# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE**
**Final Evaluation of "Development of the North West Coast and Mine action project"**
**FWC BENEFICIARIES 2013 –**
**LOT 12 Humanitarian Aid, Crisis Management & Post-Crisis assistance**
**Request of Services N. 2018/395872**

### 1. BACKGROUND

The major source of contamination from explosive remnants of war in Egypt can be traced back more than 70 years to World War II, as well as to the Egypt-Israel wars of 1956, 1967 and 1973. Prior to launching of the first phase of this project (2007) , contamination affected an estimated 2,395 square kilometres of land in the North West Coast. Explosive remnants of war land contamination affects an estimated 2,680 square kilometres of land in the North West Coast and has claimed 8,313 casualties (697 killed and 7,616 injured), of which 5,015 were civilians. Due to this contamination, the North West Coast and its inland desert suffer from a fragile socio-economic structure, with a modest contribution to the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) not exceeding 0.7%, although covering over 16% of Egypt's geographic area. In an effort to support Matrouh Governorate overcome this major developmental challenge, especially since it is disadvantaged with being one of the poorest 10 governorates in Egypt, this project aims to strengthen the national capacities of stakeholders to address Mine Action in Egypt through the provision of relevant tools and mechanisms; reintegrate mine victims into the economy as productive community members; and support the continuation of mine clearance operations in line with the national Development Plan of the North West Coast.

- **Mine Action in Egypt**

In 2001, as part of the overall North West Coast development plan, a National Demining Committee was established. The committee was comprised of 20 ministries, concerned governorates, and NGOs and headed by the Minister of International Cooperation.

In November 2007, a first phase of the Mine Action Programme was started, with the support of UNDP, through the Executive Secretariat for Demining and Development of the North West Coast, at the Ministry of International Cooperation ("Executive Secretariat"). This first phase received funding from Germany, the UK Department for International Development (DFID-UK), New Zealand, the British Embassy, Japan and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

The Corps of Military Engineers has the overall responsibility to undertake demining operations in Egypt. The Government of Egypt made a yearly allocation of EGP 2 million, focusing mainly on the operational costs of the demining operations. Demining is conducted at the request of line Ministries having plan for the development of the land to be cleared. In recent years, these Ministries have been asked to shoulder the operational costs of demining. This has proved to be sometimes difficult, in particular for the Ministry of Agriculture.

- **The Joint EU Rural Development Programme**

The Financing Agreement for the Joint EU Rural development Programme has been signed on the 19 October 2014. There are three "beneficiary" Ministries: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation

("Lead Beneficiary"), Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation and Ministry of Local Development, with the Ministry of Investment and International Cooperation being the National Coordinator.

- EU Contribution: EUR 27 m.
- Duration: 5 years
- The Programme has 2 components:
    - The Rural Development Component, implemented by the Italian Cooperation, via a Delegation Agreement (EU contribution: EUR 21.9 m, duration 5 years starting from December 2014, in Fayoum, Menia and Matrouh Governorates).
    - The Mine Action Component (formally "Support to the North West Coast Development Plan and Relevant Mine Action: Phase II"), implemented by UNDP, via a Contribution Agreement (EU contribution: EUR 4.7 m, duration 3 years starting in October 2014), in partnership with the Executive Secretariat for the Demining and Development of the North West Coast, Ministry of International Cooperation.

### 1.1 The Action to be evaluated

The Mine Action Component financed by the EU is the second phase of a wider Mine Action Programme initiated in 2007 with the participation of several donors and EU Member States. A Contribution Agreement of EUR 4.7 million was signed with UNDP in December 2014 for the implementation of the Action, with a retro-active starting date of 23 October 2014.

**The overall objective of the project is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall Mine Action Programme in Egypt.**

The project, which has a duration of 3 years (with an extension of 6 months, in effect running till 30 April 2018 ), addresses the negative humanitarian and socio-economic impact of widespread contamination – actual and perceived – caused by land mines and Unexploded Ordinances (UXO). The Government, the UNDP and the European Union aim to develop and modernise national structures to better address the impediments to development and the security risk posed by landmines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW). A particular focus of the project is to provide support to enhance the coordination and management of mine action activities in Egypt. An added value of this joint programme is to enhance and strengthen international cooperation between not only Egypt, the United Nations, and the European Union, but also between Egypt, neighbouring countries, and the wider International Community.

