

## SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A

### Final Evaluation of

EU- Nepal Practical Partnership for Technical Vocational Education and Training reform (TVET- PP).

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4 Human Development and safety net

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

SIEA-2018-13505

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY : THE EUROPEAN UNION DELEGATION TO NEPAL

<b>1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / SECTOR/ BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2	THE INTERVENTIONS TO BE EVALUATED .....	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION.....	8
1.4	PREVIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MONITORING (INCL. ROM), EVALUATION AND OTHER STUDIES UNDERTAKEN .....	10
<b>2</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	10
2.2	INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS .....	11
2.3	STRUCTURING OF THE EVALUATION AND OUTPUTS .....	14
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER).....	18
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION .....	19
2.6	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT AND OF THE REPORTS.....	20
<b>3</b>	<b>LOGISTICS AND TIMING .....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF .....	20
<b>4</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>REPORTS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	20
5.2	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES .....	21
5.3	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	21
<b>6</b>	<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1	CONTENT OF REPORTING .....	21
6.2	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS .....	21
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	21
<b>7</b>	<b>PRACTICAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM.....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX.....</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE .....</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID .....</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>GUIDANCE FOR THE COMPLETION OF PART B IN OPSYS .....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>

## 1 BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Relevant country / sector/ background

After a decade of civil war, Nepal's peace process led to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2006 and the promulgation of a new Constitution in September 2015. The Constitution officially institutionalized Nepal as a Federal Democratic Republic with three tiers of government. In addition to the Federal Government, 7 provincial and 753 local level governments have been formed with the powers, functions and responsibilities of the state divided among them, detailed by sector in the unbundling report annexed to the Constitution. The Constitution guarantees the fundamental right to education, and specifies the Directive Principles of the State on education and concurrent rights.

The Government of Nepal has emphasized the importance of the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) sector for achieving an inclusive economic development and shared prosperity for its citizens. This is reflected in Nepal's constitution (article 51, h,1) which envisions to develop competent and well-prepared human resources through a "scientific, technical, vocational, empirical, employment and people-oriented" education, that should make the labour force competent and professional. Following the 2 devastating earthquakes of 2015, the Post Disaster Need Assessment (PDNA) emphasised upgrading of skills and knowledge as one of the most important paths towards a swift recovery and enhanced resilience.

With a population of around 29 million, youth make up about 40% of Nepal's population. More than 450,000 people enter the job market yearly, while around 1500 workforce enter the international job market every day. With a low rate of students completing school education, let alone higher education, sound technical education and vocational training system is one of the most important needs for Nepal.

The Government of Nepal (GoN) has long recognized the importance of TVET, and in 1989 it created the Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT), the national autonomous apex body for the TVET sector, under the Ministry of Education. Despite recognising the role of skilled workforce in reducing poverty, the vocational education sector in Nepal has not been prioritised over years. The TVET system in Nepal is still fragmented and the quality of training does not meet market needs. Training irrelevancy, poor access and lack of post training support like career guidance and employment support services are the major issues the current TVET system is facing.

However, subject to the approval of TVET Act, CTEVT will be reformed in reference to its structure because of governments' need for federalizing TVET as stated in the unbundling report .

The EU supports the education sector including TVET in Nepal as part of the EU-Nepal cooperation strategy (2014-2020). The "EU- Nepal Practical Partnership for Technical Vocational Education and Training reform (TVET-PP) program " is an essential response in the post-disaster context. The action is in line with the specific objective n. 6 of the MIP for Nepal 2014- 2020: "Strengthening the Vocational Training System".

The TVET- PP will act as a catalyst for an improved Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) sector in Nepal with an active engagement of private sector in the Government led coordination and policy which will enhance the quality, the relevance and the access of TVET.

## 1.2 The interventions to be evaluated<sup>1</sup>

This evaluation covers following interventions financed by the EU in the TVET sector as follows:

<b>Titles of the interventions to be evaluated</b>	<b>1. TVET Practical Partnership for Nepal (TVET-PP) ( Decision)</b> <b>2. Dakchyata :TVET Practical Partnership ( Contract)</b> <b>3. SAKCHYAMTA: Scaled-up Quality of the TVET provision and implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>( Contract)</li> </ul>	
<b>Budgets of the interventions to be evaluated</b>	1. 20, 000,000.00 EUR + 611, 111 EUR (TVET PP) (400,000.00 EUR is allocated for Visibility, Audit & evaluation and Contingency) 2. 14, 099,323.00 EUR ( EU Contribution ) + 10,000 EUR (British Council co-financing) - Dakchayata 3. 5, 500,000.00 EUR ( EU Contribution ) + 611,111 EUR ( CTEVT co-financing) - Sakchymata	
<b>CRIS and/or OPSYS numbers of the interventions to be evaluated</b>	1. ACA/2015/37498 ( Decision) (TVET PP) 2. ACA/2016/379-793 ( Contract) Dakchayata 3. ACA/2017/386-809 ( Contract) Sakchymata	
<b>Dates of the interventions to be evaluated</b>	• Start date:	28/12/2016
	• End date:	31/07/2022

### 1. DCI-ASIE/2015/037-498 (Decision) - TVET PP

In December 2016, the European Union and the Government of Nepal signed a Financing agreement "EU-Nepal Practical Partnership for Technical Vocational Education and Training reform (TVET- PP) " aiming to contribute to the implementation of the Government of Nepal's (GoN) policies and enhance the quality, the relevance and the access of TVET, in view of achieving the overall objective to contribute to Nepal's inclusive and sustainable growth through investment in human capital and by creating better employment Opportunities. As foreseen in the Financing Agreement, EU financed independent Mid Term Review (MTR) of the program.

The overall EU contribution to the program is € 20 Million. The program comprises two implementation modality; Direct management mode: grant- direct award to CTEVT and Indirect management with the British Council.

The specific objective is to strengthen and implement more effectively a TVET policy responsive to labour market needs and pilot an integrated Public Private Partnership (PPP) Approach in three key economic sectors: i) agriculture (commercial farming and food production), ii) constructions, iii) tourism that offer opportunities for promoting the transition to a greener, climate-resilient, low-emission economy. These

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'intervention' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

sectors are particularly important in the aftermath of the earthquakes, given their contribution to Nepal's economic development post disaster.

