

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A

Mid-term evaluation

Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia

FWC SIEA 2018 – LOT 4 Human Development and Safety Net

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

PCC – 418 372

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

1	BACKGROUND	3
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY AND SECTOR BACKGROUND	3
1.2	THE INTERVENTION TO BE EVALUATED	4
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION.....	5
1.4	PREVIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MONITORING (INCL. ROM), EVALUATIONS AND OTHER STUDIES UNDERTAKEN	6
2	DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	6
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
2.2	INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS	8
2.3	STRUCTURING OF THE EVALUATION AND OUTPUTS	9
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER).....	12
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	13
2.6	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT AND OF THE DELIVERABLES.....	14
3	LOGISTICS AND TIMING	14
3.1	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION OF STAFF PLACEMENT.....	14
4	REQUIREMENTS.....	14
5	REPORTS.....	14
5.1	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	14
5.2	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES.....	14
5.3	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	15
6	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	15
6.1	CONTENT OF REPORTING	15
6.2	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	15
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	15
7	PRACTICAL INFORMATION	15
	ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS	16
	ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA	21
	ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM.....	23
	ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX.....	24
	ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS	26
	ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE	29
	ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID	30

GUIDANCE FOR THE COMPLETION OF PART B IN OPSYS	34
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	34
LOCATION AND DURATION	34
REQUIREMENTS	35
DELIVERABLES.....	36

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country and sector background

According to the demographic data, Liberia has a youthful population, with 79% of Liberians under the age of 35. This significant youth bulge, coupled with a growing youth unemployment crisis, has severe consequences for the national education and training systems. Addressing the challenges of youth unemployment requires young people to be equipped with employable skills and competencies. Demand-driven and competency-based TVET programmes can provide an important avenue for the acquisition of employable skills and think out of the box. TVET must be developed in such a way that it responds to both youth unemployment on one hand and the demand for skilled workers by the private sector on the other hand. Young Liberians generally lack employable skills and are ill-equipped to access economic opportunities. Only a small proportion of Liberian youth participates in vocational education or training, which is mostly supply-driven.

There is a severe lack of qualified young people, which is creating a bottleneck in the supply of labour in occupations required by employers. Almost half of young workers in Liberia are undereducated for the work they do and do not hold the level of qualifications required for the job. While forecasts show that Liberia's industry will have a demand for 620,000 skilled workers by 2030, Liberia's economy is currently only employing about 152,000 skilled workers.

Through the action 'EU support to demand-driven technical vocational education and training for young people in Liberia', the European Union (EU) supports the implementation of two dedicated intervention areas for the development of an innovative, demand-driven and sustainable national TVET system. The overall objective is to enable Liberian youth to respond to economic growth opportunities, including green ones, by increasing their employability and entrepreneurship potential through strengthening of the TVET sector, including the development of a demand-driven TVET model by the private sector.

The intervention logic of the action is based on two differentiated but interlinked components, component 1 which extends the support to the public formal TVET sector and builds on the approach followed by the existing EU funded 'Youth Rising Project', and component 2, which addresses private sector led, demand-driven TVET provision. The component 2 is implemented by GIZ as a joint multi-donor action, jointly co-financed by the European Union and the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany. The component 2 'Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia' referred as the joint multi-donor action aims to strengthen TVET in selected sectors through the development of a demand driven model of TVET provision under the leadership of the private sector in Liberia.

GIZ's project 'Capacity Development in the Transport Sector' has been active in Liberia for more than one decade. Numerous activities, like the establishment of a vocational training course for road technicians, have been carried out to improve the capacities in the transport sector in Liberia. Component 2 is establishing a vocational training centre to further strengthen the capacity of the construction sector.

