Final Evaluation of Timor Leste Rural Development Programme (TL RDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Country</th>
<th>Timor Leste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector (as defined in CSP/NIP)</td>
<td>Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>ASIE/2003/005-795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Context

- The poverty incidence in Timor-Leste continues to be one of the highest in Asia and in the world with a Human Development Index rank of 140\(^1\). Despite progress in many areas since the restoration of independence in 2002, 50% of Timor-Leste’s population (estimated at 925,000) still live below the poverty line. Poverty indicators and trends have shown a worsening of the standard of living between 2001 and 2007. There are ongoing problems with environmental degradation, food insecurity, inefficient service delivery, damaged or poorly maintained infrastructures and poor health and nutrition.

- Most poor people live in rural areas. Indicators show a trend of increasing poverty from East to West part of Timor Leste and mostly concentrated in the western districts. Upland families are more likely to be poor than lowland families, although this division is increasingly less distinct. Annually, 90% of the population suffers food shortages for at least one month, with the majority suffering shortages for 3 to 5 months between November and March each year. Moreover the crisis of 2006 resulted in the displacement of 100,000 people and unsettlement in rural areas due to rebel army roaming the country. These problems have now been mostly solved: the rebel soldiers were reintegrated in civilian life, while 53 of the 64 IDP camps have been closed and the people returned to their homes or to transit shelters.

- Ninety percent of the rural population relies on farming as the sole source of income while another 10% relying on wages and other income, including self-employment. The vast majority of East Timorese are engaged in subsistence agriculture with low productivity. Raising cattle and small livestock and growing maize, sweet potato and cassava are the main subsistence activities, especially in the uplands, and relatively few products are traded. Environmentally unsustainable farming practices such as the application of traditional shifting cultivation systems, have contributed to the uncontrolled degradation forest and watershed in the country. Local populations experience annual cycles of drought, flash flooding, soil erosion, pests and diseases which contribute to further impoverishment.

---

\(^1\) Human Development Report 2006, UNDP
With a view to contribute to making the transition from humanitarian emergency aid and the ensuing rehabilitation/reconstruction phase to a longer term development approach with tangible benefits for the rural poor, the EC adopted a Decision on 17 December 2003, ASIE 2003 / 005-795, in support of Timor Leste Rural Development Programme (TL RDP) with a total EC contribution of € 25.5 million. The programme was in conformity with the development priorities as expressed in the Country Strategy Paper for Timor-Leste (2002-2006) and the National Indicative programme (2002-04), which adopted health, rural development and public institutional capacity building as the key priority areas of focus for EC development cooperation with Timor-Leste.

In order to assess and maximize relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and lessons learnt for future similar initiatives, the EC wishes to launch a final evaluation of TL RDP to assess the final achievements of the programme. The final evaluation will cover 5 of the 6 components, 1 component (implemented through IOM) having already been evaluated after completion (31/03/2007).

1.2 Description of TIMOR LESTE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (TL RDP)

1.2.1 Overall objective

- The overall objective of TL RDP is to pursue overall poverty reduction, economic growth (and stability) in line with the Timor Leste Government poverty reduction strategy and the National Development Plan.

1.2.1 Programme Purpose

- The programme purpose is to support six (6) initiatives that contribute to rural development by restoring community infrastructure, empowering communities, increasing job opportunities, improving livelihood capacities and self-sufficiency (food supply) in rural areas.

TL RDP consists of 6 components (3 contracts). For the implementation of the 6 components, the EC signed three contribution / administration agreements with UNDP, IOM and WB and IOM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total component cost: € 31,210,219</th>
<th>Other funding sources: € 5,710,219</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC contribution: € 25,500,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation and Community Development in rural areas (RCDRA) - UNDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access Improvements to Markets in the Eastern Region (AIM) € 6,592,110</td>
<td>25.88 % (UNDP / UNOPS) € 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oecussi Ambeno Community Activation Project (OCAP) € 3,062,089</td>
<td>12.01 % (UNDP / UNOPS) € 297,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skills Training for Gainful Employment (STAGE). € 4,650,994</td>
<td>18.24 % (UNDP / ILO) € 436,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programme for Enhancing Rural Women's Leadership and Participation in Nation Building in Timor Leste (PERWL). € 575,000</td>
<td>2.25 % (UNDP / UNIFEM) € 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Community Stabilisation in Timor Leste (ACS) - IOM € 2,715,502</td>
<td>10.65 % (IOM) € 389,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Rehabilitation Project (ARP III) - World Bank € 6,854,530</td>
<td>26.68 % (TFET) € 3,000,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluation &amp; audit € 700,000</td>
<td>2.75 % (CFET) € 1,537,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies € 349,775</td>
<td>1.37 % € 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.3 Expected results