TVET- PP expected results and indicative budget breakdown for each result are:

R 1. Quality of the TVET provision and implementation scaled-up and outreach to the most disadvantaged ensured. Indicative EU budget contribution: EUR 5 500 000; CTEVT contribution EUR 611,111;

R.2 Innovative PPP models to expand relevant TVET provision in Nepal tested. Indicative EU budget contribution: EUR 9 000 000;

R 3. Capacity building and role of the GoN in the TVET system enhanced and TVET governance improved. Indicative EU budget contribution: EUR 5 100 000

There are two individual projects Sakchyamta and Dakchayata, governed by this decision / Financing Agreement which contributes to the achievement of TVET PP results respectively.

## **2. ACA/2016/379-793 (Contract)- " DAKCHYATA"; Implementing partner : British council**

In December 2016, a Delegation agreement " Dakchyata: TVET Practical Partnership" was signed between EU and the British council with the starting date of 01/03/2017 only. **The project is responsible for Result 2 and Result 3 of TVET PP (decision).**

The original duration of the program was 48 months and was fully financed by the EU contribution; no co-financing from the British council which means any Individual Procurement and Grant contracts implementing this Agreement shall be signed by the Organisation: no later than thirty six (36) months from the date of entry into force of this Agreement.

In 2019, the British council co-financed the project with EUR 10, 000 and the duration was extended for 10 months as well. It prolonged the project duration to 58 months and eliminated the D+3 procurement requirements.

Again in 2021, the project duration was extended by 11m 28 days (i.e. 69 m 28 days in total) due to COVID impact in the implementation of some of the activities.

The beneficiary needs to provide Bi-annual technical progress report and work plan in addition to the regular yearly narrative and financial report.

The project achieves its objective/ outcomes through following activities. The pandemic has impacted the delivery of activities to some extent during two last years, however, key achievements are summarised here below;

### **Outcome # Public private partnership (PPPs) identify practices to enhance relevance quality and sustainability of TVET provision in Nepal.**

#### **i) Practical Partnership Pilots (PPPs)**

The various PPP mechanisms developed and piloted have provided practical examples of working models that challenge outdated ways of thinking about the role of private sector and the labour market in TVET. Lessons and learning on collaborative practices from the Pilots are providing insights on the most appropriate employer engagement models to increase relevance, quality and sustainability of TVET provision, including Semi-Apprenticeship Models (SAM), Field- Based Approach models (FBA), and Employer Dialogue Forum (EDF).

Total 10 grants under this stream have been awarded.

ii) Strengthening Employer Engagement in Council of Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) Schools (SEECs)

CTEVT and the nine participating schools have made progress in working towards the objective to 'build models of quality training in the Dakchayata Supported Schools (DSS) and the wider CTEVT sector, that develop the skills employers consider relevant, leading to growth in livelihood, employment and entrepreneurship'.

Development of collaborative partnerships with employers; promoting instructors' up-to-date industry knowledge; promoting access to training and learner transition to employment; building school leadership capacity; growing understanding and application of sustainable practices and development of green skills are key achievements under this grant stream .

In recognition of the value CTEVT now places on Employer Engagement activities, plans are in place to further replicate the structures developed through more schools throughout 2022.

iii) Employer-led Labour Market Secretariat (ELMS)

With establishment of the Secretariat governing structures to support private sector to collaborate on demand side labour market activities, good progress has been made towards the five key aims of the Employer-led Labour Market Secretariat:

- Effective frameworks and infrastructure to deliver harmonised employer led LMI
- Employers' capacity to design and deliver LMI
- Shared understanding of skills, knowledge and behaviours for priority occupations
- Design and delivery effective employer led LMI surveys
- Supporting employer led contributions to labour market policy forums

iv) Skills support for integration of returning migrant workers into the labour market

Three new Grant Agreements have been concluded under a fourth funding stream designed to support the skilling of migrant workers returning to Nepal. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) aims to provide effective, relevant, and efficient skills training to returning migrant workers, particularly women, historically disadvantaged, poor, and marginalised groups and to link them with skills certification to create better employment and self-employment opportunities. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is targeting three geographic areas to enhance employability of individuals who have returned to Nepal following the pandemic, and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) project will be implemented at a nationwide level to generate evidence on future skills needs, promote the upskilling of migrant workers, and identify new opportunities for migrant returnees. The three grants thus complement one another and mutually reinforce the common goal of assisting the reintegration of returning migrant workers into the labour market.

v) High level TVET PPP Working Group established as forum for senior PPP representatives to engage regularly on PPP issues, with nominations from MoEST, CTEVT, FNCCI, FNCSI, CNI and relevant commodity associations. PPP Working Group was committed to work together to develop PPP policy guidelines incorporating learning from a wide range of resources developed on the Practical Partnership approach, and furthermore to act as "PPP champions for Nepal". After a sustained period of deliberation, interaction, and reflection among the public and private sector representatives in the Working Group, the Policy Guiding Document (PGD) was finalised, agreed and submitted to the Government.

### **Outcome # Enhance the capacity of the GoN to coordinate and govern the TVET system**

- i) The “**Competency Framework for TVET Professionals**” developed in collaboration with, and endorsed by, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST ) is being beneficial in coordinated capacity development across the TVET sector as it aims to provide comprehensive overview of skills needs for more effective delivery and co-ordination in the sector, by mapping out the capacity development needs of the various category of personnel involved in TVET across different TVET related organisations.

On the basis of the finalised CD framework, a specific training package targeting Implementation level Personnel was developed and piloted in every province of the country in collaboration with the Training Institute for Technical Instruction (TITI).

The Ministry of Education has requested a significant increase in the level of training available under the Competency Framework, with plans to build the capacity of teachers in General Schools running the 9-12 Technical Education Stream.

- ii) To support the MoEST’s initiative, TVET Sector Reform Plan, a supply-side TVET sector analysis forming a baseline data set has been conducted. Dakchyata has worked closely with MoEST to define the parameters for this assignment, resulting in an assessment of 17 key performance areas, with a total of 150 indicators. Data has been collected from approximately five hundred submissions across the country.
- iii) Support to the monitoring of TVET reform by carrying out an Annual Review of TVET is completed with the fourth and final Dakchyata-led Annual Review. In parallel, a TVET Sector Monitoring Manual co-developed with the Ministry of Education, had been finalised and will serve as a guiding document for Government to take forward systematic monitoring of the sector in the years ahead.

