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ANNEXES

**BACKGROUND**

* 1. **Relevant country / region / sector background**

This project has been crafted to comply with the EU’s priorities and methodology for democracy and electoral support[[1]](#footnote-1), and is based on the **European Response to Electoral Cycle Support Strategy** (EURESC)[[2]](#footnote-2) designed by the **European Partnership for Democracy** (EPD) consortium led by the European Centre for Electoral Support (**ECES**).

‘

The project is construed to deliver support to implement the recommendations of the EU Election Observation Missions (**EUEOM**) to Jordan, and draws on the lessons learned from project funded by the EU and EU-members states implemented in Jordan by members of the EPD Consortium[[3]](#footnote-3), notably the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (**WFD**), the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (**NIMD**) and the French Agency for Media Cooperation (**CFI**). Moreover, this project is informed by the lessons learned and accumulated experience of the EPD Consortium from having delivered more than 200 democracy and electoral support projects in 150 countries.

The consortium assembled a joint scoping team composed of national, regional and international experts and conducted three needs assessment (NAM) and formulation missions to Jordan, coupled with thorough research, to this proposal in the requests of key beneficiary groups and the priorities of the contracting authority. The NAMs employed a participatory methodology whereby key informant interviews (Kii) and focus groups were central means of data collection, and they documented key stakeholders’ priorities, in terms of content and preferred delivery mechanism of activities. The mission further identified entry points to operate in an effective, accepted and sustainable manner. This preparation phase allowed the partners to craft a truly tailored methodology for the project, conceived with and for Jordanian beneficiaries. All other electoral and democracy assistance providers present in Jordan have been consulted in order to avoid activity duplication, seek synergies and establish reciprocal and cordial working relationships.

* 1. **The Action to be evaluated**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the Action to be evaluated | * **EU Support to Jordanian Democratic Institutions & Development) – EU JDID**
 |
| Budget of the Action to be evaluated | * EUR 12,737,995
 |
| CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated | **ENI/2017/385-539** |
| Dates of the Action to be evaluated | * Start: 25/10/2018
* End: 31/08/2020
 |

* 1. **Stakeholders of the Action**

The main beneficiaries of the project are identified as the House of Representatives (**HoR**), the Independent Electoral Commission (**IEC)**, the Judiciary, the Ministry of Political and Parliamentary Affairs (**MoPPA**), **political parties**, **women** and **young** in leadership positions and media houses and their owners/journalists involved in political reporting. The final beneficiaries will be Jordanian citizens in general, with emphasis on women, youth at policy level.

1.4.1 Description of the action

The project EU-JDID aims to support reform process in Jordan, by consolidating democracy and promoting inclusiveness of national policy and decision-making process. This 4-years project support partners institutions and relevant stakeholders in the democratic reform process including: The House of Representatives; the Independent Electoral Commission and the Judiciary; Political Parties; the Ministry of Political and Parliamentary Affairs (MoPPA); Women and Youth; and Media and Journalists.

The project is structured around three core pillars in order to weld together a coordinated and coherent response: 1) Parliamentary support; 2) Electoral assistance; 3) Support to political party system.

The project is implemented along the lines of the European Response to Electoral Cycle Support Strategy (EURECS), conceived jointly by ECES and the members of the European Partnership for Democracy of which WFD is part. EURECS is an innovative delivery mechanism to implement electoral and democracy assistance activities that are consistent with European values and EU policies. EURECS adopts an inclusive approach towards a wide range of electoral stakeholders in order to ensure comprehensive and sustainable actions and it is built to help prevent, mitigate and manage electoral related conflicts.

1.4.2 Objectives of the action

* With the aim of supporting Jordan's reform process towards consolidating democracy and promoting the inclusiveness in national policy and decision-making processes, the objectives of EU-JDID are to:
* Strengthen the functioning of the House of Representatives (HoR) in exercising its core parliamentary functions in a professional, accountable and transparent manner;
* Enhance the functioning of the Independent Election Commission (IEC) and other key stakeholders, contributing to elections conducted in a professional, transparent and credible manner;
* Support the Political Party (PP) System in contributing to democratic governance and policy making, in particular in the HoR.