The expected results of TL RDP are:

- **AIM**: Improved access to markets - key bridges repaired thereby opening up district roads in Viqueque and Lautem for vehicular use (main target group: farmers and traders);
- **OCAP**: Livelihood opportunities restored through the adoption of improved agricultural technologies, food security and basic service delivery in Oecussi (main target group: rural population);
- **STAGE**: Increased employment through vocational skills training nation-wide (main target group: government staff, trainers and rural poor);
- **PERWL**: Enhanced rural women’s leadership and participation through the empowerment of the women’s civil rights nation-wide (main target group: rural women);
- **ACS**: 120 community based infrastructure components in the Eastern region rehabilitated, *e.g.* markets, village water systems and community irrigation schemes (main target group: farmers and traders)

  ²;
- **ARP III**: Capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) and its development partners strengthened to support farmers in increasing sustainable production and income (main target group: government staff, farmers, development partners).

2. **DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

2.1 Global objective

The final evaluation, which has been foreseen in the Technical and Administrative Provisions of the Commission Decision, will provide the decision-makers in the Government of Timor Leste, the relevant services in the European Commission, the implementing partners (UNDP and the WB) and the wider public with sufficient information to:

- make an overall independent assessment about the past performance of the programme / components, paying particularly attention to the impact of the actions against its overall objective and project purpose;
- identify key lessons learnt and practical recommendations for future rural development programme / projects in Timor Leste;

These Terms of Reference are for a comprehensive and independent final evaluation of the TL RDP and its components:

- **UNDP – RCDRA** which consists of four components: AIM, OCAP, STAGE and PERLW.
- **WB – ARP III**
- **IOM – ACS. This component will not be covered by this final evaluation as it was already completed when the Mid Term Review (MTR) mission took place in March 2007.**

A brief summary of the six components is presented in Annex IV of this ToR.

2.2 Issues to be Studied

- The evaluation study responds to the requirements of the last phase of the project cycle. The experts shall verify, analyse and assess in detail the issues outlined in Annex II “Indicative Layout and Structure of the Final Evaluation Report”. The list of issues is not intended to be exhaustive, and they refer to the five evaluation criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact), and to the EC-specific evaluation criteria (EC added value and coherence).
- The experts are requested to verify, analyse and assess the integration and impact of cross cutting issue in the project. The experts are required to use their professional judgement and experience to review all relevant factors and to bring these to the attention of the Government of Timor Leste and European Commission.

² This component will not be covered by this evaluation.
2.3 Requested services and Methodology

- The selected consultant shall provide a team of experts to undertake an evaluation of TL RDP.
- At the start of the evaluation mission, the experts will have a briefing with the EC Delegation in Dili, Timor Leste.
- The experts will undertake a desk review of all available documents relevant to the programme / components.
- Within 5 working days the commencement of the mission, the experts will develop an inception report, in consultation with the implementing partners (UNDP, WB and relevant GoTL agencies). The inception report will outline the scope, methodology and process of the final evaluation, as well as identify key stakeholders to be consulted and activities to be undertaken. It will include a schedule for meetings with relevant parties and for field visit.
- The team will carry out field visits of the 5 components and hold discussions with relevant ministries of the GoTL, implementing agencies, project management units, main beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders to assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and potential sustainability of the components. It will ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of, the different stakeholders, working closely with the relevant government authorities and agencies during the entire assignment.
- At the end of the mission, the experts will conduct a debriefing in Timor Leste, with the EC Delegation in Dili, Timor Leste, relevant government agencies and component representatives. Another debriefing by the Team Leader of the evaluation mission is foreseen with the EC Delegation in Jakarta, Indonesia.