A comparative analysis showing the progress, trends and challenges over the study period was also finalised, and provided a solid foundation charting development in the TVET landscapes as planning begins on the Government’s long-term TVET Sector Reform Plan.

- iv) On completion of technical assistance to CTEVT in the originally mandated areas of Curriculum Development and Quality Assurance, and subsequent expanded collaboration through joint delivery of the Public Information Campaign, four new areas of collaboration have since emerged: Occupation Demand Tool for assessing labour market demand; Institutionalisation of lessons from the TVET Public Information Campaign (PIC); Greening TVET; Labour Market Information Collaboration.

**3. ACA/2017/ 386-809 (Contract) SAKCHYAMTA: Scaled-up Quality of the TVET provision and Implementation; implementing partner: Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT)** - A direct grant award was concluded between the EU and CTEVT on 08/12/2017 following de jure monopoly according to the article 190 (1) (c) RAP; without a call for proposals.

#### **The project is responsible for Result 1 of TVET PP (decision).**

CTEVT has exclusive competence in the field of activity to which the grant relates pursuant to any applicable law. CTEVT is the national autonomous apex body of TVET subsector in Nepal and is responsible for policy formulation, coordination, quality assurance and program implementation. CTEVT

has been mandated for offering technical and vocational education and short term vocational training by CTEVT act 1989.

In December 2017, a grant contract " SAKCHYAMTA: Scaled-up Quality of the TVET provision and Implementation " was signed between EU and the CTEVT. The project is responsible for Result 1 of TVET PP (decision).

The original duration of the program was 48 months. The project is funded by EU along with co-financing from the CTEVT; EU contribution = € 5,500,000 and CTEVT co-financing = € 611,111  
Training Institute for Technical Instruction (TITI) involved in the project as an affiliated entity.

In 2021, the project duration was extended by 12 m 20 days (i.e. 60 m 20 days in total) due to COVID impact in the implementation of some of the activities.

The beneficiary needs to provide Bi-annual technical progress report and work plan in addition to the regular yearly narrative and financial report.

The project will achieve its objectives/ outcomes through following activities. The pandemic has impacted the delivery of activities to some extent during two last years, however, key achievements are summarised here below;

**Outcome # Strengthen human resources and institutional capacity of CTEVT**

- i) Organizational and management Survey and Training Need Assessment are completed.
- ii) Job descriptions of staff working in two technical schools- Pokhara Technical School, and Tikapur Polytechnic Institute were developed.
- iii) Technical Education and Vocational Training Management Information System (TVET-MIS) developed and oriented in Lahan Technical School, Tikapur Polytechnic Institute, and Pokhara Technical School. TVET-MIS provides information on vocational training graduates at national level.
- iv) Capacity development training and support was provided to the staff of CTEVT and private technical schools on the development of instructional material including for e- learning program, curriculum design, career Guidance, occupational skill upgrading.
- v) Lab/workshop in 3 technical schools are refurbished with upgraded tools/equipment to improve the quality of training.
- vi) A networking system in three CoEs has been developed to deliver TVET e- learning programs which turned out to be very relevant during lockdowns triggered by COVID. It enabled digital teaching and learning which has contributed to the quality of TVET learning outcome.

**Outcome # Improve curriculum development and instructional materials involving active participation of business and industry sector;**

- i) New curriculum and National Occupation Skill Standards (NOSS) were developed in collaboration with the private sector along with the revision of some existing NoSS and Curriculums to match the market needs.

- ii) An assessment was conducted to introduce an effective alternative to curriculum development methodology/ approach; Functional Analysis approach seems to be the most feasible one. 3 curricula will be developed through this option as a pilot.
- iii) Residential vocational skill training, using the new standards/curricula, and mobilizing the local expert workers, entrepreneurs at 3 CoEs were conducted to reduce the job market supply – demand gap.
- iv) Many e-learning materials including instructional and training materials of the selected occupation been designed and developed for the piloting of e-learning Program.

#### **Outcome # Improve TVET Quality Assurance System (QAS):**

- i) Quality Assurance System has great importance to have standard quality delivery of TVET programs. It encompasses quality improvement, quality management, and accreditation .Quality assurance system focusing on accreditation of the TVET institutes/programs is quite new for Nepal and it has a great significance for the overall quality improvement and management and ultimately linkage with the increased employability of graduates.

Thus, following the development of a quality assurance framework of the TVET program, the project has developed an accreditation manual and procedures. Piloting of the accreditation manual in 3 CoEs is underway with the support of technical experts.

- ii) Online based Tracer study and Reporting System has been developed and strengthen the capacity of the 3 CoEs.

#### **Outcomes # Coordinate and collaborate with TVET Stakeholders**

- i) Since province and local government have not their separate structure and competent human resources to look after TVET programs. CTEVT including Sakchyamta Project has been giving a message to the provincial governments and local governments through various workshops, means of communication and interactions programs regarding its readiness to offer assistance and support for the development of TVET programs in their respective province and the local area.
- ii) In collaboration with the representatives of provincial and local elected bodies several public awareness campaigns/events had been organized to disseminate the significance of TVET programs to create employability, provide information on TVET programs offered throughout the country and bring different stakeholders of the TVET programs, students, and employers together.

### **1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention**

The following table describes the key stakeholders of the intervention.

Stakeholder groups	Role and involvement in the intervention	How the intervention is expected to impact on the stakeholder group
<b>Implementing partners</b>	CTEVT and British Council are two implementing partners who	The interventions will contribute in capacitating key actors / stakeholders group of



	contributes in achieving objectives of the program through agreed activities.	the sector which will ultimately enhanced the relevancy and quality of the TVET.
<b>National partners</b>	<p># Ministry of Education, Science and Technology ( MoEST) and CTEVT are actively involved in the planning and implementation of the project.</p> <p># Private sector representatives (Agriculture, tourism and construction) are core stakeholders of the intervention. They are systematically involved in each phase of the implementation.</p> <p># Through the TVET DPs working group meetings, TVET DPs are regularly informed about the intervention's objectives, modality , and activities since the initial stage. As feasible, their suggestions and input were taken into consideration. The European Union , Swiss Development Cooperation, Asian Development Bank, World Bank, German Cooperation - GIZ, Korea International Cooperation Agency – KOICA , British Embassy Kathmandu , UNDP are regular members of the TVET DPs working Group. .</p>	<p>Enhance the capacity of the GoN to coordinate and govern the TVET system.</p> <p>The quality, access, inclusivity, relevancy and effectiveness of TVET is strengthened.</p> <p>Role of the private sector in TVET becomes more prominent, meaningful and valued.</p> <p>Coordinated and coherent approach is established among DPs, relevant stakeholders and national authority to enhance the synergy among various activities and to avoid duplications.</p>
<b>Target groups</b>	CTEVT schools, MoEST, Private sector are main target groups. Components and activities were designed in a way that it will enhance their capacity in governance & coordination, meaningful engagement. They are systematically involved in the implementation of those activities.	TVET will be more responsive to labour market needs (reduced supply- demand gap) in three economic sectors and will contribute to better employment opportunities.
<b>End beneficiaries</b>	Along with the target groups, youth & general people are also beneficiaries of the intervention. The ultimate benefits arisen from	Change of mind-set about TEVT and acknowledge its importance in social and economic growth.