**Expected results and activities**

1) Strengthened national capacities of relevant stakeholders to manage Mine Action in Egypt, for mine clearance operations in the North West Coast region and for accelerated mine clearance operations

    a. Strengthening of the information base to support decision making and development of strategies to address the challenge of mine action (technical and non-technical surveys, improved geographic information system, formal clearance prioritisation system).
    b. Development of national capacities in the field of mine action (finalisation of a gender sensitive Mine Action Strategy, exchange programme and workshop with other countries).
    c. Strengthened national capacities in mine clearance operations (development of Egyptian Mine Clearance Standard Operating Procedures, technical training for demining teams, Clearance Quality Management Unit performing in line with international best practices and Emergency Mine Action Survey (EMAS)).

d. Procurement of necessary demining equipment.
e. Strengthening of the Executive Secretariat.

2) Reintegration of Mine Victims, with a special emphasis on women, into society and enabling them to contribute to the development of the North West Coast Area.

   a. Creation of a medical facility to provide mine victims with access to treatment minimising physical impairment from injury, restoring maximum physical functional ability (including provision of appropriate assistive devices), and psychological support.
   b. Strengthening and empowering NGO and mine victims through income-generating activities and capacity building.

3) Development and expansion of the Mine Risk Education (MRE) Programme and advocacy activities
   a. Needs assessment for mine risk education, providing a baseline for MRE intervention design and subsequent Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) evaluations of MRE effectiveness.
   b. Training of opinion leaders on MRE.
   c. Advocacy initiatives intended at creating greater public awareness on the landmine situation, mine action activities, direct and indirect impact of antipersonnel landmine contamination.

### 1.2 Stakeholders of the action

**The main stakeholders of the action are at institutional level:**

- The Ministry of International Cooperation and its Executive Secretariat for Mine action
- The European Union Delegation
- The UNDP office in Egypt
- The Governorate of Marsa Matrouh

**At field level:**

- Military Units involved in the action (Corps of Military Engineers)
- NGOs that are executing specific activities of the project
- Community leaders
- Mine victims
- Community organizations
- Public services involved (Artificial Limb Center, schools and other units

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION

### 2.1 Purpose of the final evaluation

The main objectives of the final evaluation are to provide to the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:
- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the project, paying particular attention to its results measured against its objectives;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve current (if relevant) and future Actions.

The main users of this evaluation will be the European Union, the executing agency United Nations Development Program and the national stakeholders involved in the Action namely the Executive Secretariat for Demining, the Ministry of Investment and International Cooperation- MOIIC and the Governorate of Marsa Matrouh

The specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

- To conduct a comprehensive review of the performance of the programme, in particular of the interventions implemented in Marsa Matrouh governorate;
- To verify and explain achieved results (including unexpected results) attributable to the programme;
- To assess the sustainability of the intervention benefits and their impact;
- To identify lessons learned and make recommendations.

**2.2 Indicative evaluation questions**

The main questions of the evaluation will be initially the following:

- Can the evaluation confirm the relevance of the intervention with a view to address the mining problem in the North West Coast of Egypt and did the intervention contribute favourably on the health situation and the economic development in the North West Coast of Egypt?
- What are the main impacts/effects of the project in the field? Are they consistent with was foreseen at the beginning of the project?
- At the desegregated level of each component, which are the main results and which of them can be especially highlighted? Have they been consistent with the objectives of the project? (with an especial emphasis on the demining component)
- In particular what are the main results in terms of institutional strengthening and capacity building? In case some constraints still prevail, how could they be circumvented?
- Have the project's funds been used appropriately, in an efficient manner?
- Which are the main lessons learnt of the project? Would it possible to identify best practices valuable form communication and dissemination?

These questions will be reviewed during the inception phase and eventually complemented.

