partially successful. Considering the needs for further assistance, in November 2017 the EU Delegation deployed additional technical support (2 experts) to the CoA covering strategic development of the institution (under PFPR TA following an amendment to the service contract) and enhancing the quality of financial and compliance audits through a separate framework contract.

The programme was the first budget support operation specifically focusing on PFM reforms, the latter being previously covered by the general condition on PFM in earlier budget support operations in Moldova. Over the implementation period of the programme, the EU was the main donor in PFM area and the only one providing dedicated budget support. WB DPOs and IMF programme covered some aspects related to fiscal governance and macroeconomic framework. Smaller scale assistance was provided by the Slovak aid on programme budgeting, Dutch cooperation on public internal control, UNDP (with Swedish funding) on parliamentary scrutiny and oversight of the budget, Swedish SAI cooperation with Moldovan SAI, WB project on Strategic development and performance

audit of the CoA. An EU twinning project on improving external audit with the Supreme Audit Institution (Court of Accounts) was implemented in 2014-2016.

### **1.3 Stakeholders of the Programme(s)**

The main stakeholders of the programme include the MoF, the CoA, PCEBF and civil society organisations.

The MoF is the specialised central public administration body in charge of developing and promoting the state's public finance policy. The MoF is responsible for the preparation, implementation and annual monitoring of the PFM Reform Strategy. Over the last years, the MoF has embarked on an ambitious medium- to long-term reform agenda and is in the process of building up its capacities to strengthen its mandate as the central fiscal authority and guardian of fiscal sustainability. The transfer of the aid coordination function to the MoF as of 2018 should contribute to a better alignment of the external support with the national budgetary framework. The line Ministries play a key role in the budgeting and spending processes.

As elsewhere across the public sector, the MoF is constrained by high staff turnover and difficulties in attracting experienced and young professionals. There are capacity limitations across the public administration. A reform of the central public administration, initiated by the Government in 2017, aims at gradually improving public sector efficiency and employment conditions. While the public administration reforms address crosscutting issues, there is also an evident need to complement those general reforms with targeted support to strengthen the MoF's capacities and role as a major policy player in the maintenance of hard-won fiscal stability.

The CoA is the Supreme Audit Institution of Moldova. The President and its Board members are appointed by the Parliament. According to the Constitution, the CoA supervises the process of formation, administration and use of public financial resources. During the last decade, the CoA has been shifting away from a Soviet-inspired control body towards a modern Supreme audit institution guided by international public auditing standards. Whereas results have already been achieved, further progress is needed in terms of quality and impact of external audit as well as the governance of the institution.

The Parliament, the Parliamentary Committee on Economy, Budget and Finance (PCEBF), is responsible for the scrutiny and oversight of the budget. The establishment of a Public Accounts Committee, targeted by the EU MFA, is on the agenda.

There is a limited number of civil society organizations (CSOs) or think-tanks active in PFM area. Analytical capacities and public outreach of such organisations need to be developed to further increase the accountability of budget holders at national and subnational levels.

### **1.4 Other available information**

The following assessment / reports shall be taken into consideration for the evaluation:

2015 PEFA: <https://pefa.org/assessment/md-dec15-pfmpr-public-en>

Latest IMF Country Report, July 2018: <https://www.imf.md/pub-rececondev.html>

SIGMA Baseline Measurement Report for Moldova (2015): <http://www.sigmaweb.org/events/baseline-measurement-moldova-may2016.htm>

2017 Open Budget Index: <https://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/moldova-open-budget-survey-2017-summary.pdf>

EUD Annual PFM reports, annual budget support reviews, the MoF's annual progress reports will be provided during the inception phase of the assignment.

The evaluation will take stock of existing reviews, evaluations and data. This includes the studies mentioned above and any other information that the evaluators might discover during the process of the evaluation. A comprehensive list of the already existing evaluations and studies shall be part of the inception report.