	the intervention will include these wider beneficiaries.	Better employment opportunities.
--	--	----------------------------------

#### 1.4 Previous internal and external monitoring (incl. ROM), evaluation and other studies undertaken

These interventions have been covered by Result Reporting exercise since few years. The Mid-term Evaluation was also performed in 2019.

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final Evaluation
Coverage	Decision along with two contracts 1. TVET Practical Partnership for Nepal (TVET-PP) ( Decision) 2. Dakchyata :TVET Practical Partnership ( Contract) 3. SAKCHYAMTA: Scaled-up Quality of the TVET provision and implementation ( Contract)
Geographic scope	Nepal
Period to be evaluated	28/12/2016 – 30/08/2022

### 2.1 Objectives of the evaluation and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority<sup>2</sup> of the European Commission<sup>3</sup>. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**<sup>4</sup> of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy, with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.<sup>5</sup>

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether and how the EU intervention(s) has/have contributed to the achievement of these results** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

<sup>2</sup> COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com\\_2013\\_686\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf); EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

<sup>3</sup> 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](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](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](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> 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](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> 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>

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

- an overall independent assessment of the performance of the SAKCHYAMATA, DAKCHYATA including sub-grants and their influence on overall EU- Nepal Practical Partnership for Technical Vocational Education and Training reform program (TVET- PP) paying particular attention to its different levels of results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations for future interventions.
- An assessment of the situation concerning the sector policy & plan, and ways forward.
- In particular, this evaluation will serve to understand whether the implementation modalities & the governance mechanism of the interventions are appropriate in order to achieve its objectives and allows suitable & efficient representation of the interests of key stakeholders;

The evaluation shall also serve to understand overall performance of the interventions and the reasons behind it in order to prepare the launching of EU's new interventions / designing the next cycle in the sector, including mainstreaming TVET in other programmes.

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation Nepal, implementing partners (British Council and CTEVT) along with key stakeholders of the project from both public and private sector namely; Ministry of Education, Ministry of labour, National planning commission, Chamber of commerce, employers association, relevant sector councils, as well as other development partners active in the sector. The EU HQ and other EU Delegations working on TVET projects in other countries and donor agencies involved in TVET sector may also get benefit from the findings of this evaluation.

The evaluation will assess the intervention(s) using the **six standard DAC evaluation criteria**, namely: **relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability** and early signs of **impact**. In addition, the evaluation will assess the intervention(s) through an **EU specific evaluation criterion**, which is the **EU added value**.

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

Furthermore, the evaluation team should consider whether **gender equality and women's empowerment**<sup>6</sup>, **environment** and **adaptation to climate change, innovation, scaling up** were mainstreamed; the relevant **SDGs and their interlinkages** were identified; the principle of **Leave No One Behind** and the **rights-based approach methodology** was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

## 2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific EQs, as formulated below, are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, and further to the finalisation/reconstruction of the Intervention Logic of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, the evaluation team will discuss these with the Evaluation Manager<sup>7</sup> and Reference Group, and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions. This will include an indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

---

<sup>6</sup> Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link: [new link to C4D to be publish](#)

<sup>7</sup> The Evaluation Manager is the staff member 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.

### **# Relevance:**

The analysis of relevance needs to focus on the extent to which the objectives of the projects/programme are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and EC's policies.

The assessment of relevancy shall, therefore, also address issues such as;

1. To what extent has the project been aligned with key policy and program frameworks, such as Nepal's development policy, TVET Policy, relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and National Youth Policy? How has it contributed to a credible, measured, result-oriented, and budgeted TVET Policy and plan?
2. To what extent are the intervention's objectives compatible with the (current) needs or challenges of the TEVT sector and its stakeholders? Was it flexible and adaptive to the changes in circumstances including changes in policies, COVID situation and climate changes issues?
3. Whether beneficiaries' opinions were incorporated to address their needs? What tools are being used to ensure inclusiveness and meaningful engagement of private sector, youth, women and disadvantage group?

### **# Coherence:**

The analysis of coherence needs to focus on the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. The assessment shall, therefore, address issues such as;

1. The extent to which the project synergies and interlinks with the country's, the European Commission's, and other development partners' evolving strategies & policies as well as with other actors' interventions in the same context.
2. To what extent has the intervention strengthened sector coordination, namely complementary, harmonization, and coherence, and to what extent is the intervention adding value while avoiding duplication of effort?

### **# Effectiveness:**

The effectiveness criterion concerns how far the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

The assessment of effectiveness shall, therefore, also address issues such as;

1. Whether planned benefits are being delivered and received, including to & by hard-to-reach communities, as perceived by all key stakeholders and the program;
2. What were the most effective and ineffective activities? Are there activities that could be replicated based on government directives (i.e., without or with minimal external funding)
3. To what extent the collaboration with different development partners including private sector organisations and enterprises has been effective, whether intended beneficiaries participated in the

intervention and noticed any change in behavioural patterns in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels?

4. What were the most effective (or ineffective) mechanisms of coordination among stakeholders including Ministries and Development partners that facilitated good results?
5. How unintended circumstances have affected the benefits received and how effectively implementation modality was adapted to ensure that the results would still be achieved; how well has it been supported by key stakeholders including Government, Commission etc.?

#### **# Efficiency:**

The assessment needs to focus on the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

The assessment of efficiency shall, therefore, also address issues such as:

1. Have resources been allocated efficiently in regard to expected outcomes? Was the duration sufficient to generate intended outcome?
2. To what extent the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions?
3. Have resources be allocated efficiently in different activities;
  - a. The quality of day-to-day management, such as, work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs),and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor), capacity of project staff and their efficiency of managing project;
  - b. Technical assistance - to provide appropriate guidance, support in developing capacities to define and produce results
  - c. Quality and timely monitoring
4. Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities implemented so far?

