

**Council of Europe Project**  
**“Promoting local democracy in Ukraine”**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>Title:</b>	Assessment of the results of the project “Promoting local democracy in Ukraine”
<b>Estimated duration:</b>	January – February 2018
<b>Deadline for submission of offers:</b>	7 January 2018 (by midnight, UTC +1)
<b>Duty Station:</b>	Home-based consultancy, with travels to Ukraine

**I. Introduction and background**

The project “Promoting local democracy in Ukraine” is implemented by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (hereafter the Congress), as part of the Action Plan for Ukraine for 2015-2017, to assist the country in its continued efforts to meet its statutory and specific obligations as a member State. It aims to improve the implementation of democratic principles in Ukraine, by enhancing the institutional and leadership capacities of local elected authorities and disseminating nationwide best practices of local democracy.

The objectives of the project are the following:

- To strengthen the institutional and leadership capacities of local elected representatives;
- To reinforce the capacities of local and regional elected representatives to provide support to the implementation of the local self-government reform;
- To foster citizen participation and support the implementation of local democratic participatory processes.

To this end, the Congress Secretariat has developed activities which consist of a series of peer-to-peer exchanges with the participation of Congress members, both from Ukraine and other member States of the Council of Europe, as well as local and international experts. Comprehensive and tailor-made support to target groups (such as mayors, councillors and young local leaders) has already been proposed in different settings to improve their co-operation, as well as their management and communication skills, particularly towards citizens. Building a sense of ownership and strengthening the capacities of local stakeholders to co-produce local policies allow them to participate in the overall decision-making and reforms in the country.

**II. Purpose of the consultancy**

After 2.5 years of project implementation, tangible improvements have taken place in the local government sphere in Ukraine.

The objective of the consultancy is to assess the main achievements of the project in comparison to the expected results, as defined in the project document.

In particular, the specific objectives of the assessment are:

- 1) evaluate the relevance and added-value of the approach undertaken by the Congress to support local authorities in their efforts to improve governance at local level and contribute to the overall decentralisation reforms, compared with other organisations providing technical assistance in the field;
- 2) evaluate the overall efficiency of the project management;
- 3) assess the sustainability of project deliverables, as well as the implementation of project activities;
- 4) evaluate the impact of the project at local level, identifying best practices and lessons learned, which are to be considered in the preparation of follow-up activities;
- 5) recommend possible lines of action and further activities for future assistance, long-standing sustainability, improved project methodology.

The results of the assessment will serve to contribute to the overall evaluation of the Action Plan for Ukraine for 2015-2017, as well as to the reshaping, if necessary, of a potential project under the next Action Plan 2018-2021. The review is commissioned by the Council of Europe and is subject to approval of funds for 2018.

### **III. Methodology**

Specific evaluation questions:

This evaluation should comply with Evaluation Guidelines of the Directorate of Internal Oversight of the Council of Europe (version: April 2014). Moreover, a gender responsive methodology should be applied throughout the various stages of the project review.

#### **1. Preparatory work should include desk review of the following documents:**

- Project Document;
- Action Plan for Ukraine 2015-2017;
- Activity plans;
- Annual progress reports;
- Website;
- Technical papers and publications.

#### **2. Initial briefing with the project team in Strasbourg and in Kyiv (by phone or Skype)**

#### **3. Interviews (face to face, and/or by phone or Skype) should include, but not be limited to, the following stakeholders:**

- Representatives of the relevant ministry and parliamentary committees;
- National associations of local and regional authorities, in particular the Association of Ukrainian Cities;
- International and local consultants that have been engaged in delivering activities, interventions, expert support and legal or technical expertise;
- Representatives and members of the Congress involved in the implementation of the project in Strasbourg and Ukraine;
- Representatives of donors to the Action Plan, present in Ukraine;
- Management of the Council of Europe Office in Kyiv

#### **4. Focus group discussions with the following stakeholders:**

- Mayors
- Local councillors
- Young local leaders

## **5. Questionnaire (online survey) to be sent to:**

- All stakeholders who took part in the project activities, in particular, representatives of local authorities and their associations, and young local leaders.

