



European Union



# TERMS OF REFERENCE For MID-TERM EVALUATION

## EU Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria (EU-SDGN) Project – Component 1



European Union Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria  
Component 1 : Support to INEC



This programme is funded by the European Union

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Mid-term Evaluation of ‘EU Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria (EU-SDGN) project – component 1

**Contracting Authority: European Centre for Electoral Support**

<b>1. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND .....	3
1.2 PROGRAMME TO BE EVALUATED.....	4
1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION .....	4
1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION.....	5
<b>2 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION .....	6
2.2 REQUESTED SERVICES .....	7
2.3 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES.....	8
2.4 MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION.....	11
2.5 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT .....	11
2.6 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT .....	11
<b>3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 NUMBER OF REQUESTED EXPERTS PER CATEGORY AND NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS PER EXPERT OR PER CATEGORY.....	11
3.2 EXPERTISE REQUIRED .....	11
3.3 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING.....	12
<b>4 LOCATION AND DURATION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 STARTING AND END PERIOD .....	12
4.2 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT .....	12
<b>5 REPORTING .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION .....	12
5.2 COMMENTS .....	13
5.3 LANGUAGE .....	13
5.4 NUMBER OF COPIES .....	14
5.5 FORMATTING OF REPORTS .....	14
<b>ANNEX I: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATOR.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ANNEX II: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

The EU has consistently in its 10th and 11th EDF National Indicative Programmes put the consolidation of democracy in Nigeria through credible elections as a key element of the respective good governance sector of intervention.

Nigeria over the years has experienced remarkable advancement in electoral governance and citizens' participation through to the 2015 General Elections. In line with the 2015 European Union Election Observation Mission (EU EOM)<sup>1</sup> recommendations, the European Union with the 11th European Development Fund (EDF) has renewed its commitment to complement the efforts of the Government of Nigeria to improve and strengthen democracy with the objectives foreseen in the EU Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria (EU-SDGN) project over 2016 – 2020 period. The EU Funded Programme "Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria" (EU-SDGN) in the amount of 26.5 million euro is anchored in the priorities of the Nigerian government<sup>2</sup> and the 2015 European Union Election Observation Mission (EU EOM)<sup>3</sup>.

The EU-SDGN programme encompasses five components, which are intrinsically linked to promote the credibility of the electoral process and to strengthen the democracy in Nigeria. The EU-SDGN component is as follows:

- Component 1: National Electoral Commission support is implemented by the European Centre for Electoral Support (ECES);
- Component 2: The National Assembly support is implemented by the Policy and Legal Advocacy Centre (PLAC) and the Youth Initiative for Advocacy, Growth and Advancement (YIAGA Africa);
- Component 3: The Political Party Leadership and Policy Development Centre of the National Institute implement the Political Parties support for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS);
- Component 4: The Media, including radio and social media, provides fair, accurate and ethical coverage of the electoral process; the Media support is implemented by the Institute for Media and Society and the International Press Centre (IPC);
- Component 5: Support to Civil Society Organisations implemented by The Albino Foundation, BBC Media Action, Centre for Citizens with Disabilities, CLEEN Foundation, Nigerian Women Trust Fund and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy.

The European Centre for Electoral Support (ECES) via a grant contract with the EU, is supporting the implementation of component 1 of the programme through technical assistance to the INEC and other electoral management bodies (SIECs, FOSIECON). Other components implemented by other implementing partners seeks to support the advancement of issues related to the National Assembly, Political Parties, Media, and Civil Society organisations (CSOs) implemented by other

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/nigeria/docs/eu-eom-nigeria-2015-final-report\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/nigeria/docs/eu-eom-nigeria-2015-final-report_en.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The Financing Agreement for this programme was signed on 5 June 2017 by the Ministry of Budget and National Planning of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the European Union for a total amount of 26.5 million euro.

<sup>3</sup> [http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/nigeria/docs/eu-eom-nigeria-2015-final-report\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/nigeria/docs/eu-eom-nigeria-2015-final-report_en.pdf)

partners. Furthermore, there is coordination and collaboration towards implementation of activities as seen in terms of coherence and complementarity with ECES' support and activities.