1.4.3 Expected results

The project built on thorough analysis of key beneficiaries’ needs and national priorities, which are meant to achieve:

* Increased political awareness amongst the population, including women and youth, reflected foremost in an increase in political participation;
* Intensified efforts amongst elected institutions in public outreach for more inclusive decision-making processes;
* Increasingly informed service delivery by public demands and subsequently more geared to cater the needs/will of the people.

In particular, with regards to the project activities, the main expected results are:

* The HoR is reinforced in exercising its core parliamentary functions in a professional, accountable and transparent manner;
* The IEC and other key stakeholders' capacities to contribute in professional, transparent and credible electoral processes are strengthened;
* The political party system’s role to contribute to democratic governance and policy-making, in particular through the Parliament, is enhanced;
* The inclusivity of national policy and decision-making processes is enhanced through sustained multi-stakeholder dialogues;

Jordan's reform process towards consolidation of deep democracy is supported by a multi- facetted approach that promotes increased coherence and performance of all democratic institutions by building bridges between elected institutions and citizens.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | FINAL ECES EVALUATION |
| Coverage | Action until 31/08/20 |
| Geographic scope | The Hashemite kingdom of Jordan |
| Period to be evaluated | 25/10/2018 to 31/08/2020 |

**2.1 Purpose of the evaluation**

In view of the general elections in Jordan scheduled for 10 November 2020, ECES and the European Union delegation agreed to carry out this evaluation of the EU-JDID programme as foreseen in the budget of the project - which is under the European Neighborhood Instrument (ENI) - taking into account that the final external evaluation will be contracted and carried out by the EU Delegation at the end of the project which is planned for April 2021.

As a Mid-term evaluation, covering the period going from April 25th 2017 to October 25th 2018, have been carried out, the present evaluation exercise will focus on approximately 22 months of implementation (25 October 2018 – 31 August 2020) of the programme EU-JDID.

Systematic and timely evaluation of Project and activities is an established priority of the European Commission[[4]](#footnote-4). The focus of evaluation is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the results of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on result-oriented approaches[[5]](#footnote-5).

From this perspective, evaluation 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 present evaluation can also build upon a previous Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) mission, as commissioned by the Delegation of the European Union in Jordan, whose report was published in April 2019.

Evaluation should provide an understanding of the cause and effects links between inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluation should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, ECES (representing the consortium), the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:

* An overall independent assessment of the performance of the Project ‘EU Support to Jordanian Democratic Institutions and Development’, paying particular attention to its results measured against its objectives and expected results before elections 2020 are taken place;
* An overall independent assessment of the added values and comparative advantages the implementing methodology “A European Response to Electoral Cycle Approach — EURECS”, in particular with regards to cost effectiveness (funds dedicate to activities compared to human resource/management costs) focusing also on activities that can be implemented to support the ongoing electoral process including looking at the EUEOMs recommendations that have been implemented.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to present lessons learned and best practices that may inform future similar activities and future actions in the field of electoral and democratic development support.

The main users of this evaluation will be ECES representing the EU JDID consortium members, the European Union Delegation to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as well as the partner institutions and relevant stakeholders (eg. The Independent Election Commission, the Ministry of Political and Parliamentary Affairs, the House of Representatives etc.). The evaluation will be seen as a public document and should therefore reach a quality standard that allows for a possible publication of the report.

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluator(s) shall furthermore consider whether the following cross-cutting issues: environmental sustainability, good governance, and human rights as taken into account in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action and its monitoring. In particular, the evaluator(s) will assess gender mainstream throughout the action and synergies between the different components of the EU- JDID Programme.