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final
Coverage	The Programme in its entirety
Geographic scope	Republic of Moldova, Chisinau
Period to be evaluated	Entire period of the Programme

### 2.1 Global objective

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority<sup>7</sup> of the European Commission<sup>8</sup>. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the **results**<sup>9</sup> of Programme in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches**<sup>10</sup>. From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

The global objective of this evaluation is to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the "Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova", paying particular attention to its results measured against its objectives;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve future Programmes.

### 2.2 Specific objective

In particular, this evaluation will serve the following specific objectives: to understand the performance of the Programme, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Programme(s) in the same sector.

---

<sup>7</sup> COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com\\_2013\\_686\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf); EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

<sup>8</sup> SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval\\_comm\\_sec\\_2007\\_213\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf) ; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd\\_br\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\\_cir.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> COM (2011) 637 final "Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change" - [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009\\_2014/documents/acp/dv/communication\\_/communication\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/acp/dv/communication_/communication_en.pdf)

The evaluation aims at assessing:

1. to what extent PFPR programme has achieved its expected results, notably through contributing to the implementation of the partner government's Public Finance Management Reform Strategy 2013-2020 sector strategies by providing opportunities for the improvement of national policy processes and policy implementation.
2. The evaluation should also specifically analyse how the budget support programme has contributed (or not) to strengthen PFM systems, including improved transparency within government systems, improved Domestic Revenues Mobilisation and stronger accountability.
3. The evaluation will also pay attention to other aid modalities (basket/common funds, projects), in order to assess the complementarity and synergy (or discrepancy) of these modalities with budget support.
4. It should also assess the impact of the budget support operation(s) on the M&E systems in the sectors supported by budget support. Budget support should aim to strengthen the monitoring systems in the sectors it supports, in alignment with the existing national level monitoring and evaluation systems, and contribute to the improved availability and credibility of data. Availability of the robust progress reports by the government, providing results information against targets set under the strategy, and the use of these reports to facilitate informed policy dialogue between the different stakeholders (CSOs, SAI, Parliament, donors) and evidence based decision making is one indicator of the capacity of the government in the area of M/E.

The evaluation will take stock of what has been achieved with the main purpose to allow for lessons learnt and recommendations to inform on:

- the conditions under which budget support has an effect (or not) and the possible intensity and nature (positive or negative) of such effect in PFM sector;
- the design and implementation of future budget support operations in the Republic of Moldova in PFM sector;
- improvements to be set up by the European Union (or other budget support provider(s)) to maximize the impact of budget support in the Republic of Moldova in PFM sector;
- constraints in government policies, institutional structures and administrative arrangements in the Republic of Moldova which might impede the effectiveness of Budget Support on spending actions and targeted public policies and reforms

The evaluation is expected to take place the year following the end of activities under the budget support programme and before the end of the implementation period of the complementary support. This should facilitate the data collection and interviews with the key stakeholders as well as the implementing entities of the Programme. PFM has been a quickly evolving sector and, as new assistance is being prepared for the nearest future, the timing of the evaluation should enable a timely and accurate assessment of the results of the PFPR programme.

The main users of this evaluation will be: the EU Delegation to Moldova, DG NEAR and other relevant services of the European Commission as well as the European External Action Service, the national counterparts, civil society organisations in Moldova.

## 2.3 Requested services, including suggested methodology

### 2.3.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover PFPR programme in its entirety on all the components. Other donors' assistance in the sectors relevant to the programme is to be taken into account.

### 2.3.2 Evaluation criteria and Evaluation Questions/Issues

The evaluation will assess programme(s) using the standard 5 DAC evaluation criteria, namely: *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.*

In addition, as requested by the Better Regulation Package<sup>11</sup>, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the *EU added value* of the programme, both regarding its design and implementation;
- the *coherence* of the programme itself, with the EU strategy in PFM sector in the Republic of Moldova, *with other EU instruments (like Macro Financial Assistance)*, with Member States, with the country's national strategies and cross cutting strategies such as PFM and the Public Administration Reform, and with *other donors when relevant.*

### 2.3.3 Evaluation Questions

The Evaluation Questions to be answered by this evaluation are:

#### Indicative list of Evaluation Questions (EQ):

##### On Relevance:

- To what extent was the design of the Budget Support programme appropriate and relevant in terms of the covered reform measures?