**2.3 Requested services**

The evaluation will assess the project using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact see Annex 1 of this document). In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action adds benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Egypt and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

The evaluation team should also consider whether the following cross-cutting issues: gender equality and environmental sustainability were taken into account in the implementation of the programme and its monitoring. As one of the main tasks, the mission is requested to identify lessons learnt and present recommendations of general and specific nature for the preparation of similar actions in the future.

**Required outputs**

The outputs of the final evaluation are:
- An inception report highlighting the main points to be addressed during the field work;
- A Power Point presentation summarising the main findings at the end of the mission in Egypt;
- A draft final report
- A final report.

**2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables**

The assignment will comprise 3 phases described in details in Annex 2 .The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted during each phase (not necessarily in chronological order) and lists the deliverables to be produced by the team, including the key meetings with the Contracting Authority .

| Phases of the evaluation | Key activities | Deliverables and *meetings* |
|---|---|---|
| **Inception Phase** | • Initial document/data collection and definition of methods of analysis<br>• Background analysis<br>• In depth document analysis<br>• Reconstruction of Intervention Logic, incl. objectives, specific features and target beneficiaries<br>• Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase<br>• Methodological design of the Field Phase | • Inception report<br>• Slide presentation<br>• Interview with EU program manager<br>• |
| **Field Phase** | • Initial meetings at country level with main stakeholders<br>• Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews, focus groups, storytelling sessions, surveys and other techniques]<br>• Data collection and analysis | • *Kick-off meeting*<br>• Slide Presentation of Key findings<br>• *Debriefing with the Reference Group* |
| **Synthesis phase** | • Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)<br>• Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations | • Draft Final Report<br>• Executive Summary<br>• Final Report<br>• Slide presentation |

**2.4 Management and Steering of the evaluation**

**At the EU level**

The evaluation is managed by the Delegation of the European Union to Egypt (OPS1, social Section) with the assistance of a Reference group by the UNDP-Egypt office and the Exective Secretariat for Demining, Ministry of International Cooperation Egypt (Reference group).
The Reference Group members' main functions are:
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.

- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Project Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

**At the Contractor level**

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

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

**2.5 Language of the Specific Contract**

The language of the Specific Contract shall be English.

## 3. EXPERTISE REQUIRED

**3.1 Number of requested experts per category and number of man-days per expert**

The assignment will be carried out by one Category I expert. The expected number of working days is 30 days, for each phase is as follows:

| | Expert 1<br>Team Leader (Category I) |
|---|---|
| | Days |
| Desk review (home-based) | 7 |
| Field work | 15 |
| Reporting (home-based) | 8 |

**3.2 Profile per expert:**

Expert 1, Team Leader (category I expert), for 30 working days:

- Education

The expert should have at least a Master's Degree in a domain relevant to this ToR (e.g. demining, humanitarian assistance, rural or local development, etc.) or, in its absence, a Bachelor Degree and additional equivalent professional experience of at least three years in evaluation of development projects (the equivalent experience must be above the general experience duration fixed below).

*- General professional experience:*

- At least 15 years' experience in development cooperation.

- *Specific professional experience:*
  - Experience in at least 2 projects in the field of demining/ humanitarian demining and in the field of rural/local development;
  - Proven experience in at least 3 assignments in the field of monitoring and evaluating development projects funded through the EU or other international cooperation programmes;
  - Demonstrable knowledge of, and experience with, EU rules and procedures, Project Cycle Management and EU led project/programme evaluation;
  - Experience in working with civil society organisations;
  - Experience in working in countries of the European Neighbourhood. Experience in Egypt will be an asset.

- Language skills

  - Fluent in English. Knowledge of Arabic will be an asset.

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

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

**3.4 Specific Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)**

A methodology for this assignment does not have to be included in this offer.

## 4. LOCATION AND DURATION

**4.1 Starting period**

The indicative start of the assignment is 1st of May 2018. [1]

- **Foreseen finishing period or duration**

The maximum expected duration of the assignment is 8 months. The Planning includes the period for notification for placement of the staff as per art 16.4 a)

**4.2 Location(s) of assignment**

The initial desk review and the report writing will be home-based. The field phase will take place in Cairo (where EU delegation, UNDP, the Executive Secretariat, and the Ministry of International Cooperation are based), as well as in Marsa Matrouh Governorate, where the programme was implemented.

