EUROPEAN UNION
DELEGATION TO
THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL PROGRAMME EVALUATION

SUPPORT TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND GOOD GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME (HRGGP)

Region:	East Africa
Beneficiary Country:	Uganda
Sector:	Capacity Building for Good Governance
Project number:	FED/2005/17801

TABLE OF CONTENT

Background

The 9th National Indicative Programme signed by the Government of Uganda and the European Commission reflected the European Commission's willingness to support the Human Rights and Good Governance sector in the Uganda. Within the framework of this Indicative Programme, 7,000,000 € were allocated for support to this effect.

1.1 Relevant country background

The Republic of Uganda has a very diverse society with a multiplicity of divisions, based in particular on ethnicity, region and religion. Following independence in 1962, Uganda had long periods of violence and political instability. However, since 1986, the country has experienced a relative calm under the government of President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni.

The government of Uganda (GoU) has over the past 20 years embarked on a reform programme of its governance institutions which has seen the creation of new institutions and modalities such as the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) and the Justice, Law and Order Sector (JLOS). In addition to creating new governance institutions, Government of Uganda (GoU) has strengthened the existing agencies such as the Uganda Police Force and Prison Services and put in place policy and legal frameworks to implement the various reforms. Following a referendum in 2005 that marked the return to multi-party democracy in Uganda, the first multi-party parliament since 1971 was inaugurated in 2006.

Before the endorsement of the **National Development Plan (NDP)** in April 2010**,** Uganda's vision for the reduction of poverty was articulated in the **Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP)**. The five pillars of the PEAP were (1) economic management, (2) production, competitiveness and incomes (3) security, conflict-resolution and disaster-management (4) good governance and (5) human development. The Human Right and Good Governance Programme (HRGGP) was aligned to the fourth pillar.

The NDP envisions the transformation of Uganda society from a peasant to a modern and prosperous country within 30 years. To this end, it identifies eight strategic objectives: (1) Increasing household income and promoting equality, (2) Enhancing the availability and quality of gainful employment, (3) Improving stock and quality of economic infrastructure, (4) Increasing access to quality social service, (5) Promoting science and technology, (6) Enhancing human capital development, (7) Strengthening good governance, defence and security and (8) Promoting sustainable population and use of natural resources. While recognising democracy and observance of the rule of law as a major pillar of a modern society, NDP reiterates the need for Uganda to consolidate and enhance the democracy so far attained to provide a solid foundation for transformation.

Although the Government of Uganda has also created an enabling environment and space for Civil Society Organisations to operate hence the growth of the sector, the Non-Governmental Organisations Act, 2008 threatens the operation of these organisations. A consortium of CSOs has petitioned the constitutional court demanding that it declares the NGO (amendment) Act of 2008 unconstitutional. It is imperative that the ramifications of the new law are examined.

However, with the insurgency in Northern Uganda (Lord's Resistance Army) not conclusively resolved, and sporadic insecurity in the North East (cattle rustling), as well as the delicate political transition process recently undergone in the country, the coming years poses a number of crucial challenges for Uganda as it attempts to foster good governance and democracy for all of its citizens.

1.2 Human Rights and Good Governance Program

The 9th European Development Fund (EDF) Support to the Human Rights and Good Governance Programme (HRGGP) commenced on 11th December 2007 and will run until 10th December 2010. Ramboll Management Consulting A/S was selected as the third party service provider under an externalised direct labour operation contract, and provided a Programme Manager and a Finance Manager. A Programme Management Unit (PMU) was set up under their leadership. The PMU have operated through 4 Programme Estimates (PEs) and the last estimate ends 19th October 2010. The stated overall objective of the programme is, "*contribution to sustainable development centred on human security and good governance; to respect, protect and fulfil the full spectrum of human rights, and the strengthened rule of law in Uganda as well as to increased participation of Ugandan citizens in decision-making*".

The following results are expected of the HRGGP:

I. Strengthened national framework for political governance;
II. Strengthened rule of law and protection of vulnerable populations through capacity building in the police and in prisons and through measures against gender based violence and child abuse;
III. Strengthened parliamentary governance and democratic accountability through increased capacity of the parliament, effective monitoring of the democratic process by civil society and media, as well as support to domestic election observers;
IV. Improved access to justice and legal awareness of the Ugandan citizen through civic education and legal aid.