2.4 Requested Outputs

- An inception note outlining the evaluation mission work plan and methodology.
- A draft outline of the de-briefing for stakeholders in Timor Leste, presenting the main conclusions. The outline will be approved by the EC Delegation in Indonesia prior to the de-briefing meeting.
- A draft final report using the indicative structure set out in Annex II.
- A final report with the same specifications as the draft final report, taking into accounts comments from the EC Delegation in Indonesia.

3. EXPERTS PROFILE

The evaluation team will be composed of 5 experts with the following profiles and qualifications:

Common features:

- a solid and diversified experience in the specific field of expertise needed, including experience in evaluation of programmes / projects;
- experience in the region and Timor Leste highly desirable (years of experience may vary per expert irrespective of their position on the team);
- excellent report writing skills, full working knowledge of English, and if possible of Tetum Language, Portuguese Language or Bahasa Indonesia would be an asset but not compulsory;
- fully conversant with the concept and principles of EC project cycle management;
- experience in working with programme / projects funded by other international institutions, notably World Bank and UNDP.

---

3.1 Expertise required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Max number of Working Days(^4)</th>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>CAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team leader – Specialist in project evaluation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Business Development Specialist</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Infrastructure Specialist</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional development expert</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Specialist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Team-leader (Category I) - Specialist in project evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>32 working days maximum with 3 days travel. The expert will act as team leader and will be responsible for the overall planning and implementation of the mission, as well as for the preparation, presentation, finalisation and in-time delivery of the evaluation report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>At least up to Masters' Degree in rural development, tropical agronomy or other relevant discipline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum requirements:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum 15 years of experience in rural development projects with significant experience in the monitoring and/or evaluation of development cooperation activities, with specific experience in the evaluation of rural development projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proven experience in the field of post-crisis assistance and community development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiarity with EC-supported projects and procedures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiarity with the evaluation guidelines of the EC;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fluency in English both spoken and written;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Excellent writing and reporting skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Rural Business Development Specialist (Category II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>28 working days maximum with 2 days travel. The expert will work under the supervision of the Team Leader.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>At least up to Masters' Degree in relevant discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum requirements:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum 10 years experience in the area of private sector development, microfinance, agribusiness in developing countries, preferably in post-crisis situations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Familiarity with the evaluation guidelines of the EC;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fluency in English both spoken and written;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Excellent writing and reporting skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Including travel time and report writing
• **Rural Infrastructure Specialist (Category II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>28 working days maximum with 2 days travel. The expert will work under the supervision of the Team Leader.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qualifications | This expert should have at least up to Masters' degree in civil engineering or other relevant disciplines. Minimum requirements:  
  - Minimum 10 years experience in the area of infrastructure construction in rural areas of developing countries, and especially with bridges, irrigation schemes and rural water supply.  
  - Familiarity with the evaluation guidelines of the EC;  
  - Fluency in English both spoken and written;  
  - Excellent writing and reporting skills. |

• **Institution Development Specialist (Category II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>28 working days maximum with 2 days travel. The expert will work under the supervision of the Team Leader.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qualifications | At least up to Masters' Degree in rural development, development studies or other relevant disciplines. Minimum requirements:  
  - 10 years experience working in institutional development/capacity building related projects, training need assessment, training implementation including vocational training, preferably related to rural development projects;  
  - Familiarity with the guidelines of Institutional Assessment and Capacity Development of the EC;  
  - Familiarity with the evaluation guidelines of the EC;  
  - Fluency in English;  
  - Excellent writing and reporting skills. |

• **Environmental Specialist (Category II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>28 working days maximum with 2 days travel. The expert will work under the supervision of the Team Leader.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qualifications | At least up to Masters' Degree in environment, rural development or other relevant disciplines. Minimum requirements:  
  - 10 years experience working in the field of environment, conducting environmental impact assessment, undertaking environmental issues in rural development / agriculture programmes / infrastructure projects;  
  - Familiarity with the evaluation guidelines of the EC;  
  - Fluency in English;  
  - Excellent writing and reporting skills. |

Please note that the proposed experts must **not** have been directly involved in the preparation or implementation of RDP I or any of its components.