##### On Efficiency:

- Were the direct and induced outputs achieved in a cost-efficient way compared to other aid modalities? This refers to Budget support as a financial flow as well as the policy dialogue, technical assistance and grant to a civil society organisation.

##### On Effectiveness:

- To what extent has budget support contributed to an increased size and share of external funding subject to the government's budgetary process and to an improved predictability of aid flows? (direct outputs). Has the discretionary budget in the sector increased as consequence of the programme set up?
- Have there been improvements in policy formulation and implementation processes, in the quality of the policy setting and in democratic accountability, and to what extent and through which mechanisms (flow of funds, policy and institutional effects, others) has Budget Support contributed to these improvements? (induced outputs)
- How have the M&E systems improved in the sectors supported by budget support?
- To what extent there have been positive changes in the outcomes of the PFM policy by PFPR Budget Support programme?

---

<sup>11</sup> SWD (2015)111 “Better Regulation Guidelines”, [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd\\_br\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf)

### On Sustainability:

- To what extent PFPR Budget Support programme's direct and induced outputs are likely to remain after the programme has come to an end?
- To what extent the PFPR Budget Support programme's outcomes are likely to remain after the programme has come to an end? [In the case of the continuation of the programme: what is it likely to happen to the [name the Budget Support programme]'s outcomes in the event that the programme comes to an end in the next two years?
- To what extent the PFPR Budget Support programme's sustainability would have been better/worse compared to other aid modalities?

### On EU added value:

- To what extent the fact that PFPR Budget Support programme has been financed through the EU has had added benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' and other donors interventions only?

The contractor is expected to critically think through these EQs during the Inception phase and confirm their relevance for the evaluation. For each EQ, the contractors will suggest a set of Judgement Criteria and Indicators. The EQs, Judgement Criteria and Indicators will be discussed with the Reference Group and will be included into the final version of the Inception Report. Once agreed, the EQs will become contractually binding. The EQs must be introduced into the Intervention Logic.

The evaluation team should also consider whether the following cross-cutting issues – democracy, good governance, Public Administration reform (PAR) mainstreaming (as per OECD-SIGMA PAR principles - were taken into account in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the programme and its monitoring. Also, to which extent did the budget support operation contribute to creating opportunities and strengthening the role of the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the country's policy design, implementation and oversight.

The contribution of the budget support operation to the image of and awareness on the EU in the country should also be taken into account. Did the programme have a communication plan? Did they contribute to enhance the capacity of the government to communicate to their stakeholders and the final beneficiaries about the reforms implemented with the support of the EU?

### 2.3.4 Evaluation methodology

It is expected that this evaluation is based on the standard methodology for the evaluation of budget support<sup>12</sup>.

This methodological approach has been thought for the undertaking of Budget Support **Strategic** evaluations. Budget Support **Strategic** evaluations are usually joint evaluations with other development partners and cover all the budget support operations that have been (or are being) implemented in a country during a relatively long period of time (usually around 10 years).

**This evaluation not being a Strategic one, it is not expected to provide information on the contribution of the PFPR Budget Support programme to development outcomes or impacts.** This means that the evaluators will carry out Step 1 of the analysis and part of Step 2 described under the point 2.3.4.1. Regarding Step 2, the evaluators are asked to provide information on the changes at outcome level (and at impact level, if possible) achieved by the partner country's policies supported

---

<sup>12</sup> See OECD/DAC (2012), *Evaluating Budget Support. Methodological Approach*, Paris. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/Methodological%20Approach%20BS%20evaluations%20Sept%202012%20with%20cover%20Thi.pdf>

by the PFPR budget support programme but not to undertake the thorough (including quantitative) analysis that would be needed to find out how much different variables contribute to the achievement of these outcomes. Indeed, the OECD-DAC methodology foresees as one of the analyses of Step 2 'the identification of the factors that have contributed to determine the key changes (or absence of changes) at impact and outcome level ". In this evaluation, the identification of such factors contributing to changes is not to be undertaken.