The purpose of the program was to improve the capacity of Ugandan institutions to ensure the respect of human rights, the rule of law and access to Justice as well as increase awareness of the Ugandan citizens about human rights and democratic participation.
The support under the Human Rights and Good Governance Program (HRGGP) was targeted through 6 government agencies and 7 grantees (civil society organisations). The government agencies supported include, (1) the Uganda Police Force (UPF), (2) Uganda Prisons Service (UPS), (3) National Community Service Program (NCSP), (4) Parliament of Uganda (5) Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) and (6) the Electoral Commission (EC).

The grantees were selected through a procurement process for grants in the areas of parliamentary monitoring, monitoring of the democratic process by the media, legal aid and gender based violence/children's rights.

The grantees who was awarded contracts and implemented projects in the above areas include*d* (1) Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Development Countries (HIVOS), an NGO based *i*n the Netherlands partnering with Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI) a local NGO, (2) Avocats Sans Frontières, an NGO based in Belgium partnering with the Uganda Association of Women Lawyers (FIDA-Uganda), (3) Kindernothilfe E.V, an NGO based in Germany partnering with African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN - Uganda Chapter), (4) Regional Centre for Quality of Health Care (RCQHC), an institution under Makerere University, (5) Oxfam Novib, an NGO based in the Netherlands partnering with Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations (DENIVA) a local NGO, (6) BBC World Service Trust, a registered Charity in England and Wales and (7) Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR), an NGO based in United Kingdom partnering with Uganda Radio Network a local NGO. However, the activities of IWPR and partner were not implemented.

1.3 Current state of affairs in the relevant sector

UPF, UPS, NCSP and UHRC which were supported under this programme are part of the JLOS. JLOS brings together 10 institutions that are supported under the sector wide approach (SWAp). JLOS has in place a ***Strategic Investment Plan*** (SIP II) which sets out the key result areas and priorities for the sector. In addition each of these institutions has developed their respective institutional plans. Support from the HRGGP was therefore aligned to the objectives and activities outlined in both the SIP II and the institutional plans of the agencies. UHRC has recently joined JLOS. At present UHRC has in place a ***corporate plan 2004-2009.*** UHRC intends to develop a new corporate plan that will be aligned to JLOS SIP II.

All public institutions in Uganda operate under the ***Medium Term Expenditure Framework*** (MTEF) which establishes resource ceilings for each sector JLOS inclusive. The MTEF is intended to provide an ex ante framework to align aggregate resources with program priorities. In principle once the ceilings for a particular financial year are established any additional donor funds received by JLOS will lead to corresponding cut. In short there should be no additional funds to the sector save for supplementary allocations that may be requested. HRGGP endeavoured to liaise with JLOS to ensure that the funding provided to the agencies was reflected in the JLOS MTEF. However some agencies like the NCSP suffered budget cuts due to the support received from HRGGP.

Parliament of Uganda has developed a ***Parliament Strategic Investment and Development Plan (PSIDP).*** The PSIDP outlines the key activities that parliament intends to carry out. The HRGGP support was linked to the PSIDP. The Electoral Commission (EC) of Uganda was also supported under the HRGGP. The EC has a strategic plan that guides its activities and the HRGGP support took full cognizance of this.

Additionally, HRGGP support was pegged to the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The PEAP expired in June 2008 but was extended to June 2009. As earlier noted, PEAP has now been replaced by the National Development Plan.

The HRGGP participated in a number of donor harmonization initiatives in line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. When the HRGGP provided support to legal aid provision by civil society organisations the programme made sure that this intervention did not overlap with the support provided under the Legal Aid Basket Fund, which (as of 1st January 2009) received contribution from Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Netherlands and Sweden.

Furthermore, when the programme supported the media it made sure that its intervention was not a duplication of the support provided to the media by other the development partners via the Partners for Democracy and Governance's (PDG's) and the Deepening Democracy Programme (DDP).

1.4 Related programme and other donor activities

Uganda has over the last 20-25 years been a recipient of development assistance that *inter alia* has been targeted at supporting reforms of key governance, Justice, Law and Order, human rights and accountability institutions. This support has been and continues to be channelled to state and non-state actors. In planning the HRGGP intervention GoU and European Union Delegation to the Republic of Uganda was aware that several other development partners already supported these institutions and that there was a need to ensure coherence of support. HRGGP therefore took this into account when rolling out its activities.