4. **LOCATION AND DURATION**

• **Indicative starting date:** 29 June 2009 (Dili, Timor Leste)

• **Foreseen finishing period or duration:** The maximum duration of the mission is 35 working days with the detail breakdown number of days to be presented hereafter.
- The maximum number of working days allowed for each consultant during the assignment is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
<th>Rural Business Development Specialist</th>
<th>Rural Infrastructure Specialist</th>
<th>Institution Development Specialist</th>
<th>Environmental Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timor Leste</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International travel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing with ECD Jakarta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and final report writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The location/s of assignment: Timor Leste. A debriefing is foreseen in Jakarta, Indonesia, by the Team Leader of the evaluation mission.
- The main language used for the mission will be English. However some meetings may take place in Tetum or Portuguese language.

5. REPORTING

**Quality:** The quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager (in the delegation or in headquarters) using a quality assessment grid (see Annex V). The explanation on how to fill this grid is available on the following link:

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

**Content:** (See also Annex II)

The team is required to submit the following reports in English:

- **An inception report** of maximum 5 pages to be produced within 5 working days from the start of the mission to be given to the EC Delegation in Timor Leste and Indonesia (by email). The main objective of the inception report is to provide a work plan and a methodology. It should also describe the foreseen degree of difficulties in collecting data, other encountered and/or foreseen difficulties and other relevant information considered appropriate by the experts.

- **A draft outline of the de-briefing** for stakeholders in Timor Leste, presenting the main conclusions, to be submitted to the EC Delegation in Timor Leste and Indonesia (by email) 3 days before the de-briefing meeting taking place. The outline will be approved by the EC Delegation in Indonesia prior to the de-briefing meeting.

- **A draft final report** (of maximum 40 pages, main text, excluding annexes) using the indicative structure set out in Annex II to be submitted to the EC Delegation in Dili Timor Leste and Indonesia (by email) prior to the end of the field mission and reflecting comments of the de-briefing meeting. The EC Delegation in Indonesia will provide comments on the draft report within **20 working days** after submission.
• A final report with the same specifications as the draft final report, taking into accounts comments from the EC Delegation in Indonesia, to be presented within **10 working days** of the receipt of EC comments on the draft final report.

The report will be in English, maximum 50 pages long (excluding the necessary annexes) and include a comprehensive executive summary. Upon approval of the evaluation report, a full good quality translation in Portuguese will be provided, as well as a good quality translation of the executive summary in Tetum, as part of the required deliverables (Both Portuguese and Tetum are official languages of Timor-Leste).

• Distribution of all the reports should include an electronic version and 3 paper copies. For the final report, 10 paper copies should be submitted including the electronic version.

6. IMPORTANT REMARKS

• Reimbursable costs: a budget shall be allocated for international travel, local travel, per diems, and services provided by interpreter/translator, if required. The budget should also comprise the cost of organising a debriefing workshop in Dili.

• The selected consultant will supply the personnel for the team as specified in point 3 of these Terms of Reference for the full duration of the assignment. The consultant is expected to organise the team’s travel arrangements within Timor Leste, transport and support/secretarial services to the team.

• Selected experts must possess a passport with a validity of at least six months and obtain an appropriate visa to undertake the mission in Timor Leste.

• Component staff will facilitate the task of the mission, providing explanations and documentation and assisting in setting up meetings.

• The consultant must ensure that all the members of the team have laptop computers and other necessary equipment for the collection and drafting of the requested reports. The cost of such equipment cannot be charged to this contract.

• During all contacts with the Timor Leste Authorities, or any component or Organisation, the experts will clearly identify themselves as independent experts and not as official representatives of the European Commission. All documents and papers produced by the consultant will clearly mention on their first page a disclaimer stating that these are the views of the consultant and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

• All outputs shall be in English and contain the following reference: “*This report was prepared with the financial support of the European Commission. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the European Commission.*”

ANNEXES:

ANNEX I: KEY DOCUMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION

ANNEX II: INDICATIVE LAYOUT AND STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

ANNEX III: METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

ANNEX IV: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF EACH PROGRAMME COMPONENT

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

ANNEX VI: THE STANDARD DAC FORMAT FOR EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARIES
ANNEX I: KEY DOCUMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION

The following documents will be provided by the EC Delegation and/or component staff. This list only contains key documents which consultation will be essential for the consultation. Additional documents considered relevant by the experts should be provided as well.