It is expected that the evaluators collect data related to the evolution during the years 2014-2018 of the outcome and impact indicators supported by the PFPR budget support programme. It is also expected that the evaluators present the evolution of the design and monitoring framework indicators between 2014-2018 in a consolidated table. In addition, the evaluation should provide information on how the Risk Management Framework has been used and a judgement on whether it served its purpose.

#### **2.3.4.1 The standard OECD/DAC methodological approach for the (strategic) evaluation of budget support**

This methodology combines a comprehensive evaluation framework articulated in five levels of analysis as follows:

Level 1: *Budget Support inputs*: funding, policy dialogue, disbursement conditions, complementary support measures<sup>13</sup>.

Level 2: *Direct outputs of Budget Support*: the country opportunities that are expected to improve as a direct consequence of the deployment of budget support inputs, e.g.: the new fiscal space created by the transfer of funds; increased predictability of funds, reduced transaction costs, a more aligned and coordinated policy dialogue and capacity strengthening activities conducive to reforms; improved monitoring of reforms; the products or services delivered by the complementary support measures.

Level 3: *Induced outputs*: expected improvements in the partner's legal and regulatory framework, public policies, public sector spending and public sector delivery, i.e., reform steps expected to be achieved by the public institutions (and/or other stakeholders) supported by budget support, as a consequence of their appropriation and implementation of the new opportunities provided (the direct outputs). These induced outputs should facilitate the achievement of outcomes. Some examples are an increase in the number and quality of schools, the improvement of the institutional and legislative framework on prevention and repression of corruption, improved PFM systems, improved business environment (e.g. related legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, and new services). The focus is on institutional improvements and not on their use by the final beneficiaries, which is part of the outcomes.

Level 4: *Outcomes*: positive changes in the behaviour of the targeted beneficiaries – services users, economic and institutional actors – to the changes in policies, organisational management and service delivery (for example in the education sector these could be improvements in enrolment, dropout, repetition and completion rates), which are supposed to open the way

---

<sup>13</sup>This will typically include one or more of the following: i) capacity development measures aimed at strengthening the capacity of the public institutions to coordinate, implement, monitor, evaluate and communicate the public policy in question; ii) capacity development measures aimed at strengthening the capacity of civil society to contribute to the implementation and monitoring of public policies; iii) monitoring, evaluation and supervision TA of the EU-funded action; and iv) support for the design and implementation of a visibility and communication strategy.

towards the longer term impacts (for example in the education sector, learning achievements and literacy rates). Other examples of outcomes include increased business confidence and private sector investment, or an improvement in corruption perception. In certain cases, outcomes can also include behavioural changes at the organisational level constituting a response by institutional actors (for example in the public administration reform area these could be the increase in prosecution of cases of corruption, that would open the way toward longer-term impacts, such as the decrease of corruption perception).

Level 5: *Impact*: the expected longer term and intermediate changes leading to the achievement of the country's strategic goals to which budget support is expected to contribute: enhanced sustainable and inclusive growth, reduced income and non-income poverty, empowerment and social inclusion of disadvantaged groups (including women), environmental protection and other impact areas, depending on the specific partnership framework, such as improvements in democracy, human rights, peace, and stabilisation.