HRGGP did acknowledge that donor coordination was universally seen as critical in the governance area in Uganda, necessary as it was for a coherent approach, the sharing of information, monitoring of developments, and a common understanding and interpretation of processes that was taking place. To this end HRGGP was an active participant in a number of development partner coordination groups such as, the Partners for Democracy and Governance (PDG) and development partner groups on Democratisation and Human Rights. In addition HRGGP was a member of the JLOS development partner group. These groups carry out monthly and bi annual governance assessments to which HRGGP provided input. Participation in these groups ensured that the PMU kept abreast with what others was supporting and thereby promoted better coherence and coordination.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

A Mid Term Review (MTR) of the HRGGP was planned for to assess the progress made, to identify constraints faced by the programme and to make recommendations for the implementation of the remaining programme period and, if deemed necessary, make suggestions regarding the re-orientation, re-organisation and duration of the programme. However, the MTR was not undertaken hence the need for a more comprehensive final programme evaluation.

The final evaluation, which has been foreseen in the Technical and Administrative Provisions of the project's Financing Agreement, will provide the decision-makers in the Government of Uganda, the relevant external co-operation services of the European Commission and the stakeholders with sufficient information to:

a. make an overall independent assessment of the performance of the programme/ projects, paying particularly attention to the impact of the programme/project actions against its objectives;
b. Identify key lessons and to propose practical recommendations for follow-up actions especially pertinent for the 10th EDF Democratic Governance and Accountability Programme.

The specific objectives of the assignment include:

§ The assessment of the performance of the programme, its effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, its impact and sustainability and extent to which the programme objectives were achieved;
§ Assessment of the grant and institutional support to measure the extent of achievement of specific objectives;
§ Analysis of programme design, reporting modalities, management and coordination; and documentation of lessons learned and best practices to improve future programme implementation;
§ Formulation of key recommendations (design, modalities etc) pertinent for future interventions under the 10th EDF Democratic Governance and Accountability programme;
§ Assessment of main strengths, weaknesses and any constraints to the implementation process and suggest appropriate recommendations. In addition, explore opportunity for effective synergy of interventions of the various partners and implementing agencies and make proposals on modalities for harmonised joint donor funding to the sector and JLOS support;
§ Assessment of the extent to which the programme has contributed to an increased dialogue and engagement between citizens, civil society organisations and government institutions at national and local level and decision-making;
§ Appraisal of the appropriateness of the logical framework.

ISSUES TO BE STUDIED

The evaluation study responds to the requirements of the last phase of the project cycle. The consultants shall verify, analyse and assess in detail the issues outlined in Annexe 2 "Layout, structure of the Final Report". The list of issues is not intended to be exhaustive. The issues refer to the five evaluation criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact), and to the EC-specific evaluation criteria (European Commission added value and coherence).

The consultants are requested to verify, analyse and assess the integration and impact of cross cutting issues (such as environmental sustainability and gender) in the project. The consultants are required to use their professional judgement and experience to review all relevant factors and to bring these to the attention of the Government and European Commission.

METHODOLOGY

For methodological guidance refer to the EuropeAid's Evaluation methodology website http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm, where guidance is available for both contracting authoutiys (Commission staff) and evaluation teams (consultants) as well as to ''Aid Delivery Methods', Volume 1 'Project Cycle Management Guidelines (EuropeAid, March 2004)
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/infopoint/publications/europeaid/49a_en.htm

4.1 The evaluation approach / process

The evaluation approach should be developed and implemented as presented below (for further details consult the evaluation methodology website above mentioned).