#### **# Impact:**

The assessment needs to focus on the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

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

1. To what extent have the project's objectives contributed to policy implementation and improving the quality, relevance, and access to TVET, taking into account the intervention's social, environmental, and economic effects as well?

#### **Sustainability:**

The sustainability criterion relates to the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

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

1. To what extent stakeholders take ownership including political ownership of project's outcomes and continue to upgrade the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities;
2. Institutional capacity; to what extent have capacities been built at the government level and counterpart institutions; to what extent the project's outcome is embedded in local institutional structures and in future interventions; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?);
3. Technical (technology) capacity; to what extent the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, skills or knowledge; whether the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance;
4. Financial sustainability; whether the products, equipment or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and will be able to cover all costs (including maintenance & recurrent costs) even after funding will end;
5. Whether relevant cross-cutting issues, including social sustainability - social capital and creating services - were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project and will be continued;

#### **# EU added value:**

The evaluation needs to focus on to what extent the intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from other donor's / development partner's interventions in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).

The assessment shall, therefore, address issues such as:

- How the program has amplified the impact of other interventions in the partner country, emphasizing on the additional benefit of the activity, as a result of it being funded by the European Commission?

#### **Looking Forward:**

**How has the programme paved a way for future interventions? What would be the most appropriate and feasible recommendations?**

#### **Visibility:**

**How well did the visibility standard align with the EU communication strategy? How well does the target group recognize the EU's contribution to the country, sector, and stakeholders, including the final beneficiaries?**

### **2.3 Structuring of the evaluation and outputs**

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases and two activities:

- Inception phase

- Interim phase
  - Desk activities
  - Field activities
- Synthesis phase
- Dissemination phase

Throughout the evaluation and following the approval of the Inception Report, if any significant deviation from the work plan could compromise the quality of the evaluation or jeopardise the completion of the specific contract within the contractual timeframe, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

### **2.3.1 Inception Phase**

Objectives of the phase: to structure the evaluation and clarify the key issues to be addressed.

Main activities of evaluators during the Inception Phase

- Initial review of background documents (see Annex IV).
- A kick-off session in Kathmandu (or remotely) between the EU Delegation, the Reference Group and the evaluators. Objectives of the meeting: i) to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility; ii) to clarify expectations of the evaluation; iii) to illustrate the tentative methodology to be used; iv) any other relevant objectives.
- Initial interviews with key stakeholders.
- Finalisation or reconstruction of the description of the Intervention Logic/Theory of Change and its underlying assumptions. This requires an assessment of the evidence (between the hierarchy of results e.g. outputs, outcomes and impact) and the assumptions necessary for the intervention to work or prevent change from happening.
- Graphic representation of the reconstructed/finalised Intervention Logic/Theory of Change.
- Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and on the reconstructed Intervention Logic.
- Finalisation of the evaluation methodology, including the definition of judgement criteria and indicators per Evaluation Question, the selection of data collection tools and sources. The methodology should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and assess if and how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.
- The methodology will include the proposed representative sample of interventions to be analysed in greater detail to inform the assessment of performance and results/sustainability. The selection of this sample should be underpinned by a clear methodology (incl. selection criteria used).
- Representation of the methodological approach in an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex IV).
- Work plan of subsequent phases.
- Identification of the expected risks and limitations of the methodology, and of the envisaged mitigation measures.
- Preparation of the Inception Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Presentation of the Inception Report in Kathmandu (or remotely) to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.

### **2.3.2 Interim Phase**

This phase is entirely devoted to gathering and analysing the information required to provide preliminary answers to the EQs. Work in this phase will consist of two activities.

1. Desk activities - review interviews with key stakeholders and other initial data collection using different tools such as surveys.

2. Field activities - further data collection and analysis with the aim of testing the hypotheses identified during the 'Desk activities'.

#### **2.3.2.1 Desk activities**

Objectives of the activities: to analyse the relevant data, draft preliminary answers to the Evaluation Questions and identify the hypotheses to be tested.

##### Main activities of evaluators

- In-depth analysis of relevant documents and other sources. This is to be done systematically and should reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.
- Selected interviews and other to support the analysis of data, as relevant.
- fine-tuning of the evaluation tools.
- finalisation of the organisation of the field visits, including list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.
- Formulation of the preliminary responses to each Evaluation Question, with analysis of their validity and limitations.
- Identification of the issues still to be covered and of the preliminary hypotheses to be tested during field.
- Preparation of a slide presentation of preliminary findings from the phase (free format).
- Presentation of the preliminary findings from the Desk Phase in Kathmandu (or remotely) [to the Reference Group, supported by the slide presentation.

#### **2.3.2.2 Field activities**

Objectives of the activities: to conduct primary research and validate/modify the hypotheses formulated during the desk activities.

##### Main activities of evaluators

- Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
- Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders, including the relevant government and local authorities and agencies, throughout the phase.
- Use of the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respecting the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and being sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments, throughout the phase.
- Preparation of a slide presentation of intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions (to be tested with the Reference group) (
- Presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions in Kathmandu to the Reference Group, supported by the slide presentation.

#### **2.3.3 Synthesis Phase**

Objectives of the phase: to report on results from the evaluation (final answers to the Evaluation Questions (final findings) and formulate conclusions and recommendations).

##### Main activities of evaluators

- Analysis and synthesis of the evidence and data collected during the previous phases to provide a final answer to the Evaluation Questions.
- Preparation of the Draft Final Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Presentation of the Draft Final Report in Kathmandu to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.



- Preparation of a response to the draft QAG (Quality Assessment Grid) formulated by the Evaluation Manager via the EVAL module<sup>8</sup>.
- Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report, upload to the EVAL module; its content is described in Annex V. 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 evaluators must explain the reasons in writing (free format).
- Preparation of the Executive Summary and upload to the EVAL module by using the compulsory format given in the module.
- Inclusion of an executive summary (free text format) in the Final Report (see Annex V).

The evaluators 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 taking place already;
- the wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, considers the audience as identified in Art. 2.1 above.

#### **2.3.4 Dissemination Phase**

Objective of the phase: to support the communication of the results of the evaluation. In particular to promote inputs to decision-making, organisational learning, accountability/transparency and efficient resource among all relevant and interested parties.