It is expected that the Team Leader will spend 7 days in Cairo and 8 days in the Marsa Matrouh Governorate.

## 5. REPORTING

[1] The indicative start of the assignment may vary according to the expert security clearance process that has to be carried out with the Egyptian authorities

**Content, timing and submission**

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

- Inception report (max 15 pages)
- Slide presentation of main findings (for debriefing meeting)
- Draft Final report
- Final report

**Comments**

For each report, the EU Delegation Project Manager will submit comments within 15 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the EU Delegation shall be submitted within 15 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

***Language***

All reports shall be submitted in English.

***Number of copies***

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in 3 paper copies and in electronic version (Word, PDF).

***Formatting of reports***

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing.

## 6. INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE

In addition to the experts' fees for the services requested, the budget may include:

- Round-trip flights from Europe to Egypt indicatively costing EUR 600 per flight; only one flight per expert is required (if not residing in Egypt), as the field work is to be done without interruption;
- Per diems for non-resident expert. If the place of residence of an expert is Greater Cairo, he/she will not be entitled to per diems, except for the overnight stays spent outside Greater Cairo;
- Provision for 8 days of car rental has to be included to undertake the field visits in Marsa Matrouh Governorate. There are different project locations in the Governorate, outside the main cities, requiring intercity travel. The indicative cost for renting a car during field missions, including vehicle operating costs, is 60 EUR per day.
- Interpretation from English to Arabic and vice versa if needed (depending on the proficiency level in Arabic of the proposed Expert). The indicative interpretation cost is EUR 140 per day. Up to 8 days may be foreseen, if necessary.

## 7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

# ANNEXES

## Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

**SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**
**Request for Services n. 2018/395872**
**FWC BENEFICIARIES 2013 – LOT 12 Humanitarian Aid, Crisis Management and Post Crisis assistance**
**EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi**

### 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

| Criteria | Maximum |
|---|---|
| *Total score for the proposed expert* | ***100*** |
| *OVERALL TOTAL SCORE* | ***100*** |

### 2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 80 out of 100 points, will be automatically rejected.

## ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper Egypt and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- EC's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports.
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors
- Any other relevant document

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

## ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The consultant is requested to deliver two distinct documents: the Final Report and the Executive Summary.
The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 5. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.
The cover page of both deliverables shall carry the following text:
*"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission"*.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Executive Summary** | A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **1. Introduction** | A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| **2. Answered questions / Findings** | A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning. |
| **3. Overall assessment *(optional)*** | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria. |
| **4. Conclusions and** | |

**Recommendations**

| | |
|---|---|
| **4.1 Conclusions** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.<br>A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.<br>If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or other dissemination activities |
| **4.2 Recommendations** | They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.<br>Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure. |
| **5. Annexes to the report** | The report should include the following annexes:<br>• The Terms of Reference of the evaluation<br>• The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)<br>• Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.<br>• Evaluation Matrix<br>• Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)<br>• Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place<br>• List of persons/organisations consulted<br>• Literature and documentation consulted<br>• Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant<br>• Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators |

### Annex IV: Quality assessment grid

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

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

| In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated as: | *Rating* |
|---|---|
| **1. Meeting needs:** | |
| • Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic?<br>• Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?<br>• Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?<br>• Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given? | |
| **2. Appropriateness of the design:** | |
| • Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?<br>• Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?<br>• Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?<br>• Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method? | |
| **3. Reliability of the data:** | |
| • Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?<br>• Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?<br>• Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?<br>• Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?<br>• Have the collected data been cross-checked? | |
| **4. Soundness of the analysis:** | |
| • Is the analysis based on the collected data?<br>• Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?<br>• Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis?<br>• Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?<br>• 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. Credibility of the findings:** | |
| • Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses?<br>• Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised?<br>• Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments? | |
| **6. Validity of the conclusions:** | |
| • Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?<br>• Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?<br>• Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations? | |
| **7. Usefulness of the recommendations:** | |
| • Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions?<br>• Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action?<br>• Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?<br>• When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised? | |
| **8. Clarity of the report:** | |
| • Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?<br>• Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences?<br>• Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?<br>• Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced? | |

