

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A
EU Justice and Legal Empowerment Programme in Vietnam (EU JULE)
Mid-term evaluation
FWC SIEA 2018 – LOT 3 Human Rights, Democracy and Peace
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi
OPSYS REFERENCE NUMBER SIEA-2018-5354
CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE EUROPEAN UNION DELEGATION TO VIETNAM

1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2	THE INTERVENTIONS TO BE EVALUATED.....	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION	8
1.4	OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	8
2	DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	9
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	9
2.2	REQUESTED SERVICES.....	10
2.3	PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS.....	14
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	18
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	18
3	LOGISTICS AND TIMING	19
3.1	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF	19
4	REQUIREMENTS	19
5	REPORTS	19
5.1	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	19
5.2	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES	19
5.3	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	19
6	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	19
6.1	CONTENT OF REPORTING	19
6.2	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	19
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	20
7	PRACTICAL INFORMATION	20
	ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	21
	ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM.....	22
	ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	23
	ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE	25
	ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....	26
	ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)	31
	ANNEX VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA	45
	ANNEX VIII: STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION (JIFF COMPONENT)	46

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

During 15- year implementation of two strategies for the development and improvement of the Viet Nam Legal System and Judicial Reform¹, Viet Nam has made significant efforts to develop a robust legal framework and to strengthen legal and judicial institutions towards building a more effective and accountable justice system. Fundamental rights and obligations of citizens are secured by the 2013 Constitution and progressive changes to domestic legislation indicate a growing willingness to embrace the principles of good governance, gender equality, to address all forms of discrimination and violence in the public and private arenas. Efforts are being made to strengthen the rule of law through increased effectiveness and responsiveness of justice institutions, for example the establishment of family and juvenile courts, and the transformation of the legal aid system aligned with the Legal Aid Reform Project and development codes of conducts for professionals in the justice system.

While impressive strides have been made, Viet Nam still faces a number of development challenges to ensure access to justice for all, including: lack of a consistent and predictable legal system and its limited effectiveness and efficiency; weak implementation of laws; limited public legal awareness of rights and lack of sufficient mechanisms for citizens' participation in law development and implementation oversight; and disparities in access to justice persist across several demographic dimensions, such as ethnicity, gender, age, disability, poverty, education and health status. Moreover, the capacity to implement these reforms remain constrained by institutional and human capacity as well as weak coordination between different entities and levels of the justice sector.

Thus, the need to promote legal empowerment and ensure justice to all remains strong in Viet Nam.

More work is needed to improve these institutions' reliability, accountability and accessibility so they can address the widening inequalities and injustices that particularly affect women, children, and vulnerable groups including ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, survivors of gender-based violence and human trafficking and internal migrants. This is not the task of a single institution but requires closely coordinate joint efforts and partnership among political, legislative, executive, and judicial institutions, and civil society organizations, at national and local levels. Progressive changes to domestic legislation indicate a growing willingness to embrace the principles of good governance, promote gender equality, address all forms of discrimination and violence in public and private arenas, and respect and protect human rights. Demonstrable efforts are needed to ensure that the justice sector consistently upholds the rule of law at all levels and abides by international standards of due process and transparency. Stronger mechanisms for transparency and integrity in the judiciary are needed to support the country's development and ensure the protection of human rights, especially as a neutral and effective arbiter to ensure that other branches of government adhere to Viet Nam's Constitution, laws and international legal commitments.

Viet Nam is a member state of the United Nations and has ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, two core components of the

¹

The two main documents upon which the judicial reform agenda is based are the Strategy for the Development and Improvement of Viet Nam's Legal System to 2010 with a Vision to 2020 (Resolution No.48/2005) –LSDS- and the Judicial Reform Strategy for the Period until 2020 Resolution No.49/2005)- LRS.

The LSDS is Vietnam's first long-term legal sector development strategy. The overall objective of the LSDS is to build up a consistent and transparent legal system, to promote the rule of law, and to fulfil human and democratic rights and freedoms. The LSDS emphasises the need for active participation of the people in the reform process. The Judicial Reform Strategy outlines areas in need of revision, including substantive and procedural criminal law, the introduction of adversarial litigation modalities, publication of judgements, and improving both the availability and quality of legal services. The JRS also stresses the need to better engage the public in the process of reforming the justice system. It recognises the importance of promoting greater popular ownership through increased legal awareness and knowledge, and emphasises the role of the media in attaining this objective

International Bill on Human Rights that concern freedom of speech. Furthermore, Viet Nam is obligated to implement accepted recommendations from United Nations' bodies, such as the UN Human Rights Council and the UN Human Rights Committee.

So far, Viet Nam has adopted seven out of the nine international conventions on human rights and has constructive cooperation with the UN Human Rights mechanisms.

Universal Periodic Review (UPR) : In June 2019, Viet Nam presented its reply to the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review to the 41st session of the Human Rights Committee, accepting 241 out of 291 recommendations. Among the accepted recommendation, Viet Nam committed to review all the recommendations of the Committee against Torture and to develop an action plan.

International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR): Viet Nam ratified the ICCPR in 1982. In December 2017, Viet Nam submitted its third report to the Human Rights Committee (HRC) in the context of ICCPR. The report was reviewed the HRC adopted recommendations on 29 August 2019. Death penalty, freedom of expression and human rights defenders were identified as priorities, and Vietnam provided information on the implementation on these recommendations, as requested, by March 2021.

1.2 The Interventions to be evaluated²

Titles of the Interventions to be evaluated	EU Justice and Legal Empowerment Programme in Vietnam (EU JULE) - EU Justice and Legal Empowerment Programme in Vietnam (EU JULE): PGoDA with UNDP - Justice Initiatives Facilitation Fund of the EU Legal and Judicial Empowerment Programme in Viet Nam (EU JULE JIFF) with Oxfam
-	Total amount of EU budget contribution: EUR 14,000,000 UN contribution: EUR 700,000. -Pagoda component: 7 400 000 (90.5 % EU contribution; 4.5% UN) -JIFF component: 6 455 406€
CRIS and / or OPSYS numbers of the Interventions to be evaluated	Decision ACA/2014/37404 • Pagoda: ACA/2015/372-239 • JIFF: ACA/2017/382-514
Dates of the Interventions to be evaluated	• Start:01/11/2017 • End: 30/11/2022

The EU JULE PROGRAMME activities is being delivered through a mix of tools that include two (2) contracts; which are the subject of this mid-term Evaluation. The achievements of these contracts will be reviewed at once.