Once the external evaluation team has been contractually engaged, the evaluation process will be carried out through three phases: Inception Phase, a Field Phase and a Synthesis Phase, as described below:

4.2.1 Inception Phase (week 1)

In the inception stage of the Desk Phase, the relevant programming documents should be reviewed, as well as documents shaping the wider strategy/policy framework. The evaluation team will then analyse the logical framework as set up at the beginning of the project/programme cycle. On the basis of the information collected the evaluation team should:

- Describe the development co-operation context.
- Comment on the logical framework.
- Determine the relevance of a validation meeting.
- Comment on the issues / evaluation questions suggested (see annexe 2; section 3) or, when relevant, propose an alternative or complementary set of evaluation questions justifying their relevance. Develop the evaluation into sub-questions identify provisional indicators and their verification means, and describe the analysis strategy.
- Propose the work plan for the finalisation of the phases.
- Confirm the final time schedule.
- Present an indicative methodology to the overall assessment of the project/programme.

At the end of the inception phase an inception report shall be prepared (see section 5). This shall be expected (5) working days after commencement of the evaluation.

4.2.2 Desk Review Phase (week 2)

In the Desk Review Phase, the evaluation team should carry out the following tasks:

- Review systematically the relevant available documents (see Annex 2);
- Submit its detailed work plan with an indicative list of people to be interviewed, surveys to be undertaken, dates of visit, itinerary, and name of team members in charge. This plan has to be applied in a way that is flexible enough to accommodate for any last-minute difficulties in the field. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these should be immediately discussed with the contracting authority;
- Present each evaluation question stating the information already gathered and their limitations provide a first partial answer to the question, identify the issues still to be covered and the assumptions still to be tested, and describe a full method to answer the question.
- Identify and present the list of tools to be applied in the Field Phase;
- List all preparatory steps already taken for the Field Phase.

<u>At the end of the desk phase, a desk report shall be prepared and presented (see section 5). The phase should be completed (10) working days after commencement of the evaluation.</u>

4.2.3 Field phase (week 3 & 4)

The Field Phase should start upon approval of the Desk Phase report by the contracting authority. The evaluation team should:

- Hold a briefing meeting with programme management, and/or Delegation in the first days of the field phase.
- Ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of, the different stakeholders; working closely with the relevant government authorities and agencies during their entire assignment. Use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information and will harmonise data from different sources to allow ready interpretation.
- Interview the key stakeholders including:
    - Programme Management Unit-HRGGP
    - National Authorising Officer (NAO)
    - EU Delegation officials
    - Uganda Police Force
    - Uganda Prisons Service
    - National Community Service Program
    - Uganda Human Rights Commission
    - Electoral Commission
    - Parliament of Uganda
    - Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Development Countries (HIVOS)/Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI)
    - Avocats Sans Frontières/the Uganda Association of Women Lawyers (FIDA-Uganda)
    - Kindernothilfe E.V/African Network for Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN - Uganda Chapter)
    - Regional Centre for Quality of Health Care (RCQHC)
    - Oxfam Novib/Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations (DENIVA)
    - BBC World Service Trust
    - Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR)/Uganda Radio Network

- Justice, Law and Order Sector Development Partners Working Group
  - Deepening Democracy Program
  - Democratisation Working Group members
  - USAID Linkages Program
  - Human Rights Working Group
  - The EU funded partner programmes: Northern Uganda Rehabilitation Programme (NUREP), and Support to Decentralisation Program (SDP)
  - Beneficiaries of the activities implemented.

- Summarise its field works at the end of the field phase, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present its preliminary findings in a meeting with NAO, EU delegation and/or reference group and coordinated by the PMU.

<u>The field phase should be completed within (25) working days after commencement of the evaluation.</u>

4.2.4 Synthesis phase (week 5)

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report. The consultants will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, affirmations accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place, in order to avoid misleading readers and causing unnecessary irritation or offence.

If the contracting authority considers the draft report of sufficient quality, he/she will circulate it for comments to the reference group members, and convene a meeting in the presence of the evaluation team.

On the basis of comments expressed, the evaluation team has to amend and revise the draft report. Comments requesting methodological quality improvements should be taken into account, except where there is a demonstrated impossibility, in which case full justification should be provided by the evaluation team. Comments on the substance of the report may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team is to motivate and explain the reasons in writing.

<u>The draft report should be prepared and submitted within (5) working days of the completion of the field phase.</u>

4.2.5 Validation meeting (week 5)

The evaluation team has to present the revised draft final report in a validation meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to present the draft final report to the main stakeholders, to check the factual basis of the evaluation, and to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

On the basis of comments made by participants and collected by the evaluation team, the evaluation team has to write the final version of the report, in which the rules applying to the integration of comments are considered. Comments requesting methodological quality improvement should be taken into account, except where it is demonstrably impossible to do so, in which case full justification has to be provided by the evaluation team. Comments on the substance of the report may either be rejected or accepted. In the latter instance, the evaluation team should explain the reason in writing.