The evaluators will propose the format of interviews, focus groups and the online survey. The project team is at the evaluators' disposition throughout the assessment to assist them with the information requests and any relevant questions.

**The evaluation should focus on the following specific questions related to the intervention:**

### **1. Relevance**

- To what extent the interventions have been relevant to the mandate of the Council of Europe and priority areas of the Action Plan for Ukraine for 2015-2017?
- To what extent have the interventions been aligned and supported of the reform and policy processes of Ukraine in the particular sectors?
- To what extent have the interventions addressed identified needs of the beneficiaries?

### **2. Added value**

- To what extent has the Congress a clear comparative advantage vis-à-vis other international actors in the implementation of the interventions? What are the shortcomings compared to other implementers?

### **3. Effectiveness**

- What achievements have been made by the project?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?
- To what extent the project has contributed to gender equality?

### **4. Efficiency**

- To what extent have the resources/inputs in terms of funds, expertise, time etc. been converted economically to results?

### **5. Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the intervention will be maintained when the project ends? What are the most important factors?

## **Format of the report**

The assignment will result in a report, which should not exceed 20 pages (not including any annexes).

The report should be structured in a clear and coherent manner (e.g. background and objectives are presented leading to the findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations are drawn from what precedes).

The report follows this proposed structure:

- Executive Summary (maximum two pages);
- Description of the intervention; evaluation methodology and scope, limitations, difficulties encountered during the evaluation;
- Findings related to each evaluation question and to any concerns identified during the evaluation;
- Findings and results related to the online survey;
- Conclusions;
- Recommendations;
- Lessons learnt;

- Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.).

The report shall be addressed to the Council of Europe project team in two original copies signed and dated by the consultant.

#### IV. Required qualifications

This Call is opened to natural and legal persons. The consultant hired on the basis of these Terms of Reference will conduct the tasks in close co-operation and co-ordination with the Congress Secretariat.

##### *Eligibility criteria*

- University degree in a relevant domain (equivalent to the first cycle of the Bologna process framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area);
- Sound professional experience in project evaluation;
- Experience in projects on local democracy is required;
- Previous work experience with the Council of Europe is appreciated; work experience in Ukraine is an asset;
- Professional knowledge of English; knowledge of Ukrainian and/or Russian is an asset;
- Familiarity with gender equality concepts is an asset.

##### *Award criteria*

Applications will be assessed against the following criteria:

- relevance and clarity of the methodology proposed (40%);
- relevance of the applicant's experience (30%);
- records of previous similar work and research (20%);
- financial offer (10%).

##### *Exclusion criteria*

(By submitting your tender, you declare on your honour not being in any of the below situations)

The offeror shall be excluded from participating in the tender procedure if he/she:

- has been sentenced by final judgment on one or more of the following charges: participation in a criminal organisation, corruption, fraud, money laundering;
- is in a situation of bankruptcy, liquidation, termination of activity, insolvency or arrangement with creditors or any like situation arising from a procedure of the same kind, or is subject to a procedure of the same kind;
- has received a judgment with *res judicata force*, finding an offence that affects his/her professional integrity or serious professional misconduct;
- does not comply with his/her obligations as regards payment of social security contributions, taxes and dues, according to the statutory provisions of his/her country of incorporation, establishment or residence.

#### V. Timeframe

Expected start date: 15 January 2018

The tasks shall be undertaken as per an agreed work-plan between the consultant and the Congress Secretariat, and finalised no later than 28 February 2017.