² The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

- ✓ **ACA/2015/372-239-Agreement with UNDP- PAGODA-** (including working with UNICEF): EUR 7.4M (EUR 6.7M from EU and EUR 0.7 from UN) to support government institutions
- ✓ **ACA/2017/382-51- Justice Initiatives Facilitation Fund (JIFF):** Establishment of a **basket fund for civil society organisations** managed by OXFAM Novib -grant contract-: EUR 6.5 (all EU).

The EU JULE programme aims to strengthen the Rule of law in Vietnam through a more reliable, trusted and better accessed justice system.

This objective will be achieved by increasing access to justice for vulnerable groups, and in particular for women, children, ethnic minorities and poor people.

The strategic approach is to make people aware of their legal rights, help them invoke those rights in practice, and to improve the availability of pragmatic legal advice, assistance and, when needed, representation.

The strategic and rights-based approach of the Programme is to address the demand-side and the supply-side constraints in the justice sector by building, in a coherent and coordinated manner, the capacity of Government institutions at both the central and provincial level. This is undertaken in coordination with the building of capacity of civil society under the JIFF mechanism of the EU JULE programme. On the demand-side, the Programme will increase levels of public knowledge and awareness around the rights and legal remedies that exist and are available under the current laws and regulations in Viet Nam, and improve the availability of legal services such as legal advice, assistance and representation, for those groups in society who are known to face exceptional difficulties in accessing justice (women, children, ethnic minorities and the poor). Such demand-side support is then combined with further strengthening of the supply-side of the justice system by the targeted support to reforms that prove necessary to overcome specific obstacles in the implementation of laws and regulations or for the revision of laws and regulations that are proven to constitute substantial impediments to enhancing access to justice

EU JULE Programme is implemented in collaboration with Ministry of Justice, the Supreme People's Court, the Supreme People Procuracy, the Ministry of Public Security, the Viet Nam Lawyers' Association, the Viet Nam Bar Federation, and others.

The Pagoda component of the programme has a national coverage and the JIFF component has a focus on 6 provinces selected on the basis of poverty rate, socio economic conditions, prevalence of ethnic minorities, mountainous remote areas : Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Dong Thap, Nghe An, Hoa Binh, Quang Binh

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the programme are to be achieved through four results:

- (1) Result 1: Increased public awareness and understanding of rights and how to invoke those rights.
- (2) Result 2: Increased access to legal advice, assistance and representation in both civil and criminal matters.
- (3) Result 3: Improved enabling legislative and regulatory framework for legal empowerment and access to justice.
- (4) Result 4: Enhanced integrity and transparency in the justice sector.

Pagoda component:

The Pagoda component contributes to the 4 EU JULE Programme results.

To implement the Action, the main approach and methodologies include (i) technical assistance to and capacity development of state institutions, in particular for the strengthening of judicial integrity; and (ii) support the generation of independent information and evidence on the formal/informal judicial systems (sub-grants to research institutes and universities) through quantitative and qualitative surveys, research studies, analysis of statistical data, and for activities promoting civil society and parliamentary oversight of the judicial systems.

To reach the project objectives, the Action is designed as an integrated intervention comprising 4 main pillars as focus areas: (i) rights awareness and understanding of rights holders; (ii) accessible legal advice and representation; (iii) legal empowerment framework and mechanisms; and (iv) judicial institutions and actors with integrity and transparency. In each of the focus areas UNDP and UNICEF will pay attention to issues listed below as key to addressing gaps and barriers to realizing legal empowerment, increasing access to justice and protecting rights across all sectors in the society:

- Enhancing the accountability of state actors in implementation;
- Strengthening national and provincial capacities to rigorously monitor and evaluate performance of judicial institutions and actors both at national and sub-national levels;
- Strengthening sectoral and inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms, platforms and practices for rights protection and administration of justice;
- Improving data systems and evidence-based processes, with a strong focus on integrity, transparency, equality and accessibility;
- Supporting the engagement and participation of citizens and civil society to engage in legislative process and monitoring law implementation and performance of judicial institutions;
- Increasing responsiveness and ‘people-centeredness’ in the justice sector

The first expected result on increasing legal awareness will be achieved through advocating the development and implementation of a comprehensive and professional legal empowerment behaviour strategy to strengthen the capacity of all types of judicial agencies and persons providing legal information, judicial service and enforcement to ensure they address the legal awareness needs of the vulnerable groups, including women, children, ethnic minorities and the poor. In addition, a capacity building program for legal communicators and disseminators, who play an important role in providing legal information to citizen, will be developed using people-centered approach and innovative methodologies. Specific interventions to raise public awareness on protection of rights and access to justice for some specific groups also another area of focus.

Increased access to legal advice, assistance and representation in both criminal and civil cases, especially for some specific vulnerable groups such as women, children, especially gender based violence and child victims of abuse, ethnic minorities and person in custody, who have particularly urgent needs for legal assistance under Result 2 will be achieved through capacity building for the supply-side, including legal aid providers, law enforcement, targeted support for implementation of the Law on Legal Aid and Legal Aid Reform, operation of the Family and Juvenile Court. In addition, promoting community-based and annexed to the court dispute resolution mechanisms, is also an intervention under Result 2.

Key interventions are identified under Result 3 based on international standards set out in the UN core human right conventions³ to support Vietnam to improve the enabling legislative and regulatory framework

³ including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and other normative documents.

for legal empowerment and access to justice. Constructive policy dialogues among various stakeholders with involvement of the international community and civil society are promoted to discuss on how to implement policies that increase the consistency of the justice sector, heighten awareness of legal rights, and improve access to justice services for vulnerable communities.

To achieve expected Result 4 on increased integrity and transparency in the justice sector, key interventions include the development and implementation the codes of conduct and ethical standards for legal professionals, in particular code of conducts for judges and lawyers. Publication of court judgement, legal precedent as well as its guidelines, together with development of a justice index also are key interventions toward transparent justice system

The logical framework was original envisaged in the Description of Action, a part of the PAGoDA and JIFF agreements in 2015 is based on data sources that are no longer available in Viet Nam, e.g the Viet Nam Justice Index and official data. In addition, it appears that most indicators are formulated as outcome indicators, i.e. not in the control of the EU JULE programme alone.