Since 2020, the project 'Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia' is establishing a technical and vocational training centre for 170 trainees, the 'Gateway Vocational Training Centre (GVTC)', which is led and owned by three private sector associations from the construction sector. Offered vocational training include road maintenance and construction, electrical wiring and solar technology and plumbing and pipefitting as well as short courses. The training curricula and materials are fully aligned with the new TVET Qualifications Framework by the Ministry of Education (MoE) and based

on the needs of the private sector. The project also funds the construction of the GVTC training facility on a 2.25 acres donated by the Liberian government to the Association of Liberian Construction Contractors.

1.2 The intervention to be evaluated¹

This evaluation covers one intervention financed by the EU in the TVET sector as follows:

Title of the intervention to be evaluated	• Mid-term review 'Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia'	
Budget of the intervention to be evaluated	• 8,950,000 EUR (5.75 M EUR EU and 3.2 M EUR BMZ)	
CRIS and/or OPSYS number of the intervention to be evaluated	• (CRIS) FED/ 2020/ 418 372	
Dates of the intervention to be evaluated	• Start date:	09/2020
	• End date:	05/2024

The mid-term evaluation's purpose is to carry out problem solving and learning purposes, in particular with respect to adapting the project to the changing context and making corrections to the project based on the lessons on the first phase of implementation. The mid-term evaluation of the component 2 is important because if the first phase of the action proves that other sectors beyond road construction are not receptive for the approach pilot in the road construction sector, available funding may be reallocated within the action.

The intervention to be evaluated relates to private sector-led demand driven TVET provision, namely 'Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia'. The project is also called joint multi-donor action. It is an action implemented as part of the ongoing GIZ project 'Capacity Development in the Transport Sector (CDTS)' in Liberia. The project duration is 44 months (from the 1st of September 2020 to the 30th of April 2024), with a total cost of 8,950,000 EUR. It is co-financed by the European Union with 5,750,000 EUR and by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development with 3,200,000 EUR and implemented by GIZ. The duration of the CDTS project was extended until the 31st of July 2024 to align the duration with the joint multi-donor action.

The CDTS project has established a performance-based vocational training programme in road maintenance and construction (RMCT) at the facilities of the Brooker Washington Institute (BWI)² in Kakata.

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

² The German Development Cooperation through the CDTS project under GIZ has supported the RMCT programme since its start in 2017. The Government of Sweden through its SIDA-funded 'Liberian-Swedish Feeder Road Project' (LSFRP) has contributed to the RMCT programme since 2019 through a monthly stipend to the trainees, as well as intake fees and transport refunds for the trainees. The European Union has been supporting the second intake of RMCT trainees since 2021 under its 'TVET by the Private Sector in Liberia' project implemented by GIZ through the CDTS project in a co-financing agreement with the German Government. The Booker Washington Institute (BWI) has been a partner of the RMCT programme from the actual training start in 2019 until today. The BWI made available for the training, a workshop with two class rooms, two offices and two storage rooms, outside training facilities, accommodation for RMCT trainers and trainees.

The RMCT serves as a pilot for the new training centre (Gateway Vocational Training Center – GVTC) developed under the joint multi-donor action. The RMCT has a modular training approach developed in close cooperation with the Association of Liberian Construction Contractors and the Ministry of Public Works.

The GVTC will take over the RMCT programme and support the implementation of three dedicated occupational areas for the development of an innovative, demand-driven, and sustainable vocational training system under the leadership of the private sector. The GVTC will target young people in Liberia and focus on skills training, dissemination of knowledge, activities and support to enter the labour market and entrepreneurship. The GVTC will use one modular training approach and focus on short-term courses rather than full-time training.

The courses to be offered include road maintenance and construction; renewable energy and energy efficiency (electrical and solar technology/ installer); and plumbing and pipefitting. The GVTC is owned by three associations of the private sector in Liberia, namely, the association of Liberian Construction Contractors, the Engineering Society of Liberia, and the Liberian Institute of Architects.

The GVTC will be located in Bentol City, Montserrado County. The interim GVTC is temporarily located in Monrovia, in Tubman Boulevard, Sinkor, at the Former Bluecrest University building. This is because there was a delay in the construction of the GVTC of approximately one year and a half due to COVID and the absence of GIZ international staff in Liberia and delays in the formal handover of the construction site to the GVTC. The actual construction of the GVTC in Bentol City has started in January 2023 and is expected to be completed within the next 11 months.