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

| **Comments on meeting needs (1):** |
|---|
| |
| **Comments on appropriateness of the design (2):** |

| |
|---|
| |
| **Comments on reliability of the data (3):** |
| |
| **Comments on soundness of the analysis (4):** |
| |
| **Comments on credibility of the findings (5):** |
| |
| **Comments on validity of the conclusions (6):** |
| |
| **Comments on usefulness of the recommendations (7):** |
| |
| **Comments on clarity of the report (8):** |
| |
| **Comments on the overall quality of the report** |
| |

# ANNEX V

## Five standard DAC evaluation criteria

**Relevance**
The relevance concerns the appropriateness of the programme objectives to the problems that it was supposed to address. The analysis of relevance will focus on the extent to which the design effectively:

- Analysed the programme coherence with the Partner Government's development policy and sector policies, in particular in relation to the conditional incentive based approach;
- Clearly and accurately identified real problems and how the objectives correctly address these problems;
- Assessed institutional capacity issues and effectively promoted local ownership;
- Established a clear and logically coherent set of programme objectives and a set of indicative activities for delivering each programme result;
- Established appropriate management and coordination arrangements.

**Efficiency**
The efficiency concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned. The assessment of efficiency will focus on:

- The quality of day-to-day management, for example in (i) management of the budget (including whether an inadequate budget was a factor); (ii) operational work planning and implementation; (iii) management of personnel, information, property, etc.; (iii) whether management of risk was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances; (iv) relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors; (v) respect for deadlines;
- Costs and value-for-money: how far the costs of the programme were justified by the benefits in comparison with similar programmes or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences;
- Partner country contributions from local institutions and government (e.g. offices, experts, reports, and tax exemption), target beneficiaries and other local parties: were they provided as planned, could re-allocation of responsibilities have improved performance, were communications good?
- Commission HQ/Delegation inputs (e.g. procurement, training, contracting, either direct or via consultants: were they provided as planned, could re-allocation of responsibilities have improved performance, were communications good?
- Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?
- Quality of monitoring: accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
- Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities?

**Effectiveness**
The effectiveness concerns how far the programme results were attained, and contributed to the achievement of the programme specific objectives. The analysis of effectiveness will focus on:

- 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;

- 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 it has been supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ/Delegation), etc.;
- Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate, which accompanying measures have been taken by the partner authorities, and with what consequences;
- 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.

**Impact**
The impact is the effect of the programme on its wider environment, and its contribution to the wider objectives (as summarised in the programme overall objective). The assessment of the impact will focus on:

- Extent to which the objectives of the programme have been achieved, and how far this was due to the programme;
- Whether the effects of the programme:
    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 the programme management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders;
    d) have contributed to economic and social development and to poverty reduction.

**Sustainability**
The sustainability concerns the likelihood of benefits produced by the programme to continue to flow after external funding has ended, and with particular reference to factors of ownership by beneficiaries, policy support, financial factors, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality, appropriate technology, environmental aspects, and institutional and management capacity. The analysis of sustainability will focus on:

- Ownership of objectives and achievements;
- How far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities affected the programme positively or adversely;
- Level of support and commitment from governmental, public, business and civil society organisations;
- Whether the products or services provided were affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding ended; whether enough funds were available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs), and continued to do so after funding ended;
- Whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies were considered, where there was a choice; and (iii) the intended beneficiaries were able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.

**Communication and visibility on EU funding**
The assessment on compliance with communication and visibility provisions in the legal documents will focus on:

- Programme contribution to promote EU visibility;
- Awareness of the programme stakeholders (including final beneficiaries) on the EU contribution;
- Compliance by UPEHC/MoALR and implementing partners with EU contract provisions and guidelines on visibility;
- Appropriateness of communication and visibility budget and actions at national, district and local levels.