To better measure direct outputs of the programme and ensure indicators and targets are in fact measurable, the original logical framework was proposed to be reviewed, revising the numerical targets, which were being dependent on the unavailable data sources, amending indicators as well as proposing of new means of verification. The Logical Framework has been amended in the Rider 3 to the Delegation Agreement and the Rider 1 to the Grant Contract (in October 2020).

The JIFF component :

The JIFF component directly contributes to the 4 Programme results. Additionally, in the design of JIFF, Oxfam has set 3 Sub-results that each contribute to the above four..

Specific objective: To increase access to justice for vulnerable groups, particularly women, children. The objectives and results of the Action will be achieved through a program of grant-making to civil society organizations (CSOs) linked to capacity development, networking, and evidence-based research for national-level policy dialogue.

Sub-result 1: Civil society organizations and networks in northern, central, and southern Vietnam complete 64 JIFF grants on priority topics related to 4 Results.

Sub-result 2: A minimum of 48 civil society organizations and networks in focus provinces deliver better quality legal services, undertake more effective, evidence based advocacy and become more effective organizations.

Sub-result 3: Networking and collaboration among at least 50 CSOs and policy makers facilitates evidence-based dialogue on JIFF priority topics and increases transparency and accountability in the justice sector

Sub-grants under Results 1 and 2 will directly benefit an estimated 80,000 people belonging to one or more vulnerable groups. An estimated 48,000 people will demonstrate increased awareness and understanding of legal rights; and at least 32,000 people will receive legal advice or assistance. Sub-grants under Results 3 and 4 will increase opportunities for access to justice for at least 4,500,000 people in 6 focus provinces. All Vietnamese citizens will benefit indirectly from changes in the regulatory environment and transparency of the justice sector.

Oxfam in Vietnam (OiV) hosts the JIFF Secretariat and delivers its principal functions, ensuring the effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Action as follows:

- Administration of basket fund for civil society organizations: manage whole cycle of granting from developing guidelines for proposals, to launching calls, screening of applications, finance management and monitoring of grants on priority topics in 4 result areas; administer JIFF basket fund through a dedicated bank account, including financial management, accounting and reporting; prepare and submit work plans, budgets, progress reports; prepare accounts for audits and audited annual financial statements; maintain all necessary documents for audit verification; and all responsibilities to refund and repay EU as relevant; develop guidelines and policies for the sub-contracting of technical assistance.
- Technical assistance and capacity development for civil society organizations: through pre- and post-grant training and coaching for CSOs in the justice sector; capacity assessment and training of grantees including governance with internal policy and control, administrative, financial and operational management; substance related capacity development of civil society interventions related to the four key results of the action, including on research and advocacy; monitoring of all CSO grants.
- Network development for policy advocacy: facilitation of provincial networks of CSOs in the justice sector; formation of a national justice platform; and organizing national dialogues on key policy topics.
- Act as Secretariat for the Grants Committee: liaise with the respective chair persons; announce meetings and distribute documentation to the members; proceedings, minutes and follow up from semi-annual meetings, ethnic minorities, and poor people

The preconditions and assumptions identified in the description of action were as follows:

A key pre-condition is that the financing agreement between EU and the Government of Vietnam for the implementation of EU JULE will constitute the legal umbrella for the implementation of EU JULE JIFF grants and other program actions. As such, it is anticipated that all organizations awarded EU JULE JIFF grantees will be able to implement their projects/actions without requiring further registration and/or authorisation by relevant authorities. This would also include that Oxfam receives the same approval.

Key assumptions concern the government's openness and commitment to engage CSOs in the national platform of dialogue so as to provide an enabling environment and to be responsive to Oxfam's role in facilitating the close coordination with state institutions to promote the engagement between CSOs and government in a sector wide approach. A strong working relationship between the JIFF and PAGODA components of EU JULE is also crucial to ensuring the overall success of the program and leveraging strong working relationships with government counterparts.

Other assumptions at result and sub-result level are listed in the logical framework. These include the use of ethnic minority languages; the possibility for grant calls on civil and criminal law, as well as legal representation of vulnerable groups; the inclusion of justice-related laws on the National Assembly legislative calendar; and the possibility to disseminate research results in the media.

The evaluation team will assess to what extent these preconditions and assumptions have been respected.

Implementation: The programme started in 2017, due to the pending the adoption of the Government's Programme Document, the first meeting of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) was held on 20 August 2018 and the Programme was launched on 12 October 2018. The programme was extended to 30 November 2022.

The programme has already been implemented for almost three years with a number of activities have been accomplished aiming at bringing justice closer to vulnerable groups; hence the Mid-term evaluation is planned to assess programme's progress against objective, expected results and identify key challenges

in achieving programmes; outcome and provide appropriate recommendations for the programme to reach its objective for the remaining period.

In addition, Covid-19 caused great impact on the implementation of the programme. It is necessary to evaluate how implementing agencies and Vietnamese partners manage to carry out activities showing the resilience during this exceptionally difficult time.

The mid- term evaluation will be outcome oriented, meaning that the evaluation should go beyond the assessment of programme activities and be geared as much as possible to programme contributions to the desired changes of justice system in Vietnam in general.

1.3 Stakeholders of the Intervention

In line with its objectives and specific activities, the Action has the following main targets:

- Ministry of Justice (MOJ)
- Supreme People's Court (SPC)
- Supreme People's Procuracy (SPP)
- Ministry of Public Security (MPS)
- Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA)
- Vietnam Lawyers' Association (VLA)
- Vietnam Bar Federation (VBF)
- JIFF grantees and other
- Vietnam Justice Association for the Poor (**VIJUSAP**)
- Institute for Policy Research, Law and Development (**PLD**).
- Provincial authorities in particular in the 6 JIFF target provinces of Hoa Binh, Hanoi, Nghe An, Quang Binh, HCMC and Dong Thap
- Communities in EU JULE six target provinces and **cities**
- Civil society organisation working on legal issues

Other target groups include provincial departments of justice; the provincial courts and provincial procuracies; relevant agencies; committees and agencies of the National Assembly; law universities and research institutions relating to law and justice, and the media.