The three associations of the private sector have been directly involved in the organisational set-up of the GVTC. This includes organisational (construction, equipment of workshops, dormitories, administrative offices, canteen, etc) and financial structure and business plan.

The GVTC got its temporary permit from the Ministry of Education (MoE) to proceed with all preparations for the commencement of training in January 2023 for one extended time until the 30th of June 2023. The GVTC is currently working on the remaining documents that are required for a permanent accreditation as TVET provider under the MoE. The MoE has approved the qualifications for electrical and solar and plumbing and pipe fitting levels 1-3.

The GVTC has already conducted training of trainers. Twenty shortlisted candidates trained in a four week train of trainers course in October 2022. Six trainers have been trained in January 2023 in lesson planning for two weeks and are currently receiving an additional training in technical drawing and assessment methodology. Two trainers have been hired each for electrical and solar installation and plumbing and pipefitting. Two additional trainers for road maintenance and construction are expected to be hired anytime soon.

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
Implementing partners	Delegation of the European Union to Liberia, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	The conclusions of the mid-term evaluation will inform the implementing partners on adapting the project to the changing context and making corrections to the project based on the lessons learnt on the first phase of implementation.

		The conclusions of the mid-term review may lead to the decision of reallocation of available funding within the action.
National partners	Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Youth and Sports (MoYS), National Authorising Office, private sector associations	The conclusions of the mid-term evaluation will inform the MoE on granting further permits for permanent accreditation as TVET provider under the MoE.
Target groups	Trainers, trainees	The conclusions of the mid-term evaluation will inform the MoE on granting further permits for permanent accreditation as TVET provider under the MoE. The conclusions may have an impact on the number of trainers and trainees taking up courses.

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

No previous ROM or evaluation conducted

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Mid-term evaluation
Coverage	The intervention through 'Technical vocational education and training by the private sector in Liberia' in its entirety on progress to date
Geographic scope	The Republic of Liberia, West Africa
Period to be evaluated	From 09/2020 to 05/2023

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority³ of the European Commission⁴. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the

³ 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 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

⁴ 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

results⁵ of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy, with increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the achievement of the SDGs.⁶**

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.**

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 project ‘Technical Vocational Education and Training by the Private Sector in Liberia’, 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 in order to improve current and future interventions.

In particular, this mid-term evaluation will serve to inform on the needs on adapting the project to the changing context and making corrections to the project based on the lessons learnt on the first phase of implementation. The conclusions of the mid-term evaluation may lead to the decision of reallocation of available funding within the action. The mid-term evaluation will also inform the exit strategies to ensure the sustainability of the project and to draw lessons that can be replicated or up-scaled in other EU interventions in Liberia. The mid-term evaluation also serves to report transparently on EU support to TVET sector in Liberia.

The main users of this evaluation will be the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Liberia, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Youth and Sports, the National Authorising Office (NAO), private sector associations, and other national stakeholders directly involved in the implementation of the project.

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

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

Furthermore, the evaluation expert should consider whether **gender equality and women’s empowerment⁷, environment and adaptation to climate change, and innovation** were mainstreamed; the relevant **SDGs and their interlinkages** were identified; the principle of **Leave No One Behind** and the **Human Rights-Based Approach** was followed during design, and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

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

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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>

⁷ Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link (outdated, produced at the time of the GAP II): https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/documents/new-guidance-note-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimension

2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions, 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 Manager⁸ 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.

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

Indicative Evaluation questions could be:

Relevance

- Are the selected trades (RMC, ESI, PPF) and short courses relevant? Which other trades/short courses could be considered in future?
- Is the GVTC board composition (focus on private sector) suitable to achieve the objectives of the project?
- Are we working with the right stakeholders?
- How can the project enhance ownership of the GVTC by private sector associations (ALCC, ESOL, LIA) and Govt. actors (MoE, MYS)?
- How can the project attract more female trainees to the trades/short courses offered by the GVTC?