Tasks & expected deliverables	Working time	Indicative schedule
Desk review	20%	Week 3 – 4
Initial briefing discussion with the project team in Strasbourg and Kyiv to clarify general and specific questions regarding the project, necessary for an efficient assessment	5%	Week 4
Prepare and conduct interviews, focus group meetings and online survey (the drafts are finalised by the evaluators based on the contribution of the project)	40%	Week 5 – 6

team)		
First draft report to be submitted for feedback to the Congress Secretariat	20%	20 February 2018
Discussion and feedback from the Congress Secretariat	5%	23 February 2018
Finalisation of the report	10%	28 February 2018

### Procedures for submission of applications

Incomplete submission will not be given consideration. Applications must be submitted in English and include:

1. Letter of Interest from the applicant highlighting the experience in conducting similar tasks with a clear mention of the all-inclusive fee, including travels and stays in Ukraine incl. related insurance for maximum 5 days (in EUR, including VAT);
2. Document outlining the approach and methodology proposed for the consultancy tasks. The document should be no longer than 1.000 words;
3. CV(s) highlighting experience in conducting similar tasks;
4. Maximum three examples of previous works in English (reports, articles, etc.);
5. Three relevant references (name, surname, phone number and e-mail);
6. If the applicant is a legal person: proof of registration (statute of the organisation, certificate of registration, etc.);
7. Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interest and consent form in Annex 1 and 2 are signed and dated.

The Terms of reference with Annexes will constitute one of the parts of the contract between the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and the selected consultant.

Applications must be submitted by e-mail to: [congress.cooperation@coe.int](mailto:congress.cooperation@coe.int)

Please note that the deadline for submission of application is on **7 January 2018 (midnight UTC +1)**.

### For more information and contact:

Svetislav Paunović, Project Co-ordinator, [svetislav.paunovic@coe.int](mailto:svetislav.paunovic@coe.int)

## Annex 1: Declaration of honour with respect to the exclusion criteria and absence of conflict of interest

The undersigned (name of the signatory of this form)

- in his/her own name (*if the economic operator is a natural person or in case of own declaration of a director or person with powers of representation, decision making or control over the economic operator*)

or

- representing (*if the economic operator is a legal person*)

official name in full (*only for legal person*):

official legal form (*only for legal person*):

official address in full:

VAT registration number:

declares that the company or organisation that he/she represents:

- a) is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not entered into an arrangement with creditors, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, and is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- b) has not been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of *res judicata*;
- c) has not been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authorities can justify;
- d) has fulfilled all its obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions and the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established, with those of the country of the contracting authority and those of the country where the contract is to be carried out;
- e) has not been the subject of a judgement which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity;
- f) is not a subject of the administrative penalty for being guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by the contracting authority as a condition of participation in the procurement procedure or failing to supply information, or being declared to be in serious breach of his obligation under contract covered by the budget.

In addition, the undersigned declares on his/her honour:

- g) that he/she has no conflict of interest in connection with the contract. A conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest;
- h) that he/she will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest;
- i) that the information provided to the Council of Europe within the context of this invitation to tender is accurate, sincere and complete.

Full Name

Date

Signature

## Annex 2: Consent Form

I hereby give my consent for information in the below form to be kept by the Office of the Council of Europe in Kyiv for its internal use only. The form will not be shared with persons outside. The storage will comply with Council of Europe's Regulation outlining a data protection system for personal data files in the Council of Europe (CM/Del/Dec(89)425/59bE).

Please print name below in block letters and sign the consent form.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

### Review Form for external consultant's services<sup>1</sup>

Form number: \_\_\_\_\_

This form is to assess the services and/or products that the external evaluation consultant provided to you or your organisation for the specific evaluation identified. When responding to the items, be sure to consider only the evaluation named, not other evaluations on which you may have worked together.

Name of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

1. Name of CoE staff member responsible for review: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Based on your experience with the evaluator in this evaluation exercise, what is your **overall assessment** of the quality of the work? (check one only)

Poor       Fair       Good       Very good       Excellent

3. How **useful** to your organisation was the work performed by the evaluator? (check one only)

Not at all useful       Somewhat useful       Very useful       Extremely useful

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators.