In particular, the following groups are beneficiary groups identified as vulnerable within the Action:

- The poor
- Women, in particular the survivors of gender based violence
- Children in conflict with the law and child victims/witness of crimes
- Ethnic minorities.

JIFF stakeholders, roles and their relationships can be visualized in the Annex VIII diagram.

1.4 Other available information

Please find in Annex the Minutes of Project Steering Committees

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	mid-term
Coverage	The intervention in its entirety will be evaluated
Geographic scope	Vietnam : all provinces for Pagoda Focus provinces for JIFF : Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Dong Thap, Nghe An, Hoa Binh, Quang Binh
Period to be evaluated	the entire period of the Intervention to date (Nov 2019- to June 2021)

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority⁴ of the European Commission⁵. The focus of evaluations is on the **assessment of achievements**, the **quality** and the **results**⁶ of Interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.⁷

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** among: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

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

- an overall independent assessment of the performance of the EU JULE PROGRAMME, paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future interventions.

This evaluation will serve as means to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and visibility of the Action. This evaluation should provide recommendations on how to improve the

⁴ COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

⁵ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", https://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁶ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf

⁷ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

Intervention during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to understand the performance of the Intervention, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results to inform the planning of the future EU intervention foreseen for “Strengthening Governance, Rule of Law and Institutional reform” under Vietnam Multi Annual Indicative Programme 2021-2027⁸.

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation to Viet Nam, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Public Security, the Supreme People’s Court, the Supreme People’s Procuracy, UNDP, UNICEF, Oxfam, JIFF grantees as well as stakeholders defined in 1.3.

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);

In its assessment, the evaluation team will use the six standard DAC evaluation criteria **integrating human rights and gender equality** and the EU added value

The definition of the 6 DAC + 1 EU evaluation criteria is contained for reference in the Annex VII.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment, digitalisation and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Intervention, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁹ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

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

1. Assess the relevance and coherence of the programme:

⁸ The MIP 2021-2027 has not yet been adopted and therefore the title and scope of the intervention might be modified.

⁹ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

- To what extent was the EU JULE Programme in line with national development priorities, country programme outputs and outcomes, the EU's Multiannual Indicative Programme and priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs ? In particular, how well do the design and areas covered help Viet Nam implement the Constitution 2013, the Strategy for the Development and Improvement of Viet Nam's Legal System to 2010 with a Vision to 2020 and the Judicial Reform Strategy for the Period until 2020? To what extent has the EU JULE Programme been appropriately responsive to, legal, and justice,, changes in the country? If not, what should be changed?
- To what extent does the EU JULE Programme contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent does the EU JULE Programme contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- How has the project been relevant to target groups' needs and aligned with EU and Vietnamese Government's strategy regarding increasing access to justice for vulnerable people and strengthening the rule of law?
- Have all the pre-conditions and assumptions are relevant during the implementation? How has the project adapted to the changes in the context (i.e changing from Vietnamese governmental legal framework, Covid-19, roles and involvement of key stakeholders (PSC, PMU, local authorities and CSOs)?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?
- How have both component of the project been compatible and synergised with each other and with and other interventions in the country, in justice sector and in partner organizations?
- To what extend has EU JULE been linked or synergized with other development programs in Vietnam led by the EU, the Vietnamese government, UN and CSOs in order to create coordinated and larger impacts? What are critical factors supporting or preventing the linkage and synergy?

2. Assess the effectiveness of the programme:

- Identify and assess overall progress, and results achieved by component. Assess how they contributed to the overall purpose of the programme. The mid-term evaluation will also look into the logframe and indicators of results achieved.
- To what extent did the EU JULE Programme contribute to the EU priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan and country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs and national development priorities?
- Are the EU JULE Programme objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? Do they clearly address women, men and vulnerable groups?
- What factors have contributed to achieving, or not, intended outputs and outcomes? What are key constraints and challenges in achieving programmes expected results?

- In which areas does the EU JULE Programme have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the EU JULE Programme build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the EU JULE Programme have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the EU JULE Programme objectives?
- To what extent have different stakeholders been involved in EU JULE Programme implementation?
- Assess the appropriateness of implementation modalities and the level of involvement its beneficiaries; as well as the adequacy of the EUD engagement in support of the programme implementation. To what extent has the partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? To what extent are EU JULE Programme management and implementation participatory, and is this participation of men, women and vulnerable groups contributing towards achievement of the EU JULE Programme objectives?

3. Assess the efficiency of the programme:

- To what extent was the EU JULE Programme management structure as outlined in the EU JULE Programme document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have both component implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent have EU JULE Programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the Monitoring and evaluations systems utilized by both components ensure effective and efficient project management?
- How have the Programme ensured the communication and visibility? How can the programme be better communicated?

4. Assess the sustainability of the programme and how the results and benefits will be maintained after EU JULE ends. Suggest actions which could ensure continuity in the areas covered by EU JULE.

- What have the project stakeholders been doing to sustain its results financially, institutionally, environmentally and at policy level?
- To what extent will targeted beneficiaries from the EU JULE Programme interventions continue in the long-term?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the EU JULE Programme?

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of EU JULE Programme outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do EU JULE interventions have already formulated well-designed and well-planned exit strategies? What could be done to strengthen its exit strategies and sustainability?

5. Assess the impact of the programme

- To what extent has the project achievements contributed to a more reliable, trusted and better accessed justice system in Vietnam
- Determine if the programme has produced improvements in the technical and/or managerial capacity EU JULE beneficiaries

6. Assess the visibility of the programme (in line with EU guidelines), including any impact on the EU visibility in Viet Nam.

7. Lessons learned, best practices as well as recommendations to sustain the programme results to be considered by the beneficiaries/EU JULE stakeholders, and recommendations that can be useful to take into account during the programming of any future EU funded intervention. Recommendations on main issues to be addressed in future interventions. .

8. Cross-cutting issues: have the relevant cross cutting issues, including human rights, disability and gender equality, empowerment of women and COVID 19 been adequately mainstreamed in the design and the implementation of the programme? To what extent environmental and/or climate related challenges as well as digital transformation aspects have been taken into account?