Coherence

- How well is the collaboration/coordination between the first component of the action implemented by UNIDO and the second component implemented by GIZ? How could the cooperation with UNIDO be strengthened?
- How well are the project's interventions harmonized/coordinated with the interventions implemented by other stakeholders in the TVET sector (IECD, AFD, USAID, EDF, SIDA, UNESCO, etc.)?
- How well aligned are the project's interventions to important policies in the Liberian TVET sector, e.g. TVET Policy, NTQF, ESP?
- How could the project enhance its inclusiveness towards marginalized groups?

Effectiveness

- To which extend is the project achieving its indicators and how effectively?
- Were the project indicators designed realistically with regards to timeframe, available resources and approach?
- Is the project's implementation approach as described in the DoA still leading to the intended results/objectives?
- What should be changed in the project's implementation approach (DoA)?
- Are the underlying assumed cause-effect hypotheses of the logframe still accurate?
- How well do the indicators still reflect/measure the results of the main interventions?

⁸ 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.

- Do indicators have to be reformulated to reflect the current implementation strategy? Please make suggestions.
- Are there any unintended positive or negative effects of the project?

Efficiency

- Have resources been used efficiently?
- Are there feasible alternatives which can deliver similar results with the given resources that the project should consider?
- Is the ToT approach of the project (international short term experts training in Liberia) efficient or are there other alternatives, e.g. sending trainers to (longterm) trainings in Southern Africa or Europe, which are more efficient?

Impact

- Is the project still leading to the initially intended impacts?
- Is the intervention leading to other changes, including “scalable” or “replicable” results?

Sustainability

- How sustainable are the project interventions with regards to:
 - Capacity strengthened of the private sector (short courses), of the GVTC (management and trainers) and of trainees (vocational training)?
 - Ownership of the private sector (ALCC, ESoL, LIA) for the GVTC?
 - Financial sustainability of the GVTC?
- How can the financial sustainability of the GVTC be enhanced?
- How could a phasing out strategy look like for the project, with emphasis on the GVTC?
- In the remaining implementation time, what can the project still do to enhance the sustainability of the GVTC?

EU added value

- To what extend has the project benefited from EU added value, e.g. through pooling of resources or enhanced synergies with EU member states?
- How well are the project’s interventions aligned to other focus areas of the EU, e.g. agriculture, forestry, transport, private sector development, etc.?

2.3 Structuring of the evaluation and outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases and through several activities:

- Inception phase
- Interim phase (desk and field activities)
- Synthesis phase
- Dissemination phase

Throughout the evaluation and following 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 taken.

2.3.1 Inception Phase

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

Main activities of evaluator during the Inception Phase

- Initial review of background documents.
- Remote kick-off session between the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Liberia and the evaluator. The objectives of the meeting will be: i) to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility; ii) to clarify the expectations of the evaluation; iii) to illustrate the tentative methodology to be used; iv) any other relevant objectives.
- Initial interviews with key stakeholders (e.g. GIZ).
- Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and the 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.
- Work plan of subsequent phases, including the identification of the expected risks and limitations of the methodology, and of the envisaged mitigation measures.
- Preparation of the draft inception report.
- Revision of the draft inception report (as relevant) following receipt of comments and preparing final version of the inception report.

2.3.2 Interim Phase

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

1. Desk activities - review of documentation and interviews with key stakeholders.
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.
- Identification of interviewees and other sources of information to support the analysis of data, as relevant.
- Finalisation of the organisation of the field visit to Liberia, including list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits.
- 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 activities.
- Presentation of the preliminary findings from the desk activities 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 national/ local authorities and stakeholders, throughout the field activities.
- 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 field activities.
- Presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (intermediary desk and field note) findings and preliminary conclusions to the Reference Group