The targeted audience will be Intervention Ministries, intervention stakeholders including from CoEs and DSS nine schools present in 1 to 7 provinces, Development Partners and beneficiaries

Main activities of evaluators

- Organize one day seminar in Kathmandu to present results of evaluations. A provision for the organization of the seminar will be included in the budget. The indicative number of participants to the seminar will be 60.
- Production of Infographics, at least 3 Thirty seconds to one-minute videos with beneficiaries and infographics showcasing the results of the programme, and 3 one- to two-page briefs for easy reference showcasing success stories, lessons learned, and recommendations. It should be of high quality & in a user friendly format.

References: the team should take inspiration from the ESS/INTPA work on **Dissemination of Evaluation Results** at [https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation\\_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations); this contains an analysis of best practice in 12 international organisations and NGOs plus five 'how-to' guides on production of infographics, briefs, videos, blogs and podcasts.

#### **2.3.5 Overview of the outputs and meetings and their timing**

The synoptic table below presents an overview of the outputs to be produced by the team, the key meetings with the Reference Group (including the Evaluation Managers) as described previously, as well as their timing.

Evaluation phases	Outputs and meetings	Timing
-------------------	----------------------	--------

<sup>8</sup> All mentions to the EVAL module throughout the text in accordance with the Art.43.3 of the "Draft Framework Contract Agreement and Special Conditions" of the SIEA Framework Contract. The module EVAL will be integrated into OPSYS.

<b>Inception phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: kick off</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After initial document analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 days after the start of evaluation assignment.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slide presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: presentation Inception Report</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "</li> </ul>
<b>Interim Phase : Desk activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slide preparation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 days after the end of inception phase.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: presentation of Desk Phase activities</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "</li> </ul>
<b>Interim Phase : Field activities</b>	Slide preparation	20 days after the end of Desk Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "</li> </ul>
<b>Synthesis phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 days after completion of Interim phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 days after completion of Interim phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments to the draft QAG</li> </ul>	Together with the Final Report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive summary of the Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Together with the Final Report</li> </ul>
<b>Dissemination Phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisation of the final presentation seminar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After approval of the Final report.</li> </ul>
	Production and dissemination of infographics and briefs for easy reference highlighting success stories, lesson learnt and recommendation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the seminar.</li> </ul>

## 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 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; it should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The contractor should develop few Evaluation Questions with relevant judgement criteria, indicators, data collection tools and methods.

This evaluation may be impacted by difficulties in accessing the field due to security constraints or health-related issues. The to-be-selected contractor will bear the duty of ensuring that the evaluators will respect, at all times, the relevant international, national and local guidance regarding travel limitations and will exert due care in preventing the spread of diseases, avoiding any unreasonable, unnecessary risks. The specific contract Organisation and Methodology should contain a clear and detailed description of the methods that the evaluation will use to address potential difficulties in access to the field. These may include the combination of face-to-face and remote methods of data collection, if relevant<sup>9</sup>.

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 15 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 included in this limit and may be presented on an A3 page]

#### **2.4.1 Evaluation ethics**

All evaluations must be credible and free from bias; they must respect dignity and diversity, and protect stakeholders' rights and interests. Evaluators must ensure confidentiality and anonymity of informants and be guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in the observation of the 'do no harm' principle. The approach of framework contractors to observe these obligations must be explicitly addressed in the specific Organisation and Methodology, and implemented by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation, including during dissemination of results.

### **2.5 Management and steering of the evaluation**

#### **2.5.1 At the EU level**

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Services, donor group representative, MoEST and Private sector representative.

#### **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 with, all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention;
- to discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team;
- to assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation;
- to support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

---

<sup>9</sup> The Framework Contractors are invited to consult the wealth of resources available through the two ESS/INTPA initiatives Evaluation in Hard-to-Reach Areas and Evaluation in Crisis: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess>.

### 2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the requirements set out in Article 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 for 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 and of the reports

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

All reports will be submitted in English.

## 3 LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

### 3.1 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff<sup>10</sup>

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

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

## 4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

All the costs other than costs for key experts of the evaluation team will be reflected in a dedicated budget provision under the chapter "Other details" of the framework contractor's financial offer.

## 5 REPORTS

For the list of reports, please refer to Chapter 2.3 of Part A and to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

### 5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

The selected contractor will **submit all deliverables by uploading them into 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.

---

<sup>10</sup> As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

## **5.2 Number of report copies**

Apart from its submission, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 3 paper copies and in electronic version at no extra cost.

## **5.3 Formatting of reports**

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

# **6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

## **6.1 Content of reporting**

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

## **6.2 Comments on the outputs**

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send the contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 30 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments will be submitted within 20 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

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

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex VII). The Contractor is given the chance to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager through the EVAL module. 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 of the FWC SIEA's specific contract Performance Evaluation by the Evaluation Manager.

# **7 PRACTICAL INFORMATION**

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address (es):

[delegation-nepal-cris-fwc-offers@eeas.europa.eu](mailto:delegation-nepal-cris-fwc-offers@eeas.europa.eu)

## **ANNEXES TO TOR - PART A**

---

### **ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS**

*Log frames of DAKCHYATA & SAKCHYAMATA projects and TVET Practical Partnership for Nepal (TVET-PP) program; the Contracting Authority will make available to the selected evaluators shortly after the contract signature:*

## ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis respects the new definitions of these criteria, their explanatory notes and the guidance document. These can be found at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

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

### DAC CRITERIA

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

### EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION

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

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

The following is an indicative list of the documents that the Contracting Authority will make available to the selected evaluators shortly after the contract signature:

- Multiannual Indicative Programmes 2014-2020
- Nepal TVET Policy 2012
- National development plans ( web links)
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Dakchayata and Sakchyamta' s contract, addenda, progress reports
- Project's baseline study and other relevant studies
- Intervention's mid-term evaluation report
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Any other relevant documents

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



## ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX

The evaluation matrix (hereinafter: the matrix) will accompany the whole evaluation by summarising its **methodological design (Part A)**, to be filled and included in the Inception Report) and **documenting the evidence analysed** to answer each EQ (Part B)

The full matrix (parts A and B) is to be included in the following reports.