- Human rights: to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from Programme's intervention?
- Gender equality: to what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Is the gender marker assigned to this project representative of reality? To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Disability: were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme implementation?
- COVID-19 related question: what has been the impact of COVID-19 on the project implementation? How did the project respond?

9. **EU added value:** to which extent does the Intervention bring additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only?

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases

- Inception/desk
- Field
- Synthesis
- Dissemination

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the **Contracting Authority** (EU Delegation) and/or the **Reference Group**, consisting of members of EU Delegation and members of EU JULE Programme Management Unit at Ministry of Justice, UNDP and UNICEF (Pagoda component) and Oxfam (JIFF component). The main content of each output is described in Chapter **Error! Reference source not found..**

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Inception Phase and Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Inception interviews • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short briefing session with EU Delegation in Hanoi () • Kick-off meeting with the Reference Group. • Inception Note • Slide presentation of the Inception Note

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Interviews with implementing partners (if deemed relevant in the inception note) • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase • Methodological design of the Field Phase Gathering of primary evidence with the use of most appropriate techniques • Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing at EU Delegation • Initial meetings at country level with main stakeholders • Intermediary Note • Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase • Debriefing with the Reference Group
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations • Reporting • Organisation of the consultation workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Report • Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module • Consultation workshop on draft report + draft summary of recommendations • Slide presentation • Final Report
<u>Dissemination phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final debriefing meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final debriefing meeting with the EU Delegation and the Reference Group • Submission of complete reports to EUD

Meetings will be face to face, COVID 19 situation permitting.

2.3.2 Inception Phase and desk phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed. This phase is also when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Intervention.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a short meeting with EU Delegation in Hanoi () followed with kick-off session in Hanoi between the Reference Group composed of representatives of EUD, MOJ-PMU; Pagoda (UNDP, UNICEF), JIFF (OXFAM) and the evaluators. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

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

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to Governance in Vietnam, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager will validate or reconstruct, the Intervention Logic of the Intervention to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Intervention that describes how change is expected to happen within the Intervention, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Intervention to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases. All these should be part of the Inception Note?

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix¹⁰, which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the **Inception Note**. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected face-to-face or phone interviews with the programme management, the EUD in and key partners in Hanoi may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the inception/desk phase an **Inception & desk Note** will be prepared on the basis of the information collected; its content is described in Chapter **Error! Reference source not found.**

2.3.3 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the **Inception & desk note** by the Evaluation Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Inception/Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

¹⁰ The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with EUD in Hanoi, MoJ-PMU, UNDP-UNICEF and Oxfam as well as other relevant stakeholders identified in the inception note.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the Reference Group.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** and a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter **Error! Reference source not found.**

2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.
- The evaluation team will deliver and then present the **Draft Final Report** during a 2 days workshop to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. Two day of presence is required of – as minimum – for all members of the evaluation team (tentatively in Halong end October –November to be confirmed Participants to the workshop will be EUD, MoJ, implementing agencies (both PAGOda and JIFF), other stakeholders (estimation of 70 people). It will be financed under the Pagoda Component.
- A summary of recommendations expressed will be drafted by the evaluation team at the end of the seminar.

Following the workshop, the **Evaluation Manager** consolidates the comments expressed and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be

corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.3.5 Dissemination phase

A final debriefing meeting with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group will be organised and the final reports distributed.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard Service for the Implementation of External Aid (SIEA) template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably human rights, gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager at EUD in Hanoi; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Delegation and members of EU JULE Programme Management Unit at Ministry of Justice, UNDP and UNICEF (Pagoda component) and Oxfam (JIFF component).

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

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

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- 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 outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.

- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

3 LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

3.1 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff¹¹

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the **Inception Note**). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

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

4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

5 REPORTS

For the list of reports, please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

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

5.2 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 6 paper copies and in electronic version at no extra cost.

5.3 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1 Content of reporting

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

6.2 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 6 calendar days. The revised reports addressing

¹¹ As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

the comments shall be submitted within 5 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 not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

6.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

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

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

7 PRACTICAL INFORMATION

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address: delegation-vietnam-cris-fwc-offers@eeas.europa.eu

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services n.SIEA 2018- 5354

FWC SIEA 2018 – LOT 3- Human Rights, Democracy and Peace

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price¹².

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

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</i>	40
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organisation of tasks including timetable	5
<i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i>	60
<i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i>	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

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

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

Phone interviews will be tentatively carried out during the period from **18/08/2021 to 25/08/2021**

¹² For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

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

- Multiannual Indicative Programme for Viet Nam; MIP 2014-2020
- Mid Term Evaluation of the MIP
- Strategy for the Development and Improvement of Viet Nam's Legal System to 2010 with a Vision to 2020 (Resolution No.48/2005) –
- LSDS- and the Judicial Reform Strategy for the Period until 2020 Resolution No.49/2005)- LRS.
- Country Strategy Paper for Vietnam and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- EU JULE feasibility / formulation studies
- EU JULE financing agreement and addenda
- Contracts with UNDP and Oxfam and addenda
- EU JULE annual reports from Pagoda and JIFF component
- Studies produced by both components
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Intervention(s)
- 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 intervention.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

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

1. Introduction

A description of the Intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (*optional*)

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

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt	Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.
4.1 Conclusions	<p>This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.</p> <p>In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.</p>
4.2 Recommendations	<p>They are intended to improve or reform the Intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Intervention for the next cycle.</p> <p>Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.</p>
5. Annexes to the report	<p>The report should include the following annexes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Terms of Reference of the evaluation • The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person) • Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses. • Evaluation Matrix • Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated) • Relevant geographic map(s) where the Intervention took place • List of persons/organisations consulted • Literature and documentation consulted • Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant • Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

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

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

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹³		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹³ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

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

Intervention (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

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

Legend: scores and their meaning

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

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows		
1. Clarity of the report		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers • Highlight the key messages • The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced • Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding • Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report) • Avoid unnecessary duplications • Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors • The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology • The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations • The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

5. Usefulness of recommendations		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions • Are concrete, achievable and realistic • Are targeted to specific addressees • Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound • (If relevant) provide advice for the Intervention's exit strategy, post-Intervention sustainability or for adjusting Intervention's design or plans 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis <i>(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)</i>		
<p>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons are identified • When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s) 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
Final comments on the overall quality of the report		Overall score

