

**Committee of Senior Representatives (CSR)
Thirtieth Meeting
Riga, Latvia
17-18 October 2018**

Reference	CSR 30/5/Info 1
Title	Terms of Reference of the NDPHS evaluation
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	<p>On 7 June 2018 the CSR accepted the EU's offer to finance the NDPHS evaluation and mandated the NDPHS Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) to develop the Terms of Reference of the evaluation (ToR) and submit them to the EU.</p> <p>This document contains the ToR agreed upon by the ESG in June 2018, submitted to the EU Delegation in Russia on 29 June 2018 and finalized on 10 July 2018, based on the requests for amendment from the EU Delegation in Russia.</p> <p>The EU Delegation in Russia intends to procure evaluation of two Partnerships, the NDPHS and the ND Culture Partnership through one contract with their framework contractor combining both evaluations in one service contract. For this purpose, a consolidated ToR is being developed by the EU Delegation in Russia. Once the consolidated ToR is approved, the EU Delegation in Russia will start the procurement procedure.</p>
Requested action	For background information

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-term evaluation of the Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-being

FWC Services for the Implementation of External Aid (SIEA) 2018 - LOT 2 EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multiContracting Authority: the European Union, represented by the European Commission, (the “Contracting Authority”)

1. BACKGROUND	4
1.1 NDPHS BACKGROUND	4
1.2 NDPHS	4
1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE NDPHS	4
1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	5
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	5
2.1 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	5
2.2 REQUESTED SERVICES	6
2.3 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES	7
2.4 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	11
2.5 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT	11
3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY	12
3.1 NUMBER OF REQUESTED EXPERTS PER CATEGORY AND NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS PER EXPERT OR PER CATEGORY	12
3.2 EXPERTISE REQUIRED	12
3.3 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING	12
3.4 SPECIFIC ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	12
4 LOCATION AND DURATION	13
4.1 STARTING PERIOD	13
4.2 FORESEEN DURATION	13
4.3 PLANNING	13
4.4 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT	13
5 REPORTING	13
5.1 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	13
5.2 COMMENTS	14
5.3 LANGUAGE	14
5.4 NUMBER OF COPIES	15
5.5 FORMATTING OF REPORTS	15
6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE	15
7 TAX ARRANGEMENTS	15
8 OTHER	15
9 MONITORING AND EVALUATION	15
ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	16
ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM	17

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....18

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE20

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID21

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 NDPHS background

The Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-being (NDPHS) is one of the four existing [Partnerships](#) established within the [Northern Dimension \(ND\)](#) policy, which involves the European Union, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation. Other forums within the ND policy are the [Northern Dimension Institute](#) (NDI), the [Northern Dimension Business Council](#) (NDBC) and the Northern Dimension Parliamentary Forum.

The NDPHS was formally established at a ministerial-level meeting on 27 October 2003, in Oslo, Norway. It operates in accordance with the [Declaration concerning the establishment of a NDPHS](#) (the Oslo Declaration), which was adopted during this meeting. The Declaration lays the foundation for the Partnership's objectives, structure, role and practical functions, main priorities, financing methods and guidelines for future development.

1.2 NDPHS

The Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-being (NDPHS) is a cooperative effort of ten governments, the European Commission and eight international organisations. The NDPHS provides a regional forum for collaboration in the field of health and social well-being in the Northern Dimension area.

As stipulated in the Declaration concerning the establishment of a NDPHS, the Partnership's mission is to promote sustainable development of the Northern Dimension area by improving peoples' health and social well-being. According to the Declaration, the Partnership works within two main priority fields:

- Reduction of the spread of major communicable diseases and prevention of life-style related non-communicable diseases;
- Enhancing peoples' levels of social well-being and promotion of socially rewarding lifestyles.