## 1.2 Programme to be evaluated<sup>4</sup>

<b>Title of the Programme to be evaluated</b>	EU Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria (EU-SDGN) project – component 1
<b>Location</b>	Federal Republic of Nigeria
<b>Budget to be evaluated</b>	13.000.000 EUR + 5% Co-contribution from ECES
<b>CRIS numbers of the Actions to be evaluated</b>	European Centre for Electoral Support (ECES) - BE-2010-CEW-1511707062
<b>Dates of the Action to be evaluated</b>	2017- 2019 at present

The EU is providing 13 million EUR to ECES with an additional contribution of 5% of the total amount from ECES over a 5-year period (2017 - 2022).

In line with the electoral cycle approach, the (EU-SDGN) project – component 1 covers pre-election, election and post-election activities. The main Key results (KR) are set as outlined below:

- 1.1 INEC's strategic planning, policy framework and operational capacity and systems strengthened;
- 1.2 INEC's capacity for efficient internal communication and engagement mechanisms with stakeholders enhanced;
- 1.3 INEC's periodic voter registration system for a largely clean register of voters significantly improved;
- 1.4 INEC's oversight of political parties strengthened;
- 1.5 INEC's and political parties' capacities in Electoral Alternate Dispute Resolution are fostered;
- 1.6 FOSIECON institutional capacity and collaboration with stakeholders enhanced;

In 2019, a Rider 1 to the EU-SDGN – component 1 was granted to adjust the initial allocation to further support the above expected results described.

It is understood that ***the focus of this mid-term evaluation is on EU-SDGN – component 1's performance where*** the beneficiaries and the EUD expect the most from its findings and lessons learned for adjusting the component 1 at the mid-term period to ensure maximum effectiveness of the action.

## 1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

The main beneficiaries of the project are the members and staff of the INEC, the Forum of States Independent Electoral Commission of Nigeria (FOSIECON), and State Independent Electoral Commissions (SIECs) of the 36 constituent states. The final beneficiaries will be Nigerian citizens in general, with a special emphasis on women, youth and marginalized groups such as PWD and IDPs.

<sup>4</sup> The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.



## 1.4 Other available information

ECES is a not for profit private foundation headquartered in Brussels with a global remit. ECES promotes sustainable democratic development through the provision of advisory services, operational support and management of large projects in the electoral and democracy assistance field. ECES works with **all electoral stakeholders**, including *"electoral management bodies, civil society organizations involved in voter education and election observation, political parties, parliaments, media, security forces, religious groups and legal institutions confronted with electoral disputes resolution"*.

ECES has crafted and copyrighted its strategy called "A European Response to Electoral Cycle Support - EURECS". This is an innovative and alternative delivery mechanism to implement electoral and democracy assistance activities that are consistent with European values and EU policies and targets the implementations of the recommendations of EU election observation missions and it is built to help prevent, mitigate and manage electoral related conflicts. EURECS is implemented via specific methodologies and tools developed and also copyrighted by ECES such as its Standard Operation Procedures, the Communication & Visibility Guidelines, the Electoral Political Economy Analyses, the project approach to contribute Preventing Electoral Conflicts and the cascade training curriculum called "Leadership and Conflict Management Skills for Electoral Stakeholders, LEAD".

ECES developed a partnership with the Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies of Pisa to promote customised, accessible and innovative capacity building programmes for all electoral stakeholders, including the Master on Electoral Policy and Administration – MEPA.

ECES is also part of a consortium led by the College of Europe to implement the ERMES project (European Response on Mediation Support) to provide a tool for the EU to advance its objectives and role in the field of mediation and dialogue. The project will be implemented under the supervision of the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments of the European Commission and in close consultation with the Mediation Support Team of the European External Action Services which will ensure the political steer. The ERMES project office is within ECES headquarters' premises in Brussels.

ECES is a member of the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD) and is part of its Board of Directors. EPD is the most important network of European civil and political society organisations working on democracy assistance. It comprises fourteen European foundations and civil society organisations from eleven EU Member States working and present in Africa, Asia, East Europe, the Middle East and Latin America.

Since February 2010, ECES has signed **over 70 contracts** in support of transparent, credible and cost-effective electoral processes and the strengthening of democratic institutions **in more than 40 countries mainly, but not only, in Africa and Middle East. The EU is by far the largest ECES' donor**, however the organization has also signed contracts and partnered with many other organizations.