--	--

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

Logframe for PGoDA component

#	Results	Indicators	Baseline (2017)	Target	Means of verification
1	Result 1: <i>Increased public awareness and understanding of rights and how to invoke those rights</i>	<p>(a) Number of communes/wards which qualify/meet the criteria in Decision 619/QD-TTg dated 8 May 2017, including on legal dissemination</p> <p>(b) Number of legal communicators and disseminators who have accessed the training programme under EU JULE</p> <p>(c) Number of women who receive gender-sensitive information on protection against GBV under EU JULE</p> <p>(d) Number of children who receive child-sensitive information on the protection of their rights under EU JULE</p>	<p>(a): NA (data available from 2018)</p> <p>(b): 0 (The training programme is developed in 2020. The first training activity starts in 2021)</p> <p>(c): 0 (The information on protection against GBV is developed in 2020, available in 2021)</p> <p>(d): 0 (the information on protection of children rights is developed in 2020, available in 2021)</p>	<p>(a) 2018: 60% 2019: 70% 2020: 75% 2021: 80% 2022: 85%</p> <p>(b) 2020: 0 2021: 200 2022: 1,000</p> <p>(c) 2021: 30,000 2022': 60,000</p> <p>(d) 2021: 50,000 2022': 100,000</p>	<p>a) Estimated figure in January; Official data available in May MOV: MOJ reports</p> <p>b) Project Report; MOJ Department of Legal Dissemination and Education report</p> <p>c) Project Report; MOJ Department of Legal Dissemination and Education report</p> <p>d) Project Report; VLA, MOJ Department of Legal Dissemination and Education report</p>

2	Result 2: Increased access to legal advice, assistance and representation in both civil and criminal matters	<p>(a) Number of cases in which legal aid representation is provided</p> <p>(b) Number of legal aid providers who receive training under EU JULE</p> <p>(c) Number of mediators who receive training under EU JULE</p> <p>(d) Number of Family and Juvenile judges that have been trained and certified in dealing with children in contact with the justice system</p> <p>(e) Number of child justice training programmes institutionalized by relevant justice professional academies/universities</p>	<p>(a): Official data not available</p> <p>(b): 0 (The training programme is developed in 2020. The first training activity starts in 2021)</p> <p>(c): 0 (The training programme is developed in 2020. The first training activity starts in 2021)</p> <p>(d): 0 (The training programme is developed in 2019. The first training activity starts in 2020)</p> <p>(e): 0</p>	<p>(a): 2018: 18,000 2019: 20,000 2020: 22,000 2021: 24,000 2022: 25,000</p> <p>(b): 2021: 120 2022: 350</p> <p>(c) 2021: 100 2022: 300</p> <p>(d) 2020: 60 2021: 150 2022: 240</p> <p>(e): 2020: 1 2021: 2 2022: 3</p>	<p>(a) Estimated figure in January; Official data available in May MOV: MOJ reports</p> <p>(b) Project report</p> <p>(c) Project report</p> <p>(d) Court Academy's Report</p> <p>(e) Project report</p>
3	Result 3: Improved enabling legislative and regulatory framework for legal empowerment and access to justice	(a) Number of new legal documents and policies adopted for improved legal empowerment and access to justice	(a): NA	<p>(a): 2018: 0 2019: 2 2020: 3 2021: 5 2022: 7</p>	(a) Official Gazette; Data published on <i>duthaonline.quochoi.vn</i> and other publically accessible channels

		<p>(b) Number of laws/regulations reviewed for better implementation, supported by EU JULE</p> <p>(c) Number of legal studies produced by EU JULE</p> <p>(d) Existence of indicators on children in contact with law and children involved in family law cases integrated in the reporting systems of the Supreme People's Court and Procuracy</p>	<p>(b): 0</p> <p>(c): 0</p> <p>(d) No</p>	<p>(b) 2018: 1 2019: 2 2020: 3 2021: 5 2022: 7</p> <p>(c) 2018: 1 2019: 2 2020: 4 2021: 6 2022: 8</p> <p>(d) 2022: Available</p>	<p>(b) Project report; Media coverage; reports of relevant agencies</p> <p>(c) Project Report</p> <p>(d) SPC's and SPP's report</p>
4	Result 4: Enhanced integrity and transparency in the justice sector	<p>(a) Number of codes of conducts and relevant regulations developed and/or reviewed</p> <p>(b) Number of precedents promulgated</p>	<p>(a): 0</p> <p>(b): 16</p> <p>(c): 0</p>	<p>(a): 2018:0 2019: 0 2020: 1 2021: 2 2022: 3</p> <p>(b) 2018: 20 2019: 25 2020: 30 2021: 35 2022: 40</p> <p>(c) 2018:0 2019: 200</p>	<p>(a) Reports of relevant state agencies</p> <p>(b) Data published on anle.toaan.gov.vn</p>

		(c) Number of judicial officers trained on enhanced integrity and transparency in the justice sector under EU JULE	(d): 0	2020: 250 2021: 300 2022: 500	(c) SPC, VBF's reports; Project reports; Media coverage
		(d) Precedent proposals reviewed and publicly consulted under EU JULE	(e): 0	(d) 2018: 0 2019: 8 2020: 15 2021: 20 2022: 25	(d) SPC's activity reports; Project Reports; Media coverage
		(e) Number of tools (including survey and statistical analysis) contributing to the measurement of the performance of the justice sector under EU JULE		(e): 2018: 0 2019: 0 2020: 1 2021: 2 2022: 3	(e) Project Report

Logframe matrix for JIFF component (Revised July 2020)

The logframe matrix should evolve during the project lifetime: new lines can be added for listing new activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and values will be regularly updated in the column foreseen for reporting purpose (see “current value”).

