SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Evaluation of the Research, Development and Innovation Programme II (RDI-II)

2010/021-866

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4 Human Development and safety net
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi
Request for service no.2019/411-819/1
Contracting Authority: European Union Delegation to the Arab Republic of Egypt

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country sector background

In the present decade the Ministry of Scientific Research undertook multiple initiatives to invigorate scientific research. Foremost among these initiatives Egypt and the EU signed an agreement for Scientific and Technological Cooperation in June 2005, aiming to encourage, develop and facilitate cooperative research and development activities of common interest. Egypt research institutions, mostly public entities, started to actively participate in the EU research Framework Programmes.

In 2007, the Ministry and the EU signed a four-year agreement for the launching of the ongoing Research, Development and Innovation programme (RDI) to promote research and development and innovation and heading towards improving Egypt's competitiveness.

Within the context of the "Developing Scientific Research (2007-2016) Plan", the Ministry is taking up all the necessary measures to restructure the national scientific research system and to promote a complete cycle of innovation. The following cite some of the initiatives already launched starting 2007:

- The "Decade for Science and Technology (2007-2016), and more specifically, the bilateral "Years of Science and Technology," which are dedicated to activities with one specific country to further promote international cooperation in S&T.
- The Higher Council for Science and Technology (HCST) was established in order to develop Egypt's strategic plan for scientific research, setting the vision and the priorities for S&T, and ensuring the implementation of such plans.
- The Science and Technology Development Fund (STDF), which ensures the implementation of Egypt's S&T strategy through the funding of research projects.

All the initiatives taken try to tackle key challenges that the scientific and technological research sector is facing in Egypt:

- Inadequate funding of applied research and innovation by Universities and Research Centres.
- Weak contribution to research and development by the private sector.
- Insufficient exploitation of scientific research by the service/production sectors.
- Scarcity and inefficiency of research and technological advancement units in service and production units.

1.2 The Action to be evaluated[1]

Title of the Action to be evaluated	**Research, Development and Innovation Programme II (RDI-II)**
Budget of the Action to be evaluated	**12,745,825.41 EUR**
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated	**2010/021-866**
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	• **Start: 28/05/2011** • **End: 26/05/2017**

The overall objective of RDI II is to further support the Egyptian government's efforts to enhance research, development and innovation performance, facilitating Egypt's move towards a knowledge-based economy. The specific objectives are:

- Fostering the Science and Innovation culture and environment.
- Expanding research collaboration between the public and private sectors.
- Enhancing the impact of Egyptian researchers' participation in EU funded programmes.
- Advancing Egypt's scientific and technological capacity through supporting Centres of Excellence.

RDI II is a continuation of the first phase of the RDI programme and therefore was designed to identify the needs and fine tune objectives and expected results to underpin the Egyptian government's reform efforts in its move towards knowledge-based economy.

Building on the experience accumulated during the implementation period of the RDI programme, and to further realize a stronger impact, RDI II focuses on specific sectors aligned with both national and EU priorities. Accordingly, the different components of the programme demonstrate synergies/complementarities with EU funding instruments along the various programmes of the EU while being aligned with national policies and directives of the Higher Council for Science and Technology. The RDI II programme attains a strong functional and physical structure with administrative independence of its components, thus ensuring the successful implementation of its objectives, strong impact and establishing the basis for sustainability. The RDI II programme also extends its activities to a regional dimension, allowing better networking with MPC/EU partners and enhance Egyptian participation in EU funded programmes. The programme has three main components:

Component I: Innovation Support

The component serves to establish an innovation support unit which administrates the EU-Egypt Innovation Fund. Therefore, it is in charge of industrial needs identification and assessment, launching and implementation of innovative applied research projects on competitive basis,

[1] *The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.*

emphasizing innovative ideas addressing the national thematic priorities and industry needs. This should further enhance collaboration between academia and industry.

Component II: Research Networking

This component serves to establish a research networking unit which will be in charge of establishing a focal center to disseminate information on funding opportunities on a national and regional basis, promote and invigorate researchers capacities and ideas, integrate researchers into European Research area and MPC states, incubate consultants and establish and support research networks, linking them further throughout universities and research centers with EU/MPC networks, extend grants to fund activities such as incoming/outgoing mobility schemes and partnerships with FP7 projects and other EU funded projects, monitor and assess the performance of grant and network projects.

Component III: Support to Innovation Clusters

This component is designed to assist the government in establishing business driven innovation clusters in Egypt. This entails identifying the areas of demand for innovation clusters, launching competitive calls for proposals for developing the clusters and monitoring their progress to ensure their sustainability.

As being a decentralized management programme, the RDI-II Programme had a Programme Implementation Office, managing on behalf of the Ministry of Scientific Research, using Programme Estimate as an implementation modality. This PIO has been the managing entity since RDI-I and continued its role in RDI-II, as per the Financing Agreement. The Financing Agreement was signed on 28 May 2011 and the ends in May 2018.