Use one set of tables (Parts A and B) for each Evaluation Question (EQ) and add or delete as many rows as needed to reflect the selected judgement criteria and indicators. Delete the guidance and the footnotes when including the matrix in the reports.

### PART A – Evaluation design

EQ1: "XXX?"				
Evaluation criteria covered <sup>11</sup>				
Judgement criteria (JC) <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (Ind) <sup>13</sup>	Information sources		Methods / tools
		Primary	Secondary	
JC 1.1 -	I 1.1.1 -			
	I 1.1.2 -			
	I 1.1.3 -			
JC 1.2 -	I 1.2.1 -			
	I 1.2.2 -			
	I 1.2.3 -			
JC 1.3 -	I 1.3.1 -			
	I 1.3.2 -			
	I 1.3.3 -			

<sup>11</sup> What evaluation criterion/criteria is/are addressed by this EQ?

<sup>12</sup> Describe each selected JC and number them as illustrated in the template; the first numeric value represents the EQ the JC refers to.

<sup>13</sup> As above. The two first numeric values represent the JC the indicators refer to. The number of JC and indicators per JC as reported in the table is purely illustrative. The table is to be adapted to your specific evaluation and reflect the appropriate JCs and indicators.

**PART B – Evidence log**

Ind <sup>14</sup>	Baseline data <sup>15</sup>	Evidence gathered/analysed	Quality of evidence <sup>16</sup>
I 1.1.1			
I 1.1.2			
I 1.1.3			
I 1.2.1			
I 1.2.2			
I 1.3.1			

---

<sup>14</sup> Use the same numbering as in Part A; no need to describe the indicators.

<sup>15</sup> In case they are available. This column can also be used to record mid-term data (if available).

<sup>16</sup> Score as follows: 0 (no evidence), 1 (some evidence), 2 (sufficient evidence), 3 (conclusive evidence)

## ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS

### **1. INCEPTION REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Inception phase)**

The format of the Inception Report is free and should have a maximum length of 20 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| • Introduction  | Short description of the context of the evaluation, its objectives and focus   |
| • Reconstructed Intervention Logic  | This will be based on initial analysis of secondary sources and consultation with key stakeholders   |
| • Stakeholder map   | Free format; this will represent the key stakeholders of the intervention(s) under evaluation and their relations with the intervention(s)   |
| • Finalised Evaluation Questions with Judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix, part A) | See the template   |
| • Methodology of the evaluation   | This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview of entire evaluation process and tools</li> <li>○ Consultation strategy</li> <li>○ Case studies</li> <li>○ Approach to the following phase of the evaluation, including planning of the missions</li> </ul> |
| • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures                   | In tabular, free format  |
| • Ethics rules  | Including, but not limited to, avoiding harm and conflict of interest, informed consents, confidentiality and awareness of local governance and regulations  |
| • Work plan   | This will include a free text description of the plans and their representation in Gantt format  |

### **2. DESK Phase slide presentation (to be delivered at the end of the desk activities)**

The format of the presentation is free and should have reasonable number of slides; it must contain at least the following:

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| • Introduction                               |                     |
| • Background and key methodological elements | With indication of: |

- Overall evaluation approach
  - Desk activities:
    - Data collection and analyses
    - Overview of tools and techniques used
  - Challenges and limitations
- Preliminary findings
 

Preliminary answers to each EQ, with indication (in a tabular form) of the hypotheses to be tested in the field and information gaps
- Update of field visit approach and work plan
- Main annexes
  - Preliminary answers by judgement criteria
  - Updated evaluation matrix (Part A + Part B)

## **2. Field phase slide presentation (to be delivered at the end of the field activities)**

The format of the field phase slide presentation is free and should have reasonable numbers of slides excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

- list of activities conducted;
- difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted;
- intermediate/preliminary findings;
- preliminary overall conclusions (to be tested with the Reference Group).

## **3. DRAFT FINAL REPORT AND FINAL REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Synthesis phase)**

The Draft Final and the Final Report have the same structure, format and content. They should 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 40 pages excluding annexes. 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 should carry the following text:

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

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

### Executive Summary

The Executive Summary is expected to highlight the evaluation purpose, the methods used, the main evaluation findings and the conclusions and recommendations. It is to be considered a “stand alone” document.

### 1. Introduction

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

2. Findings	A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Question headings, supported by evidence and reasoning. Findings per judgement criteria and detailed evidence per indicator are included in an annex to the Report.
3. Overall assessment ( <i>optional</i> )	A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the intervention. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	
4.1 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.
4.2 Conclusions	<p>This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.</p> <p>In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasising the three or four major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.</p>
4.3 Recommendations	<p>They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle underway, or to prepare the design of a new intervention for the next cycle.</p> <p>Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.</p>
5. Annexes to the report	<p>The report should include the following annexes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference of the evaluation;</li> <li>• names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person);</li> <li>• detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties</li> </ul>

encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses;

- detailed answer by judgement criteria;
- evaluation matrix with data gathered and analysed by (EQ/JC) indicator;
- Intervention Logic/Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated);
- relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place;
- list of persons/organisations consulted;
- literature and documentation consulted;
- other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant.

#### **4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (EVAL Module)**

An Executive Summary is to be prepared using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. Its format will be available to evaluators at the time of the submission through EVAL of the Final Report. This is additional to the request to prepare a self-standing executive summary to be included in the Final Report (please refer to the paragraph above, detailing the content of the Final Report).

## ANNEX VI: 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 should reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days <sup>17</sup>		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

<sup>17</sup> Add one column per each evaluator

## ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (following 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, who will be able to include their comments.

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

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

#### Legend: scores and their meaning

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

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent



## The evaluation report is assessed as follows

### 1. Clarity of the report

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;
- have various chapters and annexes well balanced in length;
- 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	
<b>4. Validity of conclusions</b>		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis;</li> <li>• conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the Evaluation Questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions;</li> <li>• conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• (if relevant) the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues</li> </ul>		
		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>5. Usefulness of recommendations</b>		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions;</li> <li>• are concrete, achievable and realistic;</li> <li>• are targeted to specific addressees;</li> <li>• are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound;</li> <li>• (if relevant) provide advice for the intervention's exit strategy, post-intervention sustainability or for adjusting the intervention's design or plans.</li> </ul>		
		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)</b>		

<div>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:</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• lessons are identified;</li><li>• where relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s).</li></ul></div> <div></div>	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments
Final comments on the overall quality of the report	Overall score



# **TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART B**

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **1. Benefitting Zone**

Nepal

### **2. Contracting authority**

The European Union, represented by the European Commission, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

### **3. Contract language**

English

## **LOCATION AND DURATION**

### **4. Location**

- **Team members :**
  - Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Kathmandu , Nepal
  - Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): 7 Provinces
- **Team members :**
  - Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Kathmandu , Nepal
  - Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): 7 Provinces
- **Team Leader :**
  - Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Kathmandu, Nepal
  - Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): 7 Provinces

### **5. Start date and period of implementation**

The indicative start date is 23/10/2022 and the period of implementation of the contract will be 240 days from this date (indicative end date: 20/06/2023).