In addition, increasing expectations from EU Member States to maintain development projects to support the democratic governance sector in the European Neighbourhood countries, with increasing budget constraints, puts a spotlight on the notion of value for money (VFM). Therefore, the EU and its partners of implementation are strongly committed to making aid more effective.

To some extent, the evaluation is expected to provide analysis on whether the monetary investment and other resources in the interventions conducted by ECES represents sensible value for money, in comparison with previous EU- funded projects in support to democratic process in Jordan.

The issue to be studied as formulated below is indicative. Based on them and following initial consultations and documental analysis, the evaluator(s) will propose in the Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed with the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

2.2.2 Issues to be addressed

The issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[[6]](#footnote-6) and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the issues to be addressed will become contractually binding.

The issues to be addressed will include but not limited to the following;

* Relevance of the action -The matching of the needs of national and local partners.
* The materialisation of the expected results and their facilitating and contrasting factors.
* Staff allocation to the Action.
* Internal implementation procedures, capacity and skills, internal mechanisms for coordination.
* Collaboration between the projects, strength and weakness of individual projects and how this contributes or detracts from the achievement of programme goals and objectives.
* Reporting relations and the performance of the management and its ability to monitor, as well as the capacity to adapt to changing conditions.
* The governing mechanisms of the Action.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases: An Inception Phase, a Remote Phase (to substitute for a field phase that cannot be conducted at the moment as per limitations related with the COVID 19 situation), and a Synthesis Phase (consolidation of findings).

2.3.1 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 expert, including the key meetings with the Contracting Authority (ECES). The main content of each deliverable is described after the table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phases of****the Key activities****evaluation** | **Deliverables and meetings** | **Working days** |
| **Inception Phase** | * Initial document/data collection, literature review
* Direct engagement with the leadership and management team of the project & initial interviews (conducted either by skype either through a field visit if it is relevant)
* Definition of methods of analysis
* Background analysis
* Reconstruction of Intervention Logic and description of Theory of Change, incl. objectives, specific features and target beneficiaries
 | * Inception note (5 pages maximum)
* *Remote Meetings with ECES/EU-JDID representatives*
 | 2 days |
| **Remote** **Phase** | * Remote interviews at country level with key stakeholders
* Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques
* Data collection and analysis
 | * Field Note (key findings in bullet points)
* Slide Presentation
* Remote debriefing with ECES/EU-JDID representatives
 | 8 working days |
| **Synthesis phase** |  | * Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)
* Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations
 | * Draft Final Report
* Slide presentation
 | 3 working days |

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying its key issues.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluator(s) from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session via teleconference between the ECES (representing the consortium members), the Project (EU-JDID) and the evaluator(s)s. Half-day presence of experts is required. The meeting has the purpose to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex I).

During this phase, the evaluator(s)s will review the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the area of electoral reform and governance (including past EU-funded projects).

During the inception phase, the expert(s) will reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated. Furthermore, the evaluator(s) will develop a narrative explanation (Theory of Change) of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

The evaluator(s) will finalise the evaluation methodology, the Evaluation Questions, the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, and the planning of the following phases. The evaluation approach will be also summarised in an Evaluation Design Matrix, which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive**, **contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality**.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures defined. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with ECES Executive Director and/or ECES focal point. On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an Inception Report. The evaluation expert will then present the Inception Report to ECES (representing the consortium).

2.3.3 Remote Phase

The Remote Phase would replace the Field Phase that normally occurs at this stage of the evaluation. The constraints that governments’ measures linked to the COVID-19 have imposed on traveling do not allow for a field visit to conduct meetings and interviews. In lieu of field activities, a number of remote meetings and discussions will be conducted.

The Remote phase starts after approval of the Inception report by ECES (representing the consortium). The Remote Phase aims at collecting evidence to the evaluation questions developed during the inception phase. 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 ECES Executive Director or ECES focal point.