RDI-II launched 3 calls for proposals, with different funding schemes; Scheme 1 (€300,000-€600,000); Scheme 2 (€50,000 - €100,000); and Innovation Clusters (€300,000-€750,000). Scheme 1 and the Innovation Clusters were under the Specific Commitment of the Programme Estimate, while Scheme 2 was under the imprest component of the PE. More than 700 applicants submitted proposals for the three launched calls and were evaluated by external assessors. Twenty Six grants will be funded under the different schemes; (11 projects under Scheme 1; 13 projects under Scheme 2; and 2 projects under Innovation Clusters), with a total EU Contribution of €7,501,599.55, representing a total EU Contribution of 85% of the total cost of the projects.

In addition, RDI-II Programme has continued to support 36 RDIN Focal points in different public universities, research centers and entities; as part of the legacy from RDI-I. RDI PIO has also participated in many activities of promoting participation of Egyptian researchers in EU Research funded programmes (FP7), as well as creating an innovation culture for linking Science and Society. A flagship programme for science-society link was the FameLab, done in coordination with the British Council. The RDI PIO has also managed a Technical Assistance to monitor and support the grants funded under RDI-II.

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

At the national level:

- EU Delegation to Egypt
- Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
- Grant Beneficiaries

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final
Coverage	The Action in its entirety
Geographic scope	Cairo and 2 field visits
Period to be evaluated	The entire period of the Action to date

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[2] of the European Commission[3]. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**[4] of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs.**[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 effect 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 relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders with:

---

[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 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008*

[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 ; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf*

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

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance and impact of the RDI II programme
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future Actions.
- A mapping of the sector's state of play, actors, main challenges and opportunities and recommendations for potential EU future actions in the sector.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to understand the performance of the Action, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results in order to adjust its design or implementing modalities if needed.

This final evaluation will serve to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Actions in the same sector.

The main users of this evaluation will be the relevant EU services (mostly the EU Delegation to Egypt) and the stakeholders that are involved in the implementation of the Action to be evaluated and its steering, in particular the Ministry of Higher Education and Research.

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 perspectives of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

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

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

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[6] and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

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

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

- E***Q1 (Relevance):*** To what extent is the Action contributing to: (i) the beneficiaries' needs, to Egypt's needs and priorities in the relevant sectors of intervention and (ii) to EU-Egypt cooperation priorities. Appropriateness of program's approach and methodology for achieving the objectives. Appropriateness and quality of log-frame, in particular indicators and targets, taking into account the specificity of the initiative, which includes major financial instruments. To what extent the objectives have been updated to adapt to changes in the context. Degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances.

- ***EQ2 (Effectiveness):*** To what extent the planned results have been delivered and received, as perceived by key stakeholders. How unplanned results may affect the outcomes. To what extent the intended beneficiaries are benefitting from the program results. Validity of assumptions and risk assessments and their effect on the achievement of the specific objectives.

- ***EQ3 (Efficiency):*** Review the main program activities and assessment of progress made against the log-frame indicators. To what extent have the activities undertaken achieved the planned results. To what extent have the program's resources and activities been managed and delivered adequately. Quality of work plans and day-to-day management (management of the budget, personnel, etc.), respect of deadlines. Quality of information management and reporting and extent to which key stakeholders are kept adequately informed of the program progress (including beneficiaries/target group).

- ***EQ4 (Impact):*** To what extent early signs of impact have been materialised. Complementarity with other programs and other financial instruments available in Egypt serving the same purpose.

- ***EQ5 (Sustainability):*** What is the level of policy support provided by the program and responsiveness of the authorities. To what extent the program has succeeded to introducing sustainable actions and initiatives which could continue after the end of the implementation period. What is the prospect for the sustainability of the benefits from the program, including financial viability, recurrent cost financing and asset maintenance. Are any institutional changes likely to stay in place and the supported by adequate government funding.

- ***EQ7 (Ownership):*** To what extent national beneficiaries have been involved in the design and implementation of the program.

- ***EQ8 (Coordination and Monitoring):*** To what extent there has been adequate coordination set up and monitoring at different levels of implementation (coordination with national and local institutions, implementing partners, beneficiaries, stakeholders, donors, etc.). Quality of monitoring system, accuracy and flexibility, adequacy of baseline information.

- ***EQ10 (Cross-cutting issues):*** To what extent relevant cross-cutting issues were taken into account in the identification/formulation documents. How cross-cutting issues have been reflected in the implementation of the program and its monitoring.

- ***EQ11 (EU Visibility):*** To what extent beneficiaries of the program are well informed and have positive perception about the EU contribution to this program and its interventions.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in 3 phases:

- Inception
- Field
- Synthesis & Dissemination

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

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and *meetings*
Inception phase	• Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Inception interviews [if relevant] • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation and field phase(Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase	• *Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority* at the EU Delegation premises in Cairo. • Inception report. • Slide presentation of the Inception Report.
Field Phase	• Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews and the most appropriate techniques • Data collection and analysis	• Initial meetings at country level with all key stakeholders • Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase . • *Debriefing* with the EU Delegation at the end of the field phase.
Synthesis & dissemination phase	• Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations • Reporting	• Draft Final Report . • Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module . • Final Report . • Slide presentation . • One-pager summarising progress against objectives of the programme for large audience).