## **REQUIREMENTS**

### **6. Expertise**

For this assignment, one individual expert must be proposed for each position.

The expertise required for the implementation of the specific contract is detailed below.

- **Team members :**

- General description of the position:
- Expert category: Cat. II (>6 years of experience)
- Qualifications and skills required: A relevant University degree of at least Master's level or equivalent specific professional experience of at least thirteen years.
- General professional experience: • At least 6 years solid and diversified experience of working in the area of skills development and human resource development/ economic development particular in the TVET sector (CBT, QA/ accreditation, curriculum development, assessment, public private partnership (PPP), policy reform ) • At least 7 years' experience in professional evaluation and should be well versed in evaluation methods and techniques; • At least 5 years professional experience of working in Asia, preferably in South Asia ( Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) • Post graduate studies and/or specific training in subjects related to the assignment under this contract (TVET and Evaluation) will be considered an asset.
- Specific professional experience: • At least 4 years' experience in Systemic Approaches to institutional (& organisational) development, reform, capacity building and change processes in the TVET sector in developing countries. • Experience of evaluating at least 5 TVET projects and 3 should be EU funded. • Experience of at least 3 Final Evaluation.
- Language skills: • At least 1 member shall possess a level C1 expertise in English Language. • At least one member of the team should have good command over Nepali language. • All team member should have report writing skills along with good communication skill, adoptability and social awareness. 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.
- Minimum number of working days: **35 days**
- **Team members :**
  - General description of the position:
  - Expert category: Cat. II (>6 years of experience)
  - Qualifications and skills required: A relevant University degree of at least Master's level or equivalent specific professional experience of at least thirteen years.
  - General professional experience: • At least 6 years solid and diversified experience of working in the area of skills development and human resource development/ economic development particular in the TVET sector (CBT, QA/ accreditation, curriculum development, assessment, public private partnership (PPP), policy reform ) • At least 7 years' experience in professional evaluation and should be well versed in evaluation methods and techniques; • At least 5 years professional experience of working in Asia, preferably in South Asia ( Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) • Post graduate studies and/or specific training in subjects related to the assignment under this contract (TVET and Evaluation) will be considered an asset.

- Specific professional experience: • At least 4 years' experience in Systemic Approaches to institutional (& organisational) development, reform, capacity building and change processes in the TVET sector in developing countries. • Experience of evaluating at least 5 TVET projects and 3 should be EU funded. • Experience of at least 3 Final Evaluation.
- Language skills: • At least 1 member shall possess a level C1 expertise in English Language. • At least one member of the team should have good command over Nepali language. • All team member should have report writing skills along with good communication skill, adoptability and social awareness. 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.
- Minimum number of working days: **35 days**
- **Team Leader :**
  - General description of the position: The Team Leader will be responsible for overall project implementation, coordination and supervision of the entire evaluation team during the evaluation missions. The Team Leader will be the primary point of contact for the EU Delegation, Reference group member, CTEVT & British Council. The Team Leader will have a primary role in all the expected results. However, the level of involvement will depend upon his/her experience and that of the rest of the team and will be defined in the Organisation & Methodology to be proposed by the Contractor.
  - Expert category: Cat. I (>12 years of experience)
  - Qualifications and skills required: A relevant University degree of at least Master's level or equivalent specific professional experience of at least thirteen years.
  - General professional experience: • At least 12 years solid and diversified experience of working in the area of skills development and human resource development/ economic development particular in the TVET sector (CBT, QA/ accreditation, curriculum development, assessment, public private partnership (PPP), policy reform) • At least 10 years' experience in professional evaluation and should be well versed in evaluation methods and techniques; • At least ten years professional experience of working in Asia, preferably in South Asia ( Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) • Post graduate studies and/or specific training in subjects related to the assignment under this contract (TVET and Evaluation) will be considered an asset. • Five years' experience in project and human resources management, including planning, budgeting, disbursement and progress monitoring;
  - Specific professional experience: • At least 5 years' experience in Systemic Approaches to institutional (& organizational) development, reform, capacity building and change processes in the TVET sector in developing countries. • Experience of evaluating at least 7 TVET projects and 5 should be EU funded. • Experience of at least 5 Final Evaluation.
  - Language skills: • Level C1 expertise in English Language. • All team member should have report writing skills along with good communication skill, adaptability and social awareness. 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.

- Minimum number of working days: **30** days
- Additional information: The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

## **7. Incidental expenditure**

No incidental expenditure provided for in this contract.

## **8. Lump sums**

No lump sums provided for in this contract.

## **9. Expenditure verification**

No expenditure verification report is required.

## **10. Other details**

### **1 - International Travel**

Minimum quantity (if applicable): 2

### **2 - local Travel**

Minimum quantity (if applicable): 7

### **3 - Per Diem**

Minimum quantity (if applicable): 40

### **4 - Seminar**

Minimum quantity (if applicable): 1

## **REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES**

### **11. Reports and deliverables requirements**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Submission timing or deadline</b>
• Inception Report	Please refer to ANNEX V: Structure of the reports of ToR	English	Within 15 Day(s) Before the project end
Desk Phase presentation	Slide preparation on Desk Phase activities Please refer to ANNEX V: Structure	English	Within 10 Day(s) Before the project end



<b>Title</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Submission timing or deadline</b>
	of the reports of ToR for reference.		
Preliminary findings presentation	Debriefing on intermediate/ preliminary (Desk and Field) findings Please refer to ANNEX V: Structure of the reports of ToR for reference.	English	Within 20 Day(s) Before the project end
Draft final report	Please refer to ANNEX V: Structure of the reports of ToR	English	Within 20 Day(s) Before the project end
Final report	Please refer to ANNEX V: Structure of the reports of ToR	English	Within 20 Day(s) Before the project end