4.2.6 Quality of the Final Evaluation Report

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the contracting authority using a quality assessment grid (see annexe IV). The explanation on how to fill this grid is available on the following link:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/egeval/guidelines/gba_en.htm

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the project's area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).
The consultant will submit the following reports in English:

1. **Inception report** of maximum 10 pages to be produced within 5 working days from the start of the consultant services. In the report, the consultant shall describe the first finding of the study, the foreseen degree of difficulties in collecting data, and other encountered and/or foreseen difficulties in addition to his programme of work and staff mobilization.
2. **Desk review report** (of maximum 30 pages, main text, excluding annexes) to be submitted at the end of the desk phase to address the issues mentioned in section 4
3. **Draft final report** (of maximum 50 pages) using the structure set out in **Annex 2** and taking due account of comments received from the reference group members Besides answering the evaluation questions, the draft final report should also synthesise all findings and conclusions into an overall assessment of the project/programme.
4. **Final report** with the same specifications as mentioned under 3 above, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report. The team leader should present the report within (3) days upon receipt of comments.

Distribution of all (10) reports in paper and electronic version will be as follows:

- EU Delegation (2) copies
- National Authorizing Officer: (6) copies
- Ministry of internal Affairs (1) copy
- PMU DGAP (1) copy

The consultant will include as an Annex the DAC Format for Evaluation Report Summaries (see Annex 5). The report is to be disseminated under the full responsibility of the Commission.

THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be composed of 3 experts with the following profiles and qualifications of the key experts:

6.1 The Team Leader (senior expert): with exposure in international human rights, governance and democratisation policy analysis and experiences with government capacity development, M&E and grants management, experience in project evaluation.

6.2 Junior experts (2): with experience in human rights, governance and democratisation policies, non governmental/civil society organisations and local governance and participation, access to justice and democratic governance monitoring by non state actors; familiar with national planning process, sector wide approaches, civil society operations and development partner coordination.

At least one team member should have thorough knowledge and familiarity with human rights, democratic governance, and rule of law in context of Uganda.

Common features:

- a solid and diversified experience in the specific field of expertise needed, including experience in evaluation of projects by at least the team leader;
- solid experience in the human rights and governance sector;
- Fluency in English and excellent report writing skills;
- A master's degree in a relevant field is desirable.
- Ability to organise and conduct programme reviews, familiar with logical framework, project cycles and procurement procedures of activities supported by international organisations.
- Be conversant with the regular IT software;
- Fully conversant with the principles and working methods of project cycle management and European Commission aid delivery methods;
- Solid knowledge and practical experience by at least 1 of the experts proposed in gender issues and gender integration analysis is an added advantage;
- Knowledge of local language(s) is an added advantage.

The composition of the team of experts should be balanced to enable complete coverage of the different aspects of project evaluation (evaluation methods and techniques) as set out in these terms of reference, including cross-cutting issues.

REIMURSABLES

The reimbursables cover the eligible travel and transport costs, per diems and cost of validation meeting incurred under this contract. It cannot be used for costs which should be covered by the Consultant as part of its fee rates. The financial evaluation of tenders only considers the total fees and not the reimbursables. The reimbursables comprise of:

Travel and transport borne by the Contracting Authority as specified in the Explanatory note to the Budget Breakdown. This heading includes international travels, national travels, luggage and per diem. The tenderer shall estimate the costs and insert in the Budget Breakdown.

WORK PLAN, TIMETABLE AND LOCATION

The consultant shall develop his/her work plan and timetable in the draft format below for discussion at the Inception phase, and it should take into consideration all the foreseen reports/deliverables in section 4 and 5 above. Overall, the assignment is expected to start by the **1st November 2010** and be completed within **50 working days**.

The dates mentioned in the summery table below may be changed with the agreement of all parties concerned.