The NDPHS' work is conducted through activities such as **expertise exchange, project development and implementation, information production and dissemination, advocacy and high-level dialogue.**

During the period up to 2020, the NDPHS work is guided by the [NDPHS Strategy 2020](#) and the [Action Plan accompanying the Strategy 2020](#), which were adopted by the NDPHS Committee of Senior Representatives (CSR) in 2015. These documents define objectives, results and activities planned to be taken to achieve these results. In addition, specific and detailed actions to be taken by the NDPHS structures are outlined in [NDPHS annual work plans](#), and the information about their implementation is included in the [NDPHS annual progress reports](#).

Furthermore, the NDPHS is the Policy Area "Health" Coordinator in the [EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region](#).

1.3 Stakeholders of the NDPHS

In accordance with the Oslo Declaration, NDPHS eligible partners are "the Founding partners, EU Member States and Northern Dimension Partner Countries, the European Commission and other relevant EU

Institutions, regional co-operation bodies, international organisations and financing institutions. Eligible participants are interested sub-national administrative entities in the Northern Dimension area. Other countries or organisations associated with the Northern Dimension may become Partners or Participants of the Partnership in accordance with national legislation or statutes and through a procedure to be established by the Committee of Senior Representatives.”

At present the NDPHS Partners are:

- Ten countries (Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden);
- European Commission;
- Eight organizations (Barents Euro-Arctic Council, Baltic Sea States Sub-regional Cooperation, Council of the Baltic Sea States, International Labour Organization, International Organization for Migration, Nordic Council of Ministers, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), World Health Organization).

Until late 2019 the Partnership will be chaired by Latvia and co-chaired by Poland.

The Partnership operates at several levels, the most important being the [Partnership Annual Conference](#) (PAC), the [Committee of Senior Representatives](#) (CSR), the [Meeting of the Parties](#) (MP), [Expert Groups](#) and the [NDPHS Secretariat](#). The [NDPHS organigram](#) provides an overall picture of the NDPHS composition and the respective web pages of the NDPHS structures provide more information on their roles and activities.

1.4 Other available information

So far the NDPHS has been subjected to two external evaluations:

- In 2008 (the evaluation report available: http://www.ndphs.org/?mtgs,csr_14__bad_neuenahr , document CSR 14/7.1/1);
- In 2013 (the evaluation report available: http://www.ndphs.org/?mtgs,csr_22__reykjavik document CSR 22/6/1).

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	mid-term
Coverage	Action ¹ in its entirety
Geographic scope	Northern Dimension area (including Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden)
Period to be evaluated	Since the last mid-term evaluation of the NDPHS in 2013

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority² of the European Commission³. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and

¹ The term Action is used throughout the TOR as a synonym of the NDPHS

² 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

the **results**⁴ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches**⁵. 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 effects links** between 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 NDPHS governing bodies, relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the NDPHS, paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its objectives;
- an overall independent assessment of the NDPHS organisational set-up and whether it is optimal to fulfil its purpose;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve current (if relevant) and future Actions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve the purpose of understanding the performance of the NDPHS when implementing the NDPHS Strategy 2020 and its Action Plan, the enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of the results, in order to apply corrective measures and inform the planning of the NDPHS strategy for the next term.

The main users of this evaluation will be the Partners of the NDPHS (including the European Commission and the EEAS) and its Structures (the Partnership Annual Conference, the Meeting of the Parties and the Committee of Senior Representatives, the Expert Groups, the national focal points and the Secretariat).

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess the coherence of the Action with the EU strategy for the Baltic Sea Region; analyse the synergies and/or overlaps with other relevant strategies; assess the added value to the Northern Dimension Policy and added value for health sector in the Northern Dimension region. The evaluation will also provide recommendations for the focus and nature of future activities of the partnership.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether the following cross-cutting issues of health equity and social cohesion in all actions, innovative approaches and technologies, the 'Health in All Policies' approach, inclusion of people in vulnerable situations in all actions of relevance⁶ were taken into account in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action and its monitoring; analyze their relevance and suggest a

³ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf

⁴ 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.