4a. Would you **recommend** this evaluator to your colleagues? (check one only)

Yes  No

4b. If Yes, why? If No, why not?

5. How would you rate the evaluator in the following areas of performance? For each area, check the one column that best represents your opinion. If an area does not apply or you do not know, check the first column.

The Evaluator's:	NA/Don't Know	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
a. <b>understanding</b> of the evaluation object					
b. <b>attentiveness</b> to my needs/organisation's needs					
c. <b>quality</b> of reports/products produced					
d. <b>appropriateness</b> of reports/products for my needs/organisation's needs					
e. <b>timeliness</b> in delivering reports/products					
f. <b>accessibility</b> to me/my organisation					
g. <b>communication</b> with me/my organisation					
h. <b>other</b> , specify:					

6. What are the **strengths** of the evaluator?

7. Please rate the evaluator's adherence to each of these principles during the project by checking the *one* column that best represents your opinion. If a principle does not apply or you do not know, check the first column.

Guiding Principle	NA/Don't know	No	Partially	Completely
Did the evaluator <b>negotiate honestly</b> with your organisation concerning:				
1) <i>costs</i> ?				
2) <i>tasks</i> to be undertaken?				
3) <i>limitations</i> of methods?				
4) <i>scope</i> of results likely to be obtained?				
5) <i>uses</i> of data resulting from the evaluation?				
b. Did the evaluator explore with your staff both the <b>shortcomings</b> and the <b>strengths</b> of different ways to evaluate the intervention?				
c. Did the evaluator record all <b>changes</b> made in the original evaluation plan and the reasons why the changes were made?				
d. Did the evaluator conduct the evaluation in a way that clearly respects the <b>dignity</b> and <b>self-worth</b> of everyone involved?				
e. Did the evaluator identify and respect <b>differences among participants</b> (e.g., age; gender; ethnicity; etc.) when planning, conducting, and reporting the evaluation?				
f. In planning and reporting the evaluation, did the evaluator <u>consider</u> including the <b>perspectives and interests</b> of all interested parties?				
g. When the evaluator presented his/her work, did he/she <b>communicate</b> accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret, and critique the work?				
h. Did the evaluator report <b>negative findings</b> in a sensitive manner without compromising the integrity of the findings?				

8. Do you have any other comments about your experience working with the evaluator on this particular project? If yes, please comment.

## **Annex 3: Council of Europe Code of Conduct for Evaluators<sup>2</sup>**

**Council of Europe, November 2013**

1. The conduct of evaluators in the Council of Europe (CoE) should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the CoE itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.
2. The CoE Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the CoE.
3. The provisions of the CoE Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.
4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the CoE, all CoE staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for CoE are required to commit to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, specifically to the following obligations:

### **Independence**

5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

### **Impartiality**

6. Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organisational unit being evaluated.

### **Conflict of Interest**

7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any recent or current situation of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work with CoE, each evaluator will complete a conflict of interest form (see [Declaration of Honour with respect to the Exclusion Criteria and Absence of Conflict of Interest](#)).

### **Honesty and Integrity**

8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their behaviour, when determining the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained and presenting their procedures, data and findings, including any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

### **Competence**

9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

---

<sup>2</sup> Drafted on the basis of UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>.