2.3.2 *Inception Phase*

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in Cairo (EUD premises) between the EU Delegation representatives and the evaluators. Half-day presence of the evaluation team is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

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

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to the Solid Waste Management sector, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

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

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

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix[7], which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality**.

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

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, if needed, present in Cairo the **Inception Report** to the EU representatives.

2.3.3 *Field Phase*

The Field Phase starts after approval of the inception report by the Evaluation Manager.

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

---

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

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

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the EU programme manager, the programme management, and relevant stakeholders

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

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

2.3.4 Synthesis & Dissemination Phase

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

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

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Cairo the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence is required.

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

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter Instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

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

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

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page]

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Programme Manager for Environment of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU delegation, implementing partners and donors institutions.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

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

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

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

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be **English**. Some of the documents might only be available in Arabic (regulations,etc.).

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Cat I	1	35	20

In particular, the **Team Leader** (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a **Cat I expert**, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than **20 working days**, out of which **10 in the field.**

3.2 Expertise required

Expert 1 - Category 1:– 35 working days

Education

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

General professional experience

- At least 12 years' experience in working with scientific research, development and innovation.

Specific professional experience:

- Experience **in at least 2 projects** in the field of scientific research and innovation;
- Proven experience in **at least 3 assignments** in the field of monitoring and evaluating development projects funded through the EU or other international cooperation programmes;
- Demonstrable knowledge of, and experience with, EU rules and procedures, Project Cycle Management and EU led project/programme evaluation;
- At least **2 significant experiences as Team Leader** in designing, monitoring and/or evaluation of projects in the field of scientific research and innovation ;
- Experience in working in countries of the European Neighbourhood. Experience in the MENA region will be an asset.

Language skills:

- English: The expert must have excellent command of English (speaking and writing skills). (C1 minimum);

- Arabic : knowledge or good command would be an asset (B1 or above).

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

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.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is **February 2020**.

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: **60 calendar days**.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, for dissemination activities and distribution of outputs.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff[8]

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 (to be referenced as '0').

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

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place **in Cairo** mostly, with 2 field visits.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

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

List of outputs:

[8] *As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA*

	Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*	Main Content	Timing for submission

Inception Report	[5-10] pages	• Intervention logic
		• Stakeholder map
		• Methodology for the evaluation, incl.:
		  o Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods
		  o Consultation strategy
		  o Field visit approach [including the criteria to select the field visits]
		• Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures
		• Work plan
			End of Inception Phase

Draft Final Report	[20-30] pages	• **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**	End of Synthesis Phase
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	• **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	20-30 pages	• 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.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	• Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

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

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group **or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days**. The revised reports addressing the **comments 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 not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

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

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

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

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in **English**.

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in **2 paper copies** and in **electronic version** (Word and PDF) via e-mail at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

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

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services n. 2019/

FWC SIEA 2018 - Lot 4: Human Development and safety net

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price[9].

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

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	***40***
• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	**10**
• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	**20**
• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	**5**
• Organisation of tasks including timetable	**5**
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	***60***
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	***100***

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

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

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

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

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action(s) to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action(s)
- Any other relevant document

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Introduction	A description of the 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 answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.
3. Overall assessment *(optional)*	A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the 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

4.3 Lessons learnt	Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.
4.1 Conclusions	This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.
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, and 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 (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person) • Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses. • Evaluation Matrix • Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated) • Relevant geographic map(s) where the 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

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

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

		Indicative Duration in working days[10]		
Activity	**Location**	**Team Leader**	**Evaluator ...**	**Indicative Dates**
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis & Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

[10] *Add one column per each evaluator*

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

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

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

Legend: scores and their meaning

<u>Very satisfactory</u>: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way
<u>Satisfactory</u>: criterion fulfilled
<u>Unsatisfactory</u>: criterion partly fulfilled
<u>Very unsatisfactory</u>: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows		
1. Clarity of the report		
This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report: • Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers • Highlight the key messages • The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced • Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding • Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report) • Avoid unnecessary duplications • Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors • The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document		ⓘ
Strengths	**Weaknesses**	**Score**
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: • Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology • The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations • The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures		ⓘ
Strengths	**Weaknesses**	**Score**
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
3. Validity of Findings		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: • Findings derive from the evidence gathered • Findings address all selected evaluation criteria • Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources		ⓘ

- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

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

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

5. Usefulness of recommendations

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis *(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)*	
This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which: • Lessons are identified • When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)	
Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Contractor's comments	**Contractor's comments**

Final comments on the overall quality of the report	**Overall score**

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