Activity	Place	Duration	*Team leader*	*Junior Expert 1*	*Junior Expert 2*	Responsibility of	Dates
Inception Phase 1. Inception reporting 2. Final time table *-etc*	**Kampala**	**[5] day(s)** [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	Evaluation team	…
Desk Review Phase 3. Document reviews 4. Listing targeted respondents 5. Develop data collection tools 6. Preparation for field phase 7. Desk phase reporting *-etc*	**Kampala**	**[5] day(s)** [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[5] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	Evaluation team	…
Field Phase 8. Stakeholder interviews 9. Field phase reporting *-etc*	**Various**	**[15]days** [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[15] days [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[15] days [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[15] days [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	Evaluation team	…
Synthesis Phase 10. Draft reporting 11. Validation meeting *-etc*	**Kampala**	**[5] day(s)** [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[3] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[3] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[3] day(s) [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	Evaluation team/PMU	…
Final Phase 12. Incorporate comments 13. Final report *-etc*	**Home**	**[3] day(s)** [..] day(s) [..] day(s)	[3] day(s)	NA	NA	Team Leader	…
TOTAL		**[33] days**	**[33] days**	**[25] days**	**[25] days**		

ANNEX 1: KEY DOCUMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION

The list is Indicative, not exhaustive and may be expanded where appropriate:

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the project / programme.
- Uganda Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programmes for the periods covered.
- Governmental national and sector policy documents.
- Project identification study.
- Project feasibility study.
- Project financing agreement and addenda.
- Project's Global and Annual Operational Plans.
- Project's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- EC's Result Oriented Monitoring Reports, and eventual other external and internal monitoring reports of the project.
- Other relevant evaluations audit reports. The evaluation team should not repeat the points already covered by such documents but use them and go beyond them.
- Relevant sector or working group's policies and plans e.g. JLOS SIP II.
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors.
- Relevant policy and planning documents from national/local partners and other donors.

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

ANNEX II: LAYOUT, STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT

The final report should not be longer than approximately 50 pages. Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

The cover page of the report shall carry the following text:

''This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission''.

The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:

14. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

2. INTRODUCTION

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

3. ANSWERED QUESTIONS / FINDINGS

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

The organization of the report should be made around the responses to the Evaluation questions which are systematically covering the DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, plus coherence and added value specific to the Commission. In such an approach, the criteria will be translated into specific questions. These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the evaluation criteria and to articulate the key issues of concern to stakeholders, thus optimising the focus and utility of the evaluation.

More information on support documents to aid the evaluation of EC-supported operations may be accessed from
http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/europeaid/activities/evaluation/sec_en.htm

3.1 Problems and needs (Relevance)

The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention (projects/ programme) are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and European Commission's policies.

The analysis of relevance will focus on the following questions in relation to the design of the project:

- the extent to which the project has been consistent with, and supportive of, the policy and programme framework within which the project is placed, in particular the EC's Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme, and the Partner Government's development policy and sector policies
- the quality of the analyses of lessons learnt from past experience, and of sustainability issues;
- the project's coherence with current/on going initiatives;
- the quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement;
- the extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and social needs, clarity and internal consistency of the stated objectives;
- the extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed
- the extent to which objectives have been updated in order to adapt to changes in the context;
- the degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances;
- the quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis and analysis of vulnerable groups) and of institutional capacity issues;
- the stakeholder participation in the design and in the management/implementation of the project, the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
- the quality of the analysis of strategic options, of the justification of the recommended implementation strategy, and of management and coordination arrangements;
- the realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative resources)
- the analysis of assumptions and risks;
- the appropriateness of the recommended monitoring and evaluation arrangements ;

3.2 Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)

The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project's results were attained, and the project's specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved.

The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

- whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
- whether intended beneficiaries participated in the intervention
- in institutional reform projects, whether behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements

(e.g. in communications, productivity, ability to generate actions which lead to economic and social development);

- if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ and locally), etc.;
- whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate, which accompanying measures have been taken by the partner authorities;
- how unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and • could have been foreseen and managed.;
- whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;

3.3 Sound management and value for money (Efficiency)

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (sometimes referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.