- EC relevant Country Strategy Paper
- Financing Decision and Technical and Administrative Provisions (TAPs) of ASIE/2003/005-795
- Contribution Agreement with UNDP
- Administration Agreement with World Bank
- Progress Reports + EC Delegation Comments
- ROM Monitoring Reports + EC Delegation Comments
- Minutes of relevant meetings and mission reports
- Component Work Plans
- Mid-Term Evaluation report
- Other relevant reports
ANNEX II: INDICATIVE LAYOUT AND STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

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

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

The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

2. INTRODUCTION

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

3. ANSWERED QUESTIONS / FINDINGS

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

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

3.1. PROBLEMS AND NEEDS (RELEVANCE)

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

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

- the extent to which the programme / components have been consistent with, and supportive of the priorities of Timor Leste, the alignment and responsiveness of the programme and its components to the National Development Plan, Sector Investment Plans and Government Policy;
- the extent to which the programme / components have been consistent with the EC strategy in Timor Leste; EC’s Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme;
- review the flexibility/adaptability of the five components under TL RDP in responding to changed priorities and circumstances in the rural development sector and within GoTL policy;
- the quality of the analyses of lessons learnt from past experience, and of sustainability issues;
- the component's coherence with current/ongoing initiatives;
- the quality of the problem analysis and the components' intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement;
- the extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and social needs, clarity and internal consistency of the stated objectives;
- the extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed;
- the extent to which objectives have been updated in order to adapt to changes in the context;
- the degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances;
- the quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis and analysis of vulnerable groups) and of institutional capacity issues;
- the stakeholder participation in the design and in the management/implementation of the component, the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
- the quality of the analysis of strategic options, of the justification of the recommended implementation strategy, and of management and coordination arrangements;
- the realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative resources)
- the analysis of assumptions and risks;
- the appropriateness of the recommended monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

3.2. ACHIEVEMENT OF PURPOSE (EFFECTIVENESS)

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

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

- whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
- whether intended beneficiaries participated in the intervention;
- whether the components' impact on a wider number of potential beneficiaries beyond those targeted directly;
- in institutional reform components, whether behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements (e.g. in communications, productivity, ability to generate actions which lead to economic and social development);
- if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexible management has adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ and locally), etc.;
- whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate, which accompanying measures have been taken by the partner authorities;
- how unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and could have been foreseen and managed;
- whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;
- extent to which mechanisms are in place to ensure coherence, coordination, complimentarity and synergies between the components; with the other EC-funded interventions and with other
stakeholders (GoTL, other donor agencies, international NGOs, other implementing partners) in Timor-Leste; and to avoid occurrence of duplication of activities;

- In which areas (geographical, sector, issue) have the components made the greatest achievements? Why is this? What have been the supporting factors? How can the component build on or expand these achievements? In which areas have the components produced the least results? What have been the constraining factors and why? How could they have been overcome?

3.3. SOUND MANAGEMENT AND VALUE FOR MONEY (EFFICIENCY)

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

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

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

- extent to which the costs of the component have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions;

- partner country contributions from local institutions and government (e.g. offices, experts, reports, tax exemption, as set out in the LogFrame resource schedule), target beneficiaries and other local parties: have they been provided as planned?

- Commission HQ/Delegation inputs (e.g. procurement, training, contracting, either direct or via consultants/bureaux): have they been provided as planned?

- technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?

- quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;

- Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities so far?