⁵ COM (2011) 637 final "Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change" -

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/acp/dv/communication_/communication_en.pdf

⁶ Cross-cutting issues as defined in the NDPHS Strategy 2020.

revised/updated list of the cross-cutting/horizontal issues for the new NDPHS Strategy and its Action Plan.

The Issues to be studied as formulated below are indicative. Based on them and following initial consultations and documental analysis, the evaluation team will 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 with the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

2.2.2 Issues to be studied

The evaluation questions will be identified in the first instance by the evaluation team during the Inception phase. The questions should include in their coverage the following main areas of analysis:

- I. Analyze the relevant outcomes of the NDPHS Strategy
 - Assess what has actually happened vs what was planned; what is and what is not working well, so that adjustments can be made along the way.

- II. Assess the NDPHS structures, set-up, intervention logic, reporting mechanisms and available funding and whether these are optimal to fulfil the mission of the Partnership, as well as the objectives of the NDPHS Strategy 2020 and its Action Plan
 - Suggest how to improve the work of all NDPHS structures and bodies – Partnership Annual Conference (PAC), CSR, Expert Groups, Secretariat – in the next term.
 - Assess the interaction with internal and external stakeholders⁷.

- III. Analyze whether the scope and aim set in the NDPHS strategic documents⁸ are still relevant for the next term and suggest ways forward for the NDPHS to add value in enhancing health in the region.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases: an Inception Phase, a Desk Phase, a Field Phase, and a Synthesis Phase. Deliverables in the form of reports and slide presentations should be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table below.

The submission of deliverables by the selected contractor will be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module, an evaluation process management tool of the European Commission; the selected consultant will have access to online guidance in order to operate with the module.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted during each phase (not necessarily in chronological order) and lists the deliverables to be produced by the team, including the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Evaluation Steering Group. The main content of each deliverable is described in Chapter 5.

⁷ The list of stakeholders to be elaborated by the Evaluation Steering Group.

⁸ The list of documents to be elaborated by the Evaluation Steering Group.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Deliverables and meetings
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial document/data collection and definition of methods of analysis Background analysis Initial interviews Reconstruction of Intervention Logic and description of Theory of Change, incl. objectives, specific features and target beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Kick-off meeting face-to-face</i> Inception report Slide presentation <i>Meeting with Evaluation Steering Group</i>
<u>Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) Interviews Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase Methodological design of the Field Phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slide presentation of key findings <i>Meeting with Evaluation Steering Group.</i>
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial meetings at country level with the members of the NDPHS governing bodies, Expert Groups' members, as well as the NDPHS Secretariat and selected external stakeholders Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intermediary Note Slide Presentation <i>Debriefing with the Evaluation Steering Group</i>
<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 Organisation of the final presentation seminar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Final Report Executive Summary Final Report Slide presentation <i>Meeting with Evaluation Steering Group</i> <i>Final presentation seminar</i>

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying its key issues.

The phase will start with a kick-off session in Stockholm, Sweden. The meeting has the purpose to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility.

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 the NDPHS, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Steering Group and the Project Manager, will reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Based on the reconstructed Intervention Logic and on the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise the evaluation methodology, the Evaluation Questions, the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, and the planning of the following phases.

They will also summarise their approach in an Evaluation Design Matrix, which will be included in the Inception Report.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures defined. 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 Project Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in Chapter 5.

The evaluation team will then present in Stockholm, Sweden the **Inception Report** to the Evaluation Steering Group.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

This phase aims at conducting most of the documental analysis needed for carrying out the evaluation; the analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing documents relevant to the action.

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

Selected interviews with the members of the NDPHS governing bodies, Expert Groups, as well as the NDPHS Secretariat and selected external stakeholders can be conducted during this phase as 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 should also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall furthermore define the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, 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 desk phase a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5. A presentation by the evaluation team to the Evaluation Steering Group will take place in Stockholm, Sweden.