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective (Goal)	To strengthen the rule of law through a more reliable, trusted and better accessed justice system.	(a) Score for ‘no improper government influence’ (b) Score for ‘Judicial independence, fairness, and citizen access to justice’ (c) Rule of Law index factor scores for civil justice and criminal justice	To be set at EU JULE program level		To be set at EU JULE program level	(a) Rule of Law Index (b) Global Integrity Index (c) World Justice Project	Low risk of reversal of the fundamental principles of the Judicial Reform Strategy. Assumption of continued political and economic stability.
Specific objective (Impact)	To increase access to justice for vulnerable groups, particularly women, children, ethnic minorities, and poor people.	(a) Aggregate indicator on accessibility of the justice system (b) Increase in rankings of JIFF focus provinces on justice and public administration indices (c) % of people from vulnerable groups in JIFF focus provinces who believe they can get justice if they have a grievance (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, and income level) (d) Evidence of thematic and geographic linkage between JIFF and UN/PAGODA activities in each objective area.	(a) PAPI National (2017) baseline = 36.56 (b) Provincial PAPI (2017) for each of the focus province (Hanoi – 34.64; Hoa Binh – 37.27; Nghe An – 35.37; Quang		(a) Increase 40% to 51.18 at the PAPI 2022 report (b) Increasing score of all PAPI provinces by 40% (Hanoi – 48.5; Hoa Binh – 52.2; Nghe An – 49.5; Quang Binh – 55; Ho Chi Minh city –	(a) PAPI reports (b) PAPI reports (c) Annual provincial law access index (d) JIFF and PAGODA reports; final evaluation.	Commitment by Government maintained to give effect to rights enumerated in the Constitution. Positive working relationships between the JIFF and UN/PAGODA components of JULE.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
			Binh – 39.53; Ho Chi Minh city – 35.88; and Dong Thap – 37.33) (c) Provincial law access index 2017 for each of the focus province. (Dong Thap: 92.36%; Hanoi: 73.29%; HCM City: 94.04%; Hoa Binh: 10.48%; Nghe An: 36.67%; Quang Binh: 79.87%) (d) 0		50.2; and Dong Thap – 52.2) (c) Evidence show increasing score of all Provincial law access index. (d) Evidence of linkage in all 4 result areas and at least 2 priority topics.		PAGODA component delivers expected results from supply side interventions.
Results (Outcomes)	1. Increased public awareness and understanding of legal rights and how to invoke these rights.	(a) # of people in JIFF focus provinces whose rights awareness increases after grantee activities (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, and income level) (b) Increase in rankings of JIFF focus provinces on awareness of fundamental rights	(a) Inception study on selected focus provinces. (b) Provincial PAPI (2017) for each of the focus province		(a) Est. 54,000 people (18 grants in this result area * 3,000 pp/grant); min. 50% female, 40% ethnic	(a) JIFF online monitoring & evaluation system.	Sufficient good quality proposals from CSOs focusing on rights awareness, covering all targeted provinces.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
					minority, 50% under 30, 50% poor or near- poor (b) Evidence show increasing score of all PAPI provinces	(b) PAPI report 2022	Information can be presented in major written and spoken ethnic minority languages in JIFF focus provinces.
	2. Increased access to legal advice, assistance and representation in administrative, civil, and criminal matters.	(a) # of people in JIFF focus provinces who benefit from access to legal advice or assistance from JIFF grantees (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, and income level) (b) # of disputes resolved or mediated by JIFF grantees (c) # of court cases representing vulnerable people contributed to by JIFF grantees	(a) 0 (b) 0 (c) 0		(a) Est. 32,000 people (32 grants in this result area * 1,000 pp/grant); 50% female, 40% ethnic minority, 50% under 30, 50% poor (b) Est. 80 (4 grants on this topic * 20 disputes/grant) (c) Est. 20 (4 grants on this topic * 5 cases/grant)	(a) JIFF online monitoring & evaluation system. (b) JIFF online monitoring & evaluation system. (c) JIFF online monitoring & evaluation system.	JIFF grant proposals from CSOs are accepted on areas including dispute resolution and court representation. CSOs are qualified to engage in issues of legal advice, assistance and representation.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	3. Improved enabling environment and regulatory framework for legal empowerment and access to justice.	(a) # of positive changes in laws and regulations that can be attributed to JIFF grantees' advocacy activities on priority topics. (b) Quality of laws/ regulations in terms of practically facilitating access to justice and legal empowerment.	(a) 0 (b) No data		(a) 4 (Law and policies for 4 priority topics) (b) Documented positive contributions.	(a) Official Gazette. (b) Independent assessment commissioned by EU.	Laws and regulations selected for advocacy are kept on the National Assembly and ministries' agendas. Law and policy development processes are open for public participation and consultation.
	4. Enhanced integrity, transparency and accountability in the justice sector.	(b) # of articles/reports/ research produced contributing to enhanced integrity, transparency and accountability in the justice sector.	(b) 0		(b) Est. 110 media articles (20/year) + 10 reports (5 research grants * 2 reports/grant)	(b) JIFF progress reports.	Articles/reports/ research can be distributed in the justice sector and to the general public. Implementation of Law on Access to Information contributes to increased transparency.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Sub-results (Outputs)	Sub-Result 1: Civil society organizations and networks in northern, central, and southern Vietnam complete 64 JIFF grants on priority topics related to 4 Results.	<p>(a) # of grants made on raising awareness among vulnerable groups, including women, children, ethnic minorities, and poor people</p> <p>(b) # of grants made to provide legal advice, assistance and representation for vulnerable groups in administrative, civil and criminal matters</p> <p>(c) # of grants made to constructively engage with policy makers on issues pertaining to legal empowerment and access to justice based on demand driven research.</p> <p>(d) # of grants made to civil society actors (media, CSOs and academics) to research and report on corruption and malpractice in the justice sector, and to enhance integrity and transparency in the justice sector.</p>	<p>(a) 0</p> <p>(b) 0</p> <p>(c) 0</p> <p>(d) 0</p>		<p>Minimum 5% of total grants (cumulative) are made in each result area.</p> <p>Minimum 20% of total grants (cumulative) are made in each of 3 geographical regions.</p>	JIFF progress reports.	<p>All grants contribute to one or more of JIFF priority topics related to the 4 Results.</p> <p>Priority topics and focus provinces are selected in the inception phase.</p> <p>Priority topics link to activities of PAGODA component.</p>
	Sub-Result 2: A minimum of 48 civil society organizations and networks in 6 focus provinces deliver better	(a) # of CSO staff/members who complete pre-grant awareness raising and capacity development activities (disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, and region)	<p>(a) 0</p> <p>(b) 0</p> <p>(c) 0</p> <p>(d) 0</p>		<p>(a) 480 people (48 CSOs * 10 staff or members/CSO) ; 50% female; 25% ethnic minority; min.</p>	<p>(a) JIFF project reports</p> <p>(b) Grantee narrative reports</p>	PAGODA activities complement JIFF's awareness raising and capacity development for CSOs.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	quality legal services, undertake more effective, evidence based advocacy and become more effective organizations.	(b) % of JIFF grantees who complete capacity development plans and report improvements in their technical and organizational capacity as a result of JIFF coaching and support (c) % of JIFF grants that achieve their set objectives and targets (d) % of grantees meeting JIFF financial management, accounting and reporting requirements.			30% in each region (b) 80% (c) 90% (d) 90%	(c) JIFF online monitoring & evaluation system (d) Grantee financial and narrative reports	
	Sub-Result 3: Networking and collaboration among at least 50 CSOs and policy makers facilitates evidence-based dialogue on JIFF priority topics and increases transparency and accountability in the justice sector.	(a) Number, type and location of CSOs participating in national platform activities. (b) # of national dialogues held between CSOs and policy makers that generate specific follow-up plans. (c) # of people participating in policy dialogues (from CSOs and government, disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, and region)	(a) 0 (b) 0 (c) 0		(a) Est. 15 CSOs (5/region) representing JIFF grantees (b) 4 (1 dialogues/year) (c) Est. 50 pp/ dialogue (40% from govt, 40% female, 20% ethnic minority, min. 25% per region)	JIFF progress reports; grantee narrative reports	National platform and policy dialogue activities contribute to JIFF priority topics related to the 4 Results. National platform and policy dialogue activities supported by evidence-based research by JIFF grantees. Outcomes of national dialogues are communicated