In the first days of the remote phase, the evaluator(s) shall hold a briefing meeting with ECES (representing the consortium), the project management (EU-JDID), the Delegation and relevant stakeholders. During this phase, the evaluator(s) shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government include local authorities as relevant authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission, the evaluator(s) 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 this phase, the evaluator(s) shall summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a remote meeting with ECES (representing the consortium). At the end of the Remote Phase, a field note will be provided by the expert with the key findings.

2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

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

The evaluation expert(s) will present in a single Report plus Annexes the findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (see Annex II); a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well.

The evaluation expert(s) will make sure that:

* the assessment is objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence- based, and recommendations realistic.
* When drafting the report, he/she will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluator(s) will deliver and then present the Draft Final Report to ECES (representing the consortium) to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

ECES focal point consolidates the comments expressed by ECES (representing the consortium / and in liaison with the EUD and the main beneficiaries of the activities and sends them to the evaluator(s) 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 evaluator(s) to verify if further improvements are required.

The evaluator(s) will then finalise the Final Report and prepare the Executive Summary by addressing the relevant comments. 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 evaluator(s) should explain the reasons in writing.

**2.4 Management of the evaluation**

2.4.1 At ECES level

The evaluation is managed by ECES in representation of the consortium in close collaboration with the EU-JDID partners and EU-JDID Monitoring and Evaluation team. ECES and EU-JDID Monitoring and Evaluation team, in collaboration with the EU Delegation, is expected to oversee the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs and the deliverables of the evaluation. In particular, it shall:

* Facilitate contacts between the evaluator(s), the EU services and external stakeholders.
* Ensure that the evaluator(s) has/have access to and has/have consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
* Define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
* Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluator(s) work throughout the assignment.
* Validate the agreed deliverables in consultation and agreement with the EU Delegation.

### **2.4.2.** **At the EU level**

The evaluation is managed by the Programme Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by a reference group made up of the Delegation, the implementing partners and National Authorising Officer.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

* To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
* 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 Action.
* 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 on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
* To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

1. EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY

3.2 **Expertise required**

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

|  Category of experts | Minimum number of evaluators | Total minimum number of working days (total)  | (Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expert 1 | 1 | 13 | 0 |
| Expert 2 | 1 | 13 | 0 |

The expert possesses a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 10 working days.

Minimum requirements of the experts:

Key Expert 1 and 2, Category I, Total 13 man/days each expert

* University degree: Advanced university degree in law, political science, international development or related field
* Professional experience in the field of elections and/or good governance, evaluation and capacity development. The expert shall have at least 12 years of proven experience in electoral assistance and/or participatory decision-making at different levels of responsibility;
* Specific experience in the field of evaluation: at least 4 previous experience in conducting evaluation of electoral assistance projects.
* Language skills: Excellent command of both written and spoken English.

Previous relevant experience in Jordan or the region.

Other skills:

* Experience in the identification, formulation, implementation of programmes funded by international donors in the region is an asset;
* Experience in working on electoral assistance or good governance (participatory decision-making processes) issues in the region;
* Experience in EU policies and procedures for internal and external actions will be considered as a strong asset;
* Experience in UN and/or OECD-DAC development agency in the region will be considered an asset.

3.3 **Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing**

The presence/availability of member(s) of the ECES representatives and EU-JDID PMU is required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

3.5 **Specific Organisation and Methodology**

Upon the approval by ECES and EU Delegation, the identified expert is expected to provide the following:

* Comments on the terms of reference for the successful execution of the assignment as well as regarding the indicative evaluation questions.
* An outline of the approach and methodology proposed to conduct the assignment.
* Comments on the timing, sequence and duration of the proposed tasks.
* Identification, if relevant, of risks and assumptions that may affect the execution of the assignment.

**LOCATION AND DURATION**

**4.1 Starting and End period**

Provisional start and end of the assignment: 1st September till the 30 of September for the final report approved and submitted to the EU Delegation

Maximum duration of the assignment: 13 working days per expert (including time for finalising the final report). It is assumed that the consultants will work on the basis of a five-day week.