2.3.4 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Note by the Project Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and bringing further 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, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Project Manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the Evaluation Steering Group.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant governments, authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team shall 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 shall summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the Evaluation Steering Group.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** and a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.5 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation of the Final Report and entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to finalise the answers to the Evaluation Questions and prepare the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

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

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Stockholm, Sweden, the **Draft Final Report** to the Evaluation Steering Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

One day of presence is required of the members of the Evaluation Steering Group.

The Project Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Evaluation Steering Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the Quality Assessment Grid will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required.

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and prepare 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 should explain the reasons in writing.

2.4 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.4.1 At the EU and NDPHS level

The evaluation is managed by Ms. Lena Karnovich, EU Project Manager, EU Delegation to Russia and this will be done with the assistance of an Evaluation Steering Group consisting of the following members of the NDPHS network:

Mr. Ali Arsalo, representing Expert Group on HIV, TB & Associated Infections, Chair of the Evaluation Steering Group ;

Mr. Zaza Tsereteli, representing Expert Group on Alcohol and Substance Abuse and Norway;

Mr. Thomas Ifland, representing Germany;

Mr. Līga Šerna, representing Latvia;

Mr. Marcin Rynkowski, Ms. Kinga Sieńko-Wójtowicz, Ms. Krystyna Drogoń, representing Poland;

Ms. Anna Korotkova, representing Russia;

Mr. Jörgen Gyllenblad, Mr. Göran Carlsson, representing Sweden;

Ms. Ülla-Karin Nurm, Ms. Silvija Geistarte, representing the NDPHS Secretariat.

The Evaluation Steering Group members' main functions are:

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

2.4.2 At the Contractor level

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

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

2.5 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Number of requested experts per category and number of working days per expert or per category

3.2 Expertise required

A team of 2 key experts is required. One member of the evaluation team will be appointed as a Team Leader.

The number of man days requested per expert is as follows: category I – min 40 man days; category II – min 50 man days.

The minimum requirements of the team of key experts for this contract are as follows.

Specific professional experience (area relevant to the evaluation)

The team is required to have expertise in evaluating projects / programmes in health sector including international cooperation partnerships, projects / programmes and experience with public health, health systems and health and health policy assessment, as well as knowledge of the Northern Dimension policy context.

Qualification and skills

- Each team member should have at least a Master's Degree or, in its absence, equivalent specific professional experience in the area relevant to the evaluation identified above
- Certified knowledge of quantitative and qualitative research/consulting methodologies
- Certified knowledge of evaluation methodologies and techniques

General professional experience

- a) For expert category I: at least 12 years' experience in the sector(s) related to the lot;
- b) For expert category II: at least 6 years' experience in the sector (s) related to the lot.

Language skills of the team:

Every team member shall have excellent command of English. Knowledge of Russian language is an asset.

It is the responsibility of the Contractor to set up his own team and mobilise human resources as needed. In this proposal, the Contractor is expected to explain how fields of expertise will be covered by the members of the project team. The overall team composition will be assessed by the Contracting Authority.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

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

3.4 Specific Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The tenderers are expected to provide their understanding of the ToR and a clear description and justification of the methodology that they propose to use for conducting the assignment.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment: August 2018.

4.2 Foreseen duration

Maximum duration of the assignment: 12 months (including time for finalising the final report).

4.3 Planning⁹

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill-in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Report). 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.

Attention is drawn to the fact that sufficient forward planning is needed in order to ensure active participation and consultation with government representatives and national stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in the evaluation team's premises, with field visits in locations in Germany, Latvia, Norway and Russia. As much as possible, the meetings of the NDPHS governing bodies should be used for interviewing the relevant NDPHS stakeholders.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

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

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Report	Max 20 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intervention logic• Methodology for the evaluation• Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators• Evaluation Matrix• Data analysis and collection methods• Work plan• Stakeholder map• Consultation strategy• Field visit approach	End of Inception Phase

⁹ including the period for notification for placement of the staff as per art 16.4 a)