The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

- the quality of day-to-day management, for example in:
    a. operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs),and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
    b. management of personnel, information, property, etc,
    c. whether management of risk has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;
    d. relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
    e. the quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including beneficiaries/target groups);
    f. respect for deadlines;

- Extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions.
- Partner country contributions from local institutions and government (e.g offices, experts, reports, tax exemption, as set out in the LogFrame resource schedule), target beneficiaries and other local parties: have they been provided as planned?
- Commission HQ/Delegation inputs (e.g. procurement, training, contracting, either direct or via consultants/bureaux): have they been provided as planned?;
- Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?

- Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
- Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities so far?

3.4 Achievement of wider effects (Impact)

The term impact denotes the relationship between the project's specific and overall objectives.

At Impact level the final or ex-post evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:

- Extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.
- whether the effects of the project:
  a) have been facilitated/constrained by external factors
  b) have produced any unintended or unexpected impacts, and if so how have these affected the overall impact.
  c) have been facilitated/constrained by project/programme management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders
  d) have contributed to economic and social development
  e) have contributed to poverty reduction
  f) have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.
  g) were spread between economic growth, salaries and wages, foreign exchange, and budget.

3.5 Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends or non funding support interventions (such as: policy dialogue, coordination).

The final evaluation will make an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:

- the ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement;
- policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy are corresponding, the potential effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the project positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organizations.
- institutional capacity, e.g. of the Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating a new institution, how far good relations with existing institutions have been established; whether the institution appears likely to be

capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;

- the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
- socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.
- financial sustainability, e.g. whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remained so after funding will end; whether enough funds are available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs), and continued to do so after funding will end; and economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated.
- technical (technology) issues, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies are being considered, where possible; and (iii) the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.
- Wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, environmental impact and good governance; were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project.

3.6 Mutual reinforcement (coherence)

The extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission to achieve its development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other Community policies. Extent to which they complement partner country's policies and other donors' interventions.

Considering other related activities undertaken by Government or other donors, at the same level or at a higher level:

- likeliness that results and impacts will mutually reinforce one another
- likeliness that results and impacts will duplicate or conflict with one another

Connection to higher level policies (coherence)
Extent to which the project/programme (its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc .):

- is likely to contribute to / contradict other EC policies
- is in line with evolving strategies of the EC and its partners

3.7 EC value added

Connection to the interventions of Member States. The extent to which the projects/programme achieved its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc.

- is complementary to the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area
- is co-ordinated with the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area
- is creating actual synergy (or duplication) with the intervention of EU Member States
- involves concerted efforts by EU Member States and the EC to optimise synergies and avoid duplication.

4. VISIBILITY

The consultants will make an assessment of the project's strategy and activities in the field of visibility, information and communication, the results obtained and the impact achieved with these actions in both the beneficiary country and the European Union countries.

5. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

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

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

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

Note:
The chapter should not follow the order of the questions or that of the evaluation criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, etc.)

It should features references to the findings (responses to the evaluation questions) or to annexes showing how the conclusions derive from data, interpretations, and analysis and judgement criteria.

The report should include a self-assessment of the methodological limits that may restrain the range or use of certain conclusions.

The conclusion chapter features not only the successes observed but also the issues requiring further thought on modifications or a different course of action.

The evaluation team presents its conclusions in a balanced way, without systematically favouring the negative or the positive conclusions.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communicating the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.

If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and presented in appropriate seminars or meetings so that they can be capitalised on and transferred.

6.2 Recommendations

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

Note:
The recommendations must be related to the conclusions without replicating them. A recommendation derives directly from one or more conclusions.

The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. **Recommendations** should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them both locally and in the Commission.

They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects for both the national implementing partners and for the Commission; the pre-conditions that might be attached to decisions on the financing of similar projects; and general issues arising from the evaluation in relation to, for example, policies, technologies, instruments, institutional development, and regional, country or sectoral strategies.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure (the project/programme task manager and the evaluation contact person will often be able to advise here).

7. ANNEXES O THE REPORT

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)
- Map of project area, if relevant
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures)
- Page DAC summary, following the format in Annex V.

Annex III - Methodological observations

The evaluation team should refer to the project/programme's logical framework.