In addition, the approach discerns three 'steps' in the evaluation. This 'three step approach' recognises the different roles of donors and government in Budget Support processes, as well as the indirect impact of Budget Support on poverty alleviation (ie. through government policies):

- The first step foresees an assessment of the inputs provided by Budget Support and their effect on the relationship between external assistance and the partner country's budget and policy processes (direct outputs) as well as the induced changes in the financing and institutional framework for public spending, public policy, policy management and service delivery (induced outputs).
- The second step aims at an assessment of the outcomes (beneficiaries' responses) and impacts (e.g. sustainable growth, poverty reduction, improved governance, etc.) which are achieved through the government policy(ies) supported by the Budget Support programme(s) being evaluated.
- Finally, based on the findings in step one and two, step three aims at a synthesis and conclusions in which way Budget Support has contributed to changes (intended but also unintended) in the partner country. It should allow matching the results of the two previous steps and help identifying the related links, if any, thereby completing the contribution assessment on the causal relationship between Budget Support and the government strategy outcomes.

## **2.4 Required outputs**

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases: an Inception Phase, a Field Phase, and a Synthesis Phase. Deliverables in the form of reports and slide presentations should be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table below.

The submission of deliverables by the selected contractor will be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module, an evaluation process management tool of the European Commission. The selected consultants will have access to online guidance in order to operate with the module.

### **2.4.1 Synoptic table**

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted during each phase (not necessarily in chronological order) and lists the deliverables to be produced by the team, including the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each deliverable is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Deliverables and meetings
<u>Inception / Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial document/data collection and definition of methods of analysis</li> <li>Background analysis</li> <li>Finalisation / elaboration of the EQs (incl. Judgment Criteria and Indicators) considering the EQs presented in the ToR</li> <li>In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)</li> <li>Phone interviews, if relevant</li> <li>Identification of preliminary answers to the EQs, information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase</li> <li>Methodological design of the Field Phase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Kick-off meeting</i> with EUD via remote conference</li> <li>Inception Note</li> </ul>
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mission of the evaluation team to the field</li> <li>Meetings at country level with the relevant stakeholders</li> <li>Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques</li> <li>Data collection and analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Face-to-face kick-off meeting</i> in Chisinau</li> <li>Intermediary Note</li> <li>Slide Presentation of key findings</li> <li><i>Debriefing with the EUD and the Reference Group</i></li> </ul>
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)</li> <li>Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Final Report with an Executive Summary</li> <li>Final Report</li> </ul>

#### 2.4.1.1 Inception / Desk Phase

The inception phase is aimed at:

- structuring the evaluation with: (i) a preliminary desk-based review of documentation and the acquisition of most of the documentation available, in order to construct a data base; (ii) the identification of the main specific features to be introduced in the comprehensive evaluation framework, the adaptation of the Evaluation Questions (EQ) to those and the formulation of the Judgement Criteria (JCs) and indicators;
- checking the availability and quality of data;
- conducting most of the documental analysis needed for carrying out the evaluation;
- conducting selected with the EUD, programme management and other key partners, if relevant, to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The principal objectives of the inception meeting are:

- to review the main motivations for the evaluation and the key concerns to be addressed;
- to discuss the Intervention Logic, the EQs and the JCs and indicators;
- to collect whatever documentation and data available immediately and make arrangements for the compilation / preparation of data in the areas where there are gaps;
- to identify the sources of additional information necessary for the evaluation;

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They should also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

This inception phase will end with the submission of the ***inception note*** to the EUD which is to be submitted 3 working days after the end of the inception phase.

#### **2.4.1.2 Field Phase**

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception Note by the Project Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Inception / Desk phase and bringing further information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Project Manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with EUD, programme management, and other stakeholders, if relevant.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team shall use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team shall summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a debriefing meeting with the EU Delegation as well as in a meeting with the programme management and the Reference Group. This phase will end with the submission of the Intermediary Note to the EUD. The note is to be submitted at latest 1 day before the de-briefing meeting.

#### **2.4.1.3 Synthesis Phase**

The Synthesis Phase starts after approval of **Intermediary Note** by the project Manager.