3.4. ACHIEVEMENT OF WIDER EFFECTS (IMPACT)

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

At Impact level the final evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:

- extent to which the objectives of the programme / components have been achieved as intended in particular the planned overall objective;
• whether the effects of the components:
  a) have been facilitated/constrained by external factors
  b) have produced any unintended or unexpected impacts, and if so how have these affected the overall impact.
  c) have been facilitated/constrained by components management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders
  d) have contributed to economic and social development
  e) have contributed to poverty reduction
  f) have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.
  g) were spread between economic growth, salaries and wages, foreign exchange, and budget.
• whether environmental risk from linked to the implementation of infrastructure projects have been identified and mitigated. The assessment will be based notably on:
  - the views and concerns of stakeholders,
  - the socio-economic consequences (especially on vulnerable groups and ethnic minorities),
  - compliance with environmental regulations and standards,
  - consistency with environmental objectives and policies, and
  - their implications for sustainable development.
• Review to what extent the programme / components influenced the policies and programmes of the GoTL and other relevant agencies;
• Assess to which extent TL RDP contributed to the overall poverty reduction, social and economic development and empowerment of rural communities as well as environmental benefits in the targeted regions of Timor-Leste.

3.5. LIKELY CONTINUATION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS (SUSTAINABILITY)

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

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

• the ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement;
• policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy are corresponding, the potential effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the component positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organizations;
• institutional capacity, e.g. of the Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the component is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating a new institution, how far good relations with existing institutions have been established; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the component ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
• the adequacy of the component budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the component is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external component staff and local communities;

- financial sustainability, e.g. whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remained so after funding will end; whether enough funds are available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs), and continued to do so after funding will end; and economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated;

- technical (technology) issues (i.e. methods used to increase agricultural productivity, etc.), e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies are being considered, where possible; and (iii) the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance;

- wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, environmental impact and good governance; were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the component;

- assess the degree in which the programme/components are embedded in Government institutions, as well as the degree of preparation of these institutions to take over after the end of EC funded implementation. Are national partners committed and likely to continue the activities at the end of implementation of the programme components?

3.6. MUTUAL REINFORCEMENT (COHERENCE)

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

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

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

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

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

3.7 EC value added

Connection to the interventions of Member States. Extent to which the programme / components (its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc.)

- is complementary to the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area
- is co-ordinated with the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area
- is creating actual synergy (or duplication) with the intervention of EU Member States
- involves concerted efforts by EU Member States and the EC to optimise synergies and avoid duplication.
4. VISIBILITY
The experts will make an assessment of the component’s strategy and activities in the field of visibility, information and communication, the results obtained and the impact achieved with these actions in both the beneficiary country and the European Union countries.

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

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the programme / components, and of the resources available to implement them both locally and in the Commission.
They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects for both the national implementing partners and for the Commission; the pre-conditions that might be attached to decisions on the financing of similar projects; and general issues arising from the evaluation in relation to, for example, policies, technologies, instruments, institutional development, and regional, country or sectoral strategies.

This section should specify which recommendations are address to the EC, to the Executing Authority and other GoTL institutions, to the component management, and to the technical assistance team.

The team will review the lessons learnt from the programme and its components as inputs for GoTL, the EC and other stakeholders for the design of future actions and related activities in the field of rural development.

7. ANNEXES TO THE REPORT

Annexes should include at least the mission’s itinerary, name of persons and institutions met, summaries of meetings held. Other relevant information may be added as appropriate.

- Terms of Reference of the final evaluation;
- Names of the evaluators and their company (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Methodology applied (phases, methods of data collecting, sampling, etc.)
- Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)
- Maps of component areas, where relevant
- List of persons / organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analysis)
- 1-page DAC summary, following the format in Annex VI
ANNEX III:  METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

The evaluation team should refer to the programme / components logical framework.

It is suggested that the evaluation team carry out a rapid appraisal through a field visit and a series of interviews and a series of focus groups involving beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, along with the use of other appropriate evaluation tools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. RCDRA – UNDP – Contract No. ASIE/2004/082-039, duration 60 months: 14/05/04 – 14/05/09

The overall objective of RCDRA is to pursue overall poverty reduction, economic growth (and stability) in line with the Timor-Leste Government’s poverty reduction strategy and the National Development Plan. RCDRA consists of four components:

Programme for Access Improvements to Markets in the Eastern Region (AIM - UNOPS)
AIM is a two-year-and-a-half programme with an estimated cost of €6.59 million in support of the National Development Plan. It is designed to facilitate the country’s economic and social development through the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the five bridges which hold the key to fulfill the rich agricultural potential of the eastern region of Timor-Leste comprising the districts of Lautem and Viqueque.