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
							within justice sector and in media/online.
Activities for inception phase	0.1. Select provinces for program implementation 0.2. Consultation visits and assessments of justice priorities in selected provinces 0.3. Initial coordination meeting with PAGoDA team and government counterparts 0.4. Select priority topics (related to 4 results) that program will focus on during implementation 0.5. Setting up grant committee 0.6. Setting up the program website and monitoring system 0.7. Develop guidelines and policies for grant-making and participatory monitoring 0.8. Develop guidelines and policies for contracting of technical assistance 0.9. Organize national launching workshop for the program 0.10. Submit inception report	Means: - Personnel: Team leader, Global adviser on access to justice, CS capacity development adviser, Research and governance adviser, MEL specialist, Communication and Media specialist, Program finance officer, Program officer and Interns. Additional time of capacity development adviser, Research and governance adviser, and Communication and Media specialist budgeted for inception phase. - Equipment: Laptop computers and other office supplies - Operational facilities: Trips, per diems, venues, office materials, local transport, services, equipment, participant expenses. Costs: 40,675.37 EUR				External factors: - Agreement between Secretariat, Steering committee, and MOJ on priority topics - Support from local authorities for implementation of JIFF grants in their provinces	
Activities for Sub-Result 1	1.1. Organize “roadshows” in each of 3 regions to introduce EU JULE JIFF and release the calls 1.2. Assessment of the proposals and announcing the awarded proposals	Means: - Personnel: Team leader, Global adviser on access to justice, CS capacity development adviser, Research and governance adviser, MEL specialist, Communication and Media specialist, Program finance officer, Program officer and Interns				External factors: - There is strong interest of CSOs in focus provinces to work on JIFF priority topics	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	1.3.– 1.6. Grantees implement awarded projects 1.7 Monitoring grantees on carrying out awarded projects 1.8.Semi-annual, narrative and financial reporting for each grant cycle 1.9. Financial management and accounting of basket fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equipment: Laptop computers and other office supplies - Operational facilities: Trips, per diems, venues, office materials, local transport, services, equipment, participant expenses Costs: 5,920,954.60 EUR					
Activities for Sub-Result 2	2.1. Pre-grant training on justice sector and organizational development topics 2.2. Conduct grantee capacity assessments 2.3. Training on project and financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and use of ICT tools for all awarded grantees 2.4. Training on organisational sustainability and gender equality (for groups of similar grantees across regions) 2.5. Training on advocacy, campaigning, and media techniques 2.6. Training on legal aid for relevant grantees 2.7. Training on justice in civil and criminal issues for relevant grantees 2.8. Training on research on integrity, transparency and anti-corruption for civil society organisations 2.9. Tailored post-grant coaching for grantees	Means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personnel: Team leader, Global adviser on access to justice, CS capacity development adviser, Research and governance adviser, MEL specialist, Communication and Media specialist, Program finance officer, Program officer and Interns - Equipment: Laptop computers and other office supplies - Operational facilities: Trips, per diems, venues, office materials, local transport, services, equipment, participant expenses Costs: 291,270.87 EUR				External factors: - consultants	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Activities for Sub-Result 3	3.1. Establish and maintain provincial networks to work on justice issues 3.2. Establish national platform to work on justice issues 3.3. Facilitate national platform to work on justice issues 3.4. Training on networking and organisational development for national justice platform 3.5. Organize joint activities to share experiences on advocacy for civil society organisations 3.6. Carry out research and documentation on selected policy topics 3.7. Hold national policy dialogues on the selected topics 3.8. Semi-annual meetings with PAGOda team and government partners to coordinate delivery of EU JULE results	Means: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Personnel: Team leader, Global adviser on access to justice, CS capacity development adviser, Research and governance adviser, MEL specialist, Communication and Media specialist, Program finance officer, Program officer and Interns- Equipment: Laptop computers and other office supplies- Operational facilities: Trips, per diems, venues, office materials, local transport, services, equipment, participant expenses				External factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support from provincial authorities for setting up provincial justice networks- Laws and regulations selected for advocacy are kept on the National Assembly and Ministries’ agenda- Positive working relationships between the JIFF and UN/PAGOda components of EU JULE.	
		Costs: 202,505.68 EUR					

ANNEX VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

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

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

DAC CRITERIA

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

EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION

- **EU added value:** the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States’ interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).

ANNEX VIII: STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION (JIFF COMPONENT)

Stakeholders of the intervention (for JIFF component)