This phase is devoted to the preparation of the Final Report and entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to finalise the answers to the Evaluation Questions and prepare the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present in a single Report, including an Executive Summary plus Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, 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 draft Final Report will be circulated by the EUD to the Reference Group for comments. The Project Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the Quality Assessment Grid will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required.

The evaluation team will then finalise the Final Report and prepare the Executive Summary by addressing the relevant comments (to be submitted on the last day of the synthesis phase). 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.

## **2.4.2 Management and Steering of the evaluation**

### **2.4.2.1 At the EU level**

The evaluation will be managed by the EUD with the support of a Reference Group (RG) gathering the key Budget Support stakeholders in the partner country (MoF, Court of Accounts, Parliament, civil society).

It is the responsibility of the EUD:

- to ensure that the evaluation is supported by and accompanied by the Moldovan authorities and that key stakeholders are involved in the budget support evaluation;
- to launch and manage the evaluation contract;
- to agree on the composition of the evaluation team according to the ToR and to contract with the consultancy office;
- to ensure the communication with the RG and with the most relevant stakeholders to approve all the deliverables;

It is the responsibility of the RG:

- to provide all information needed by the evaluation team to attend the different meetings and provide comments to the evaluation team and the EUD;
- to give timely comments on the deliverables, including draft and final report. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Project Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

### **2.4.2.2 At the Contractor level**

The contractor is expected to oversee the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs and the deliverables of the evaluation. In particular, it shall:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that for each evaluation phase specific tasks and deliverables for each team member are clearly defined.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.

## **2.5 Language of the specific contract**

The language of the specific contract is English. The team may need to review documentation in Romanian language. English-Romanian translation/interpretation for some meetings should be foreseen.

### 3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

#### 3.1 Number of requested experts per category and number of working days per expert or per category

The assignment is to be performed by two experts, as specified below. The CVs of the experts should include the number of working days per each assignment.

##### **Expert I, Team Leader, Category I (minimum 23 working days)**

###### *Qualifications and skills:*

At least Master's Degree in the field of economy, public finance management, public administration or other field relevant to the assignment or, in its absence, 5 years of equivalent professional experience in the fields mentioned above on top of the general professional experience specified below,;

###### *- General professional experience:*

At least 12 years' experience in design and/or, implementation and/ or evaluation of public administration reforms or public finance management reforms

###### *- Specific professional experience:*

- At least 5 years of experience in evaluation of budget support programmes;
- Previous experience in managing and/or implementing and/or monitoring and/or evaluating budget support in public finance management will constitute an asset;
- Previous experience in evaluating projects implemented in the current Instrument for pre-accession (IPA)<sup>14</sup> or European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)<sup>15</sup> countries will be an advantage.

###### *- Language skills:*

- Excellent command of written and spoken English;
- Working knowledge of Romanian or Russian will be an asset.

##### **- Expert II Public finance Management specialist, Category I (minimum 23 working days)**

###### *Qualifications and skills:*

At least Master's Degree in the field of economy, public finance management, public administration or other field relevant to the assignment or, in its absence, 5 years of equivalent professional experience in the fields mentioned above on top of the general professional experience specified below,;

###### *- General professional experience:*

At least 12 years' experience in public finance management;

###### *- Specific professional experience:*

- At least 5 years of experience in managing and/or implementing and/or monitoring and/or evaluating budget support in public finance management;

---

<sup>14</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/funding/ipa/](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/funding/ipa/)

<sup>15</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/overview\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/overview_en)

- Previous experience in projects implemented in the current IPA or ENI countries will be an advantage.

- *Language skills:*

- Excellent command of written and spoken English;
- Working knowledge of Romanian or Russian will be an asset.

### 3.2 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

## 4 LOCATION AND DURATION

### 4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment: October 1, 2018.

### 4.2 Foreseen duration

The assignment is to be completed by February 28, 2019.