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of risks and of mitigating measures • 	
Desk Report	Max 20 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary answer to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information • Issues still to be covered and assumptions to be tested • Methodology for the evaluation unless defined in the Inception Report • Field visit approach including the criteria to select the field visits - unless defined in the Inception Report • Analysis of risks and of mitigating measures unless defined in the Inception Report • Workplan of the following phases unless defined in the Inception Report 	End of the Desk Phase
Intermediary Report	Max 10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities conducted during the field phase • Difficulties encountered during the phase and mitigation measures adopted • Key preliminary findings 	End of the Field Phase
Draft Final Report	Max 60 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Executive Summary	3-5 pages Also in a format of a ppt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Final report	40-60 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.

5.2 Comments

For each report, the Project Manager will submit comments within 14 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the Evaluation Steering Group shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

5.3 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.4 Number of copies

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in electronic version.

5.5 Formatting of reports

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

6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE

Reimbursable costs will cover:

- per diems
- international travel
- local travel (inter-city) at mission places

Should the Contractor wish to include translation of any documents or provide translation of all or part of the reports, translation expenses can also be part of the reimbursable costs, with the provision that the total budget cannot be increased. Reimbursable can also cover the costs for interpretation in the mission.

No equipment can be supplied via the framework contract. The same applies to the purchase of software. An exception could be authorised in writing by the Contracting Authority and will be limited to the purchase of documents, statistics, legislative texts and similar items only when the Contractor proves to the Contracting Authority that none of the documents requested can be obtained free of charge. The documents will become the property of the EC at the end of the mission. The related costs must be only a negligible part of the total of the assignment. Any cost related to such documents must be approved in advance and writing by the Contracting Authority.

7 Tax arrangements

N/A

8 Other

During all contacts including local authorities and other stakeholders, the experts will clearly identify themselves as independent consultants and not as official representatives of the European Union.

9 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the Project Manager using the quality assessment grid provided in Annex V, which is a tool to review the quality of the Draft and the Final report. Its compilation will support/inform the Performance Assessment required in CRIS, in particular with reference to the third criterion 'Quality of Service' (and should the score be 2 or 3 a synthesis of the QAG comments can be pasted in the Comment box of the Performance Assessment).

Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
[Request for Services n.]
FWC SIEA- LOT [number and title of the lot]
EuropeAid/1338778/C/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</i>	50
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	15
<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">• Organization of tasks including timetable	10
<i>Total score for the quality of the proposed team of experts</i>	50
<i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i>	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

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

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

No interviews are planned.

Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action to be evaluated
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action's annual and multi-annual strategies and work plans
- Action's annual progress reports
- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports.
- Any other relevant document

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

Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The consultant is requested to deliver three distinct documents: the Final Report, the Executive Summary and the final presentation in ppt format.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 5. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The cover page of both deliverables shall carry the following text:

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

Executive Summary

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

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

1. Introduction

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

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (*optional*)

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

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while

avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.

If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or other dissemination activities

4.2 Recommendations

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

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation 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 Action 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

[Add as many rows as needed]

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹⁰		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Expert ...	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)				

¹⁰ Add one column per each expert

Annex V: Quality assessment grid

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

The rates have the following meaning:

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

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated as:	Rating
1. Meeting needs:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic? • Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme? • Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process? • Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given? 	
2. Appropriateness of the design:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.? • Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail? • Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context? • Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method? 	
3. Reliability of the data:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design? • Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed? • Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report? • Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards? • Have the collected data been cross-checked? 	
4. Soundness of the analysis:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the analysis based on the collected data? • Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic? • Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis? • Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way? • Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any? 	
5. Credibility of the findings:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses? • Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised? • Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments? 	
6. Validity of the conclusions:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings? • Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria? • Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations? 	
7. Usefulness of the recommendations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions? • Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action? • Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation? • When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised? 	
8. Clarity of the report:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary? • Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences? • Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms? • Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced? 	

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

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

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