In 2017, the Delegation of the European Union (EU) to Nigeria via a direct negotiation, awarded ECES the contract for the implementation of the project "EU Support to Democratic Governance in Nigeria (EU-SDGN) – Component 1. This action is implemented in partnership with the INEC.

ECES has developed an internal **Monitoring and Knowledge-sharing Strategy (MKS)** tailored to the Nigerian context with particular focus on INEC 's needs (component 1 of the EU-SDGN).

Relevant documents under annex II are available and will be shared with the Evaluators. Besides, documents pertaining to instruments for monitoring and evaluation under this project will be made available, for example Project Steering Committee Minutes, Mission Reports, etc.

## 2 Description of the action

Type of evaluation	Mid-term evaluation
Coverage	EU-SDGN- Component 1
Geographic scope	Nigeria
Period to be evaluated	a) Mid-term evaluation – (7 June 2017 – 29 February 2020)

### 2.1 Objectives of the Mid-term Evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority of the European Commission.

The focus of evaluations 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 and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.

From this perspective, the mid-term 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 evaluation should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. The evaluation should serve accountability, decision-making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this mid-term evaluation are to provide ECES, the relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with:

- An overall independent assessment of the past performance of the EU-SDGN Component 1, paying particular attention to 'intermediate' and 'final' results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- Key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future ECES activities.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to present lessons learned and best practices that may inform on-going activities and future Actions in the field of operations.

## 2.2 Requested services

### 2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the **five standard DAC evaluation criteria**, namely: relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, potential sustainability and impact. In addition, the evaluation will be based on two ECES specific evaluation criteria:

- the ECES added value (the extent to which the Action adds benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- The coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Nigeria and with other EU policies and Member State Actions, and the other most involved donors such as USAID, UNDP.

The evaluator shall furthermore consider whether the following cross-cutting issues: environmental sustainability, good governance, and human rights were 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 will assess gender mainstream throughout the action and synergies between the different components of the EU-SDGN 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 Nigeria.

The *Issue to be studied* as formulated below is indicative. Based on them and following initial consultations and documental analysis, the evaluator will 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.

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

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether the following cross-cutting issues as the promotion of human rights, gender equality, democracy, good governance were taken into account in the formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action and its monitoring.

### 2.2.2 Indicative Issues to be studied

The Issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluator will discuss with the ECES Evaluation Manager 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 Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding. The issues to be studied are as follows :

- The extent to which the project responded to the electoral needs ;
- The performance of the project arrangements, along the institutional response of the beneficiaries in the delivery of the project's objectives ;
- The materialisation of the expected results at national and local level, along its enabling and hindering factors ;
- The impact of the ECES support to date with particular focus on the 2019 general elections ;
- The lessons learned from the electoral cycles support, **and its recommendations for adjusting EU-SDGN component 1 actions.**

## 2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases: an Inception Phase, a Field Phase, and a Synthesis Phase (consolidation of findings). 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 outputs of each phase are:

### 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).

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Deliverables and meetings	Working days
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial document/data collection, literature review</li> <li>• Direct engagement with the leadership and management team of the project &amp; initial interviews (conducted either by Skype either through a field visit if it is relevant)</li> <li>• Definition of methods of analysis</li> <li>• Background analysis</li> <li>• Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)</li> <li>• Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Kick-off meeting with the ECES and the Reference Group in Abuja (EUD, INEC - (FOSIECON), and (SIECs) representatives</i></li> <li>• <i>Inception note ( 7 pages maximum ) Meeting with ECES/EUD Nigeria representatives</i></li> </ul>	6 days



Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Deliverables and meetings	Working days
<b><u>Field Phase</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings at country level with key stakeholders and skype interviews</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>Field Note (key findings in bullet points)</li> <li>Slide Presentation</li> <li><i>Debriefing with ECES/EUD Nigeria representatives</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 days</li> </ul>
<b><u>Synthesis phase</u></b>	<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</li> <li>Slide presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 days</li> </ul>

### 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 evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in Nigeria with the ECES team, the Reference Group and the evaluator. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex I).

During this phase, the evaluator will review the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of ECES support to the EU- SDGN component 1 project in the area of electoral reform and governance (including past EU-funded projects).