### 4.3 Planning<sup>16</sup>

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill-in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Note). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment.

Attention is drawn to the fact that sufficient forward planning is needed in order to ensure active participation and consultation with government representatives and national stakeholders.

### 4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Chisinau, Moldova.

## 5 REPORTING

### 5.1 Content

The reports must match quality standards. The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Note	Max 8 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention logic</li> <li>• Methodology for the evaluation</li> </ul>	End of Inception /

<sup>16</sup> including the period for notification for placement of the staff as per art 16.4 a)

	<b>Number of Pages (excluding annexes)</b>	<b>Main Content</b>	<b>Timing for submission</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators</li> <li>• Evaluation Matrix</li> <li>• Data analysis and collection methods</li> <li>• Work plan</li> </ul>	Desk Phase
<b>Intermediary Note</b>	Max 10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the activities undertaken during the field Phase;</li> <li>• Preliminary findings.</li> </ul>	End of Field phase
<b>Draft Final Report with Executive Summary</b>	Max 50 pages + max 2 pages for Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u></b></li> </ul>	End of Synthesis Phase
<b>Final report</b>	Max 50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted</li> </ul>	1 week after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.

## 5.2 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

The final report including the Executive summary is to be translated into Romanian.

## 5.3 Submission and comments timing

For submission deadlines see point 5.1

For each report, the Project Manager will submit comments within 15 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the Reference Group shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments.

## 5.4 Number of report (s) copies

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in 1 paper copy and in electronic version with the final invoice. All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing.

## 6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE

### 6.1 Other authorized items to foresee under 'Reimbursable'

The following items under the budget heading "reimbursable costs" are eligible:

1. International travel costs
2. Visa costs (if needed)
3. Translation costs: minimum 150 pages
4. Interpretation: minimum 10 working days

The contractor must make available an appropriate logistical support for its experts, including their travel, visa (if needed) and accommodation arrangements.

No equipment is to be purchased on behalf of the Contracting Authority / beneficiary country within the context of this contract (neither in the context of individual assignments).

Secretarial/office-related costs which may include office rental, communications (fax, telecommunications, mail, courier etc.), report production and secretarial services both in the Contractor's Headquarters and/or individual expert's home office and for experts in the beneficiary country are considered to be included within the fee rates of the experts. No costs of this nature may be charged in addition.

The fee rate which should be used is that in force on the day the request for services has been signed and is not revisable. No price revision applies during the duration of this contract.

The final invoice shall be accompanied by an expenditure verification report. The provision for the expenditure verification shall be **EUR 4,000.00**.

This contract is a fee based contract with a maximum budget of 72,000.00 EUR.

### 6.2 Tax arrangements

The European Commission and the Republic of Moldova have agreed in a Framework Agreement between Republic of Moldova and the Commission of the European Communities regarding technical assistance, signed in Brussels on 11 May 2006, ratified through Law nr. 426-XVI of 27 December 2006 to fully exonerate the following taxes: value added tax, taxes and customs duties or any other charges having equivalent effects. The legislation in force in the Republic of Moldova regulates such tax exemptions by Government Decision of the Republic of Moldova nr. 246 of 08 April 2010 (including modifications published in Government Decision of the Republic of Moldova nr. 389 of 28 May 2014).

## 7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the Project Manager using the quality assessment grid provided in Annex V, which is a tool to review the quality of the Draft and the Final report. Its compilation will support/inform the Performance Assessment required in CRIS, in particular with reference to the third criterion 'Quality of Service' (and should the score be 2 or 3 a synthesis of the QAG comments can be pasted in the Comment box of the Performance Assessment).