The programme will target five major bridges along the Viqueque - Los Palos national road:
• Bebui (90 m span. Viqueque district)
• Wekain (30 m span. Viqueque district)
• Irabere (220 m span. Viqueque/Lautem districts)
• Mauma’a or Rorolai (120 m span. Lautem district)
• Lihulu (45 m span. Lautem district)

Oecussi Ambeno Community Activation Programme (OCAP - UNOPS)
OCAP is a five-year programme, at a proposed cost of €3.36 million, in support of the National Development Plan designed to respond to the special needs of the 48,000 population of the enclave of Oecussi Ambeno, one of the country’s poorest Districts.

The overall objective of OCAP is the restoration of sustainable livelihood opportunities for the residents of Oecussi Ambeno District. The strategy will be the empowerment of communities whereby the people lead the development process. Strategic entry points will be the promotion of cohesive communities, development of new skills and knowledge, enhanced food security and generation of supplementary income, and identification of livelihood opportunities.

The programme will introduce a mechanism (Community Development Fund) to finance community investments which are planned and implemented by community groups. The knowledge and viability of women will be renewed and they will be empowered to play a wider role in their communities. Community owned savings and credit schemes will be introduced for enhanced access to basic financial services. Simple improved agricultural technologies in cattle raising, upland farming, etc. will be introduced in order to improve productivity.

Skills Training for Gainful Employment Programme (STAGE - ILO)
STAGE is a 5-year programme at a proposed cost of €5.09 million. In response to prevailing poverty and high unemployment levels, the programme proposes a flexible decentralised approach to skill training, and small and micro business development that will lead to income generation and gainful employment.

Accordingly, the programme’s purpose is to build national capacity to develop and implement a sustainable and effective system of skill and enterprise training. The overall strategy is three-fold:

• Institutional and capacity strengthening of the Secretariat of State for Labour and Solidarity (SSLS) and its District Employment Centres, (DECs) which provide enterprise development and skills training services to the districts, in particular. DEC staff will be trained in 4 regional offices (Dili, Maliana, Oecussi and Baucau) on collection and analysis of employment data to ensure that training programmes are designed based on local economic opportunities. Effective management of the Employment and Vocational Training Fund (EVTF) will also be ensured;
• In order to develop effective training capacities and a micro/small enterprise development mechanism in Timor-Leste, STAGE will strengthen the capacity of existing training providers by providing them with management training, training of trainers, resource material and financial resources through increased access to the EVTF. Training providers will work closely with the DEC’s for the delivery of training to the communities through mobile units; and
• Given the fragile economy, employment in the sense of full-time wage employment may not be an option for many years to come. The STAGE will put emphasis on informal sector employment opportunities for the grassroots. Access of community members to small business development and skills training will be facilitated through a decentralized and flexible system of training, including outreach programme and mobile training, and the EVTF mechanism.

Programme for Enhancing Rural Women’s Leadership and Participation in Nation Building in Timor-Leste (PERWL)
The proposal is for a three-year programme, at a proposed cost of €0.63 million, to enhance rural women’s participation in nation building in Timor-Leste. It is part of an integrated strategy focused on facilitating capacity building of women leaders and groups at the national and local levels so that women can participate on an informed basis in the processes of nation building including elections, establishment of local government and how to use nation building institutions at a local level.

The component aims:
• To support women to run for the aldeia and suco elections country wide; vote with greater knowledge and increase the effectiveness of women local government officials and build capacity of rural women’s transformative leadership and citizenship in the context of decentralised government;
• To pilot in 4 districts per region and in the districts of Lautem and Bobonaro methods and materials to build the capacity of grassroots women to understand, contribute to and benefit from the process of nation building through training in leadership and civic education, gender sensitisation of grassroots men, and linking grassroots women with national women’s organizations and women leaders; and
• To generate essential data required for the formulation of informed programmes to address the socio economic needs of rural women and address urgent need by the government to produce the first national report and civil society to produce a shadow report to the CEDAW committee.