It is suggested that the evaluation team carry out *[here refer to the main tools that are envisaged for data collection, if any (the length of this section may range from very short to rather long, depending on whether or not the issues have been a subject of preliminary reflection), for instance:*

- a rapid appraisal through a field visit and a series of interviews
- a questionnaire survey involving a sample of beneficiaries
- a series of focus groups involving beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
- a series of case studies

The proposal in response to these terms of reference should identify any language and/or cultural gap and explain how it will be bridged.

The project/programme is to be judged more from the angle of the beneficiaries' perceptions of benefits received than from the managers' perspective of outputs delivered or results achieved. Consequently, interviews and surveys should focus on outsiders (beneficiaries and other affected groups beyond beneficiaries) as much as insiders (managers, partners, field level operators). The proposal in response to these terms of reference, as well as further documents delivered by the evaluation team, should clearly state the proportion of insiders and outsiders among interviews and surveys.

A key methodological issue is whether observed or reported change can be partially or entirely attributed to the project / programme, or how far the project/programme has contributed to such change. The evaluation team should identify attribution / contribution problems where relevant and carry out its analyses accordingly.

It must be clear for all evaluation team members that the evaluation is neither an opinion poll nor an opportunity to express one's preconceptions. This means that all conclusions are to be based on facts and evidence through clear chains of reasoning and transparent value judgements. Each value judgement is to be made explicit as regards:

- the aspect of the project/programme being judged (its design, an implementation procedure, a given management practice, etc.)
- the evaluation criterion is used (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, coherence, EC value added)

The evaluation report should not systematically be biased towards positive or negative conclusions. Criticisms are welcome if they are expressed in a constructive way. The evaluation team clearly acknowledges where changes in the desired direction are already taking place, in order to avoid misleading readers and causing unnecessary offence.

ANNEX IV - QUALITY ASSESSMENT GR ID

**This grid is annexed to the ToRs for information to the consultants*

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

1 = unacceptable = criteria mostly not fulfilled or totally absent
2 = weak = criteria partially fulfilled
3 = good = criteria mostly fulfilled
4 = very good = criteria entirely fulfilled
5 = excellent = criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. Meeting needs:					
a) Does the report precisely describe what is evaluated, including the intervention logic in the form of a logical framework?					
b) Does the report clearly cover the requested period of time, as well as the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?					
c) Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?					
d) Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests. If not, are justifications given?					
2. Appropriate design					
a) Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes stock of the rationale of the project / programme, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?					
b) Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?					
c) Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?					
d) Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?					
3. Reliable data					
a) Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?					
b) Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?					
c) Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?					
d) Have the collected data been cross-checked?					
e) Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?					
4. Sound analysis					
a) Is the analysis based on the collected data?					
b) Is the analysis clearly focused on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?					
c) Is the context adequately taken into account in the analysis?					

Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:	1	2	3	4	5
d) Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?					
e) Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any?					
5. Credible findings					
a) Are the findings derived from the data and analyses?					
b) Is the generalisability of findings discussed?					
c) Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?					
6. Valid conclusions					
a) Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?					
b) Does the report reach overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?					
c) Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?					
7.Useful recommendations					
a) Are recommendations coherent with conclusions?					
b) Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidance for taking action?					
c) Do the recommendations cater for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?					
d) Where necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?					
8.Clear report					
a) Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?					
b) Is the report well structured and adapted to its various audiences?					
c) Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?					
d) Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?					
Considering the 8 previous criteria, what is the overall quality of the report?					

ANNEXE V - THE STANDARD DAC FORMAT FOR EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARIES

Evaluation Title (and Reference)

Abstract
(central, 4 lines maximum)

Subject of the Evaluation
(5 lines max. on the project, organisation, or issue/theme being evaluated)

Evaluation Description
Purpose (3 lines max)
Methodology (3 lines max)

Main Findings
Clearly distinguishing possible successes/obstacles and the like where possible (25 lines max)

Recommendations

25 lines max

Feedback
(5 lines max)

Donor: European Commission	Region:	DAC sector :
Evaluation type: Efficiency, effectiveness and impact.	Date of report:	Subject of evaluation :
Language :	N° vol./pages :	Author :
Programme and budget line concerned :		
Type of evaluation :	( ) ex ante	(x) intermediate / ongoing ( ) ex post
Timing :	Start date :	Completion date :
Contact person :	Authors :	
Cost : Euro	Steering group : Yes/No	