## ANNEXES

---

### Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

**Request for Services n. 2018 / 399273**  
**FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 5 BUDGET SUPPORT**  
**EUROPEAID/138778/DH/SER/MULTI**

#### 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighing between technical quality and price. Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

	<b>Maximum</b>
<b>Total score for Organisation and methodology</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Experts/ Expertise:</b>	
<b>Expert 1</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Qualifications and skills</b>	<b>5</b>
General professional experience	12
Specific professional experience: At least 5 years of experience in evaluation of budget support programmes;	10
Specific professional experience: Previous experience in managing and/or implementing and/or monitoring and/or evaluating budget support in public finance management will constitute an asset	5
Specific professional experience: Previous experience in evaluating projects implemented in EU pre-accession or European neighbourhood countries will be an advantage.	5
Language skills	3
<b>Expert 2</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Qualifications and skills</b>	<b>5</b>
General professional experience	12
Specific professional experience: At least 5 years of experience in managing and/or implementing and/or monitoring and/or evaluating budget support in public finance management;	15
Specific professional experience: Previous experience in evaluating projects implemented in EU pre-accession or European neighbourhood countries will be an advantage.	5
Language skills	3
<b>Total score for experts</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Overall total score</b>	<b>100</b>

## **2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD**

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

## **3. INTERVIEWS**

No interviews will be foreseen for the awarding procedure of this project.

## Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The consultant is requested to deliver two distinct documents: the Final Report and the Executive Summary.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 5. Additional information on the overall context of the Programme(s), description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The cover page of both deliverables 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".*

### Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. 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.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

#### 1. Introduction

A description of the Programme(s), of the relevant country/region/sector background and of 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 (optional)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Programme(s). 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 evaluation criteria.

#### 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

#### **4.1 Conclusions**

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

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 communication of 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 other dissemination activities

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

They are intended to improve or reform the Programme(s) in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Programme(s) 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 to 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 methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Programme(s) took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

**Annex IV: Planning schedule**

(Add as many rows as needed)

		Indicative Duration in working days <sup>17</sup>		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Expert ...	Indicative Dates
<b>Inception /Desk phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
•				
<b>Field phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
•				
<b>Synthesis phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
•				
<b>TOTAL working days (maximum)</b>				

<sup>17</sup> Add one column per each expert

## Annex V: Quality assessment grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Project Manager using the following quality assessment grid; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team.

The rates have the following meaning:

- *Very weak* – criteria mostly not fulfilled
- *Weak* – criteria partly fulfilled
- *Average* – criteria mostly fulfilled but not up to expectations
- *Good* – criteria entirely fulfilled as expected
- *Very good* – criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated as:	Rating
<b>1. Meeting needs:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic?</li> <li>• Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?</li> <li>• Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?</li> <li>• Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given?</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Appropriateness of the design:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?</li> <li>• Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?</li> <li>• Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?</li> <li>• Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Reliability of the data:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?</li> <li>• Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?</li> <li>• Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?</li> <li>• Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?</li> <li>• Have the collected data been cross-checked?</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Soundness of the analysis:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the analysis based on the collected data?</li> <li>• Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?</li> <li>• Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis?</li> <li>• Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Credibility of the findings:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses?</li> <li>• Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised?</li> <li>• Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Validity of the conclusions:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?</li> <li>• Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?</li> <li>• Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?</li> </ul>	
<b>7. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions?</li> <li>• Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action?</li> <li>• Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?</li> <li>• When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?</li> </ul>	
<b>8. Clarity of the report:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?</li> <li>• Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences?</li> <li>• Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?</li> <li>• Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?</li> </ul>	

	Rating
Considering the 8 previous criteria what is the overall quality of the report?	

<b>Comments on meeting needs (1):</b>
<b>Comments on appropriateness of the design (2):</b>
<b>Comments on reliability of the data (3):</b>
<b>Comments on soundness of the analysis (4):</b>
<b>Comments on credibility of the findings (5):</b>
<b>Comments on validity of the conclusions (6):</b>
<b>Comments on usefulness of the recommendations (7):</b>
<b>Comments on clarity of the report (8):</b>
<b>Comments on the overall quality of the report</b>