2. ACS – IOM – Contract No. ASIE/2004/081-103, duration 36 months: 24/03/04 – 31/03/07
The IOM component will not be covered by the EC final evaluation as it was already completed when the MTR took place in January-March 2007.

The overall objective of the Component is to improve rural community assets in the districts of Baucau, Lautem and Viqueque in order to contribute to long-term population stability and minimise rural-urban migration. The purpose of the Component is to improve rural community infrastructure, empower communities and improve livelihoods of rural Timorese.

Component results:
• 120 community-based infrastructure projects undertaken, e.g. markets, village water systems and community irrigation schemes.
• Component partners trained to manage the implementation of at least 40 projects.
• Women directly involved in the identification and implementation of at least 40 projects.
• Skills transfer in programme management for nine IOM national staff and capacity building for 8 staff of two Project partner institutions (in general project and financial management and implementation).
• 20 training sessions/seminars held for local partners and community/government participants.

The overall objective of the Third Agriculture Rehabilitation Project (ARP III) is to strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and its key development partners to assist rural communities in increasing their production and income in a sustainable way.
Irrigation Rehabilitation and Management Component
This component will support MAF’s program of strengthening rural communities’ food security and sustainable economic development in lowland, irrigated areas. The component will rehabilitate community based irrigation schemes serving 3,000 hectares of irrigable land, and 150 kilometres of rural access roads; rehabilitate the major-damaged irrigation scheme in Manufahi (Caraulun) covering 1,030 hectares of irrigable land; and strengthen or establish about 24 Water User Associations (WUAs).

Results:
- 3,000 ha. of irrigated area rehabilitated by communities
- 150 km. of existing farm-to-market roads rehabilitated by communities
- 1,030 ha. of major-damaged irrigation scheme rehabilitated
- 14 new Water Users Associations (WUAs) established (including a network of WUAs in major-damaged scheme), and 10 existing WUAs provided with advisory services and further training (including women)

Services to Farmers Component
This component aims to strengthen and institutionalize MAF’s Service Delivery to Farmers in three key areas (a) Information Services (b) Animal Health Services (c) Agri-business

Programme Management Component
This component aims to assist MAF in developing key organizational and sector policies, build further core skills amongst MAF staff and their partners, and integrate ARP management fully within MAF’s organizational structure.
- Four agriculture policy studies/advisory services completed, discussed with key stakeholders, and accepted by MAF
- Advisory support to component management, finance, and procurement provided
- 100 person-days of training provided to MAF staff and partners (including women)
ANNEX V - QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Meeting needs:**  
a) Does the report precisely describe what is evaluated, including the intervention logic in the form of a logical framework? | | | | | |
| b) Does the report clearly cover the requested period of time, as well as the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the programme / components? | | | | | |
| c) Has the evolution of the programme / components been taken into account in the evaluation process? | | | | | |
| d) Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests. If not, are justifications given? | | | | | |
| **2. Appropriate design**  
a) Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes stock of the rationale of the programme / components, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders’ interests, etc.? | | | | | |
| b) Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail? | | | | | |
| c) Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the programme / components and its context? | | | | | |
| d) Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method? | | | | | |
| **3. Reliable data**  
a) Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design? | | | | | |
| b) Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report? | | | | | |
| c) Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards? | | | | | |
| d) Have the collected data been cross-checked? | | | | | |
| e) Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed? | | | | | |
| **4. Sound analysis**  
a) Is the analysis based on the collected data? | | | | | |
<p>| b) Is the analysis clearly focused on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic? | | | | | |
| c) Is the context adequately taken into account in the analysis? | | | | | |
| d) Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way? | | | | | |
| e) Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any? | | | | | |
| <strong>5. Credible findings</strong> | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Are the findings derived from the data and analyses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the generalisability of findings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Valid conclusions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the report reach overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Useful recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are recommendations coherent with conclusions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidance for taking action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do the recommendations cater for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Where necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Clear report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the report well structured and adapted to its various audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considering the 8 previous criteria, what is the overall quality of the report?**
ANNEXE VI - THE STANDARD DAC FORMAT FOR EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARIES

Evaluation Title (and Reference)

Abstract
(central, 4 lines maximum)

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

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

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

Recommendations
25 lines/lignes max

Feedback
(5 lines/lignes max )

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