During the inception phase, the experts will analyse the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated. Furthermore, the evaluators 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 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. He/she will also summarise his/her approach in an Evaluation Design Matrix, which will be included in the Inception Report.

The methodological approach will be represented 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 the project has 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 evaluator should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in Chapter 0.

The evaluation expert will then present the **Inception Report** to ECES.

### 2.3.3 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception report by ECES.

The Field 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 field phase, the evaluator shall hold a briefing meeting with ECES, the project management, the EU Delegation and relevant stakeholders.

During the field phase, the evaluator shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; Throughout the mission the evaluator 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 evaluator shall summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with ECES Executive Director or focal point and the Reference Group.

At the end of the Field Phase a **Slide Presentation** 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 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 will present in a single Report which includes Annexes, his/her 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 will make sure that:

- His/ her 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 will deliver and then present the **Draft Final Report** to ECES to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

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

The evaluator 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 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 close collaboration with the EUD and the beneficiary INEC.

In collaboration with the EU Delegation, ECES 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, the EU services and external stakeholders.
- Ensure that the evaluator has access to and has 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 work throughout the assignment.
- Validate the agreed deliverables in consultation and agreement with the EU Delegation.

## 2.5 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

## 2.6 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

## 3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY

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

### 3.2 Expertise required

2 key CAT I experts are expected to conduct the evaluation. The minimum requirements of the expert for this contract are as follows.

#### Minimum requirements of the experts:

##### *Key Expert 1, Category I, Total 20 man/days)*

- **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 EU

funded electoral assistance projects and/or participatory decision-making at different levels of responsibility in the context of EU funded project in support of elections;

- **Specific experience in the field of evaluation of projects preferably in Africa and within EU funding:**
- Excellent command of both written and spoken English.

**Other skills:**

- Experience in the identification, formulation, implementation of programmes funded by international donors especially the EU, in the region is an asset;
- Experience in working on electoral assistance or good governance (participatory decision-making processes) issues in the region, especially with the EU funding;
- 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 of member(s) of the ECES representatives, INEC and EUD is required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

## **4 LOCATION AND DURATION**

### **4.1 Starting and End period**

Provisional start and end of the assignment: 10<sup>th</sup> March – 10<sup>th</sup> April 2020.

Maximum duration of the assignment: 6 working days for the inception phase, 8 working days on the field for each expert and 8 days writing the report (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 Location(s) of assignment**

The assignment will entail home-base work and visits at ECES HQ in Brussels and the field office in Abuja, Nigeria.

## **5 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 evaluator will submit the following reports:



	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
<b>Inception Report</b>	7 pages maximum (the Evaluation Design Matrix is presented in Annex 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intervention logic incl. a reconstruction of the intervention logic and spelling out the theory of change</li> <li>Methodology for the evaluation</li> <li>Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators</li> <li>Evaluation Matrix</li> <li>Data analysis and collection methods</li> <li>Work plan</li> <li>Stakeholder map</li> <li>Analysis of risks and of mitigating measures</li> </ul>	End of Inception Phase
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	20/25 pages maximum (plus annexes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executive Summary</li> <li>Introduction</li> <li>Answered questions / Findings</li> <li>Overall assessment (<i>optional</i>)</li> <li>Conclusions and Recommendations</li> <li>Annexes to the report</li> </ul>	End of Synthesis Phase
<b>Executive Summary</b>	2/3 pages	Short, no more than 3/4 pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.	1 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
<b>Final report</b>	25/30 pages maximum (plus annexes)	<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>	3 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.

## 5.2 Comments

For each report, ECES, and the EU Delegation focal points will submit comments within 7 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the ECES shall be submitted within 7 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluator 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.

## 5.3 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

#### 5.4 Number of copies

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

#### 5.5 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: Information that will be provided to the evaluator

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper Nigeria 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 narrative reports, and technical reports
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors
- Relevant documentation about past EU-funded projects in support to democratic reform processes in Nigeria
- Action' social media and websites
- Minutes of EU-SDGN Project Technical Committee meeting and minutes of ECES staff meetings
- Any other relevant document

**Note:** The evaluators have 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 II: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

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

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.

### Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than two to three 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 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 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 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

### 4.1 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.

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 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, 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 name/s of the evaluator (CV/s should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page);
- 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.