**4.2** **Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days**

Maximum duration of the assignment: 30 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

**4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff[[7]](#footnote-7)**

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV. 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 (to be referenced as ‘0’).

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

**4.4** **Location(s) of assignment**

The assignment will entail home-base work and remote interviews given the current travel limitations linked to COVID-19 crisis.

**REPORTING**

5.1 Content, timing and submission

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 area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Pages *(excluding* annexes)** | **Main Content** | **Timing for****submission** |
| **Inception****Report** | 5 pages maximum (the Evaluation Design Matrix is presented in Annex 1) | * Intervention logic incl. a reconstruction of the intervention logic and spelling out the theory of change
* Methodology for the evaluation
* Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators
* Evaluation Matrix
* Data analysis and collection methods
* Work plan
* Stakeholder map
* Analysis of risks and of mitigating measures
* Workplan
 | End of Inception Phase |
| **Draft Final** | 20/25 pages | * Executive Summary
* Introduction
* Answered questions / Findings
* Overall assessment *(optional)*
* Conclusions and Recommendations
* Annexes to the report

Short, no more than 3/5 pages. It should focus on the key purposes or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.* Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted
 | End of |
| **Report** | maximum | Synthesis |
|  | (plus | Phase |
|  | annexes) |  |
| Executive Summary | 3/5 pages | 1 week after having received comments to the Draft Final report |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Final report | 25/30 pages maximum (plus annexes | 1 week after having delivered comments to the Draft Final report |

## **Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators**

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

## **Comments**

For each report, ECES, representing the consortium, and the EU Delegation focal points will submit comments within 5 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the ECES shall be submitted within 5 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluator(s) should provide a separate document (a comments sheet) explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

##

## **Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary**

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

## **Language**

All reports shall be submitted in English.

## **Number of copies**

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in 4 paper copies and in electronic version in PDF and MS WORD format.

## **Formatting of reports**

All reports will be produced using Font Arial minimum 11, single spacing. The draft report will use consecutive numbers for the paragraphs for easier commenting. These will be removed in the final draft of the report.

Annexes

# Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

**SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price[[8]](#footnote-8).

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum** |
| ***Total score for Organisation and Methodology*** | ***40*** |
| * 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
 | **15** |
| * Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium
 | **5** |
| * Organisation of tasks including timetable
 | **10** |
| ***Score for the expertise of the proposed team***  | ***60*** |
| ***Overall total score*** | ***100*** |

1. **Technical threshold**

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

# Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

* Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action(s) to be evaluated
* Country Strategy Paper Jordan and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
* Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
* Action identification studies
* Action feasibility / formulation studies
* Action financing agreement and addenda
* Action’s quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
* Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
* [Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/guidance-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimension_en)
* Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action(s)
* Mid Term and ROM reports and external system audit
* Any other relevant document

***Note***: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

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

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module** - **two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

‘’*This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by the European Centre for Electoral Support. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission*’’.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** | A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. 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. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Introduction** | A description of the Action, 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 answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning. |
| **3. Overall assessment *(optional)*** | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. 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** |  |
|  | **4.3 Lessons learnt** | Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.  |
|  | **4.1 Conclusions** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.  |
|  | **4.2 Recommendations** | They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle. Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and 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 (CVs can 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 Action 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

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

|  |  | **Indicative Duration in working days[[9]](#footnote-9)** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Location** | **Team Leader** | **Evaluator …** | **Indicative Dates** |
| **Inception phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Desk phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Field phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (maximum)** |  |  |  |