## **Accountability**

10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

## **Obligations to participants**

11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the European Convention of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

## **Confidentiality**

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

## **Avoidance of Harm**

13. Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and avoid harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

## **Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability**

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

## **Transparency**

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

## **Omissions and wrongdoing**

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

## Annex 4: Quality assurance checklist for evaluation reports

<b>Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Reports</b>	
This checklist is intended to help evaluation managers and evaluators to ensure the final product of the evaluation - evaluation report - meets the expected quality. It can also be shared as part of the TOR prior to the conduct of the evaluation or after the report is finalized to assess its quality.	
<b>Evaluation Title:</b>	
<b>1. The Report Structure</b>	
1.0	The report is well structured, logical, clear, concise and complete.
1.1	The report uses gender sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.
1.2	<p>Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). The report follows the proposed structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Summary (maximum two pages)</li> <li>• Introduction               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Purpose and scope of the evaluation (what is the intended use of the evaluation?); Description of the intervention; Evaluation methodology incl. limitations; Difficulties encountered during the evaluation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Findings               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Findings related to each evaluation question; Findings related to additional evaluation questions that came up while carrying out the evaluation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Conclusions</li> <li>• Recommendations, possibly including suggested modalities of implementation</li> <li>• Lessons learnt</li> <li>• Annexes (including list of interviews and of documents reviewed, questionnaires, formats for structured and semi-structured interviews, etc.)</li> </ul>
1.3	<p>The title page and opening pages provide key basic information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report</li> <li>• Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Names and/or organisations of evaluators</li> <li>• Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation</li> <li>• Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes</li> <li>• List of acronyms.</li> </ul>
1.4	<p>The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the evaluation object</li> <li>• Evaluation objectives and intended audience</li> <li>• Evaluation methodology</li> <li>• Most important findings and conclusions</li> <li>• Main recommendations</li> </ul>

1.5	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: <sup>2</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TORs</li> <li>• List of persons interviewed and sites visited.</li> <li>• List of documents consulted</li> <li>• More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity</li> <li>• Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition</li> <li>• Evaluation matrix</li> <li>• results framework</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Object of Evaluation</b>		
2.0	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.	
2.1	The <b>logic model and/or the expected results chain</b> (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is/are clearly described.	
2.2	The <b>context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors</b> that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.	
2.3	The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The number of components</b>, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly.</li> <li>• <b>The geographic context and boundaries</b> (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant</li> <li>• The purpose and goal, and organisation/management of the object</li> <li>• The <b>total resources</b> from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions.</li> </ul>	
2.4	The <b>key stakeholders involved</b> in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
2.5	The report identifies the <b>implementation status of the object</b> , including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.	
<b>3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.</b>		
3.0	The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained.	
3.1	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	
3.2	The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover.	
3.3	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	
3.4	As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights.	

<b>4. Evaluation Methodology</b>		
4.0	The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.	
4.1	The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.	
4.2	The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.	
4.3	The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.	
4.4	The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	
4.5	The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.	
4.6	The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender equality and human rights responsive and appropriate for analyzing the gender equality and human rights issues identified in the scope.	
4.7	The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools, etc.)	
4.8	The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach.	
<b>5. Findings</b>		
5.0	Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.	
5.1	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
5.2	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope.	
5.3	The report assesses if the design of the object was based on a sound gender analysis and human rights analysis and implementation for results was monitored through gender and human rights frameworks, as well as the actual results on gender equality and human rights.	
5.4	Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence.	
5.5	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
5.6	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.	
5.7	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.	

<b>6. Conclusions</b>		
6.0	Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	
6.1	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.	
6.2	Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	
6.3	Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users.	
6.4	Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	
<b>7. Lessons learnt and best practices</b>		
7.0	Lessons learnt are specific and relevant to the topic of the evaluation	
7.1	Lessons learnt and best practices are clearly linked to specific findings	
7.3	Lessons learnt and best practices are tied to clearly identified external factors	
7.3	Lessons learnt and best practices are replicable in the organisational context	
<b>8. Recommendations</b>		
8.0	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.	
8.1	The connection between findings, conclusions and recommendations is demonstrated through graphic means;	
8.2	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	
8.3	Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.	
8.4	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation.	
8.5	Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.	
8.6	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.	
8.7	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organisation and potential constraints to follow-up.	
8.8	Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender equality and human rights aspects.	
8.9	Recommendations are supplemented with suggested modalities of implementation and opportunities for improvement.	