# Annex V: Quality Assessment Grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

|  |
| --- |
| **Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation data** |
| **Evaluation title** |  |
| **Evaluation managed by** |  | **Type of evaluation** |  |
| **CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract** |  | **EVAL ref.** |  |
| **Evaluation budget** |  |
| **EUD/Unit in charge** |  | **Evaluation Manager** |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | **Start:** |  | **End:** |  |
| **Date of draft final report** |  | **Date of Response of the Services** |  |
| **Comments** |  |
| **Project data** |
| **Main project evaluated** |  |
| **CRIS # of evaluated project(s)** |  |
| **DAC Sector** |  |
| **Contractor's details** |
| **Evaluation Team Leader** |  | **Evaluation Contractor** |  |
| **Evaluation expert(s)** |  |

**Legend: scores and their meaning**

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

|  |
| --- |
| **The evaluation report is assessed as follows**  |
| 1. **Clarity of the report**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:* Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
* Highlight the key messages
* The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
* Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
* Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
* Avoid unnecessary duplications
* Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
* The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Reliability of data and robustness of evidence**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which: * Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
* The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners’ relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
* The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Validity of Findings**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which: * Findings derive from the evidence gathered
* Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
* Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
* When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
* The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Validity of conclusions**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which:* Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
* Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
* Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
* Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
* (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Usefulness of recommendations**
 |
| This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:* Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
* Are concrete, achievable and realistic
* Are targeted to specific addressees
* Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
* (If relevant) provide advice for the Action’s exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action’s design or plans
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis *(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)***
 |
| **This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:*** Lessons are identified
* When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)
 |  |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Contractor's comments** | **Contractor's comments** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Final comments on the overall quality of the report** | **Overall score** |

# Annex VI: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated action(s)

[Please include here the Logframe(s) of the Actions to be evaluated]

Annex VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of the DAC evaluation criteria has changed following the release (10 December 2019) of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” (DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL).

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis will respect the new definitions of these criteria and their explanatory notes. Reference and guidance documents are being developed and can be found here: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in the chapter 2.2.1, the evaluation will assess the Action using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their definitions are reported below:

**DAC CRITERIA**

* + **Relevance**: the “extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”
	+ **Coherence**: the “compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”
	+ **Effectiveness**: the “extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”
	+ **Efficiency**: the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”
	+ **Impact**: the “extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.”
	+ **Sustainability**: the “extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.”

**EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION**

* + **EU added value**: the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).
1. EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy 2015-2019, Single Support Framework (SFF) for EU support to Jordan 2014-2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. EURECS is an innovative delivery mechanism for electoral and democracy assistance, conceived following the experience of the 13 members from 11 countries from the EPD. Consistent with European values and EU policies, EURECS adopts an inclusive approach towards a wide range of electoral stakeholders in order to ensure comprehensive and sustainable actions, and is built to help prevent, mitigate and manage electoral related conflicts, in line with international standards and obligations. <http://www.eces.eu/en/posts/eurecs> ; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V40gaByHnPI&t=5s> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. NIMD (Mapping of PP conducted by the Identity Center for Human Development – 2013, Desk analysis of the political developments - 2016), CFI (Support to Journalism Education in Jordan -2016, Ebticar project in Jordan: development and consolidation of online media 2013-2016; 4M “Transition to online for Arabic-language newspapers” ; 4M Mashreq in Jordan- Improving the viability, pluralism and quality of 10 online media 2013-2014) and WfD (Establishment of HoR Research Centre, Support to the women’s caucus of parliamentarians; youth leadership programme and Parliament’s first ever induction programme 2012-2015; Consolidation of the HoR Research Centre, support women MP and Parliament’s consultative mechanisms 2015-2018) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation - improving evaluation" - [http://sc.eurooa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com 2013 686 en.pdf](http://sc.eurooa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com%202013%20686%20en.pdf) ; 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

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 ; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", [httP://ec.euroPa.eu/smart- reQulation/su.idelines/docs/swd br guidelines en.pdf](http://ec.euroPa.eu/smart-%20reQulation/su.idelines/docs/swd%20br%20guidelines%20en.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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/financiaI\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\_cir.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-%20enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financiaI_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf)

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> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - <https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Add one column per each evaluator [↑](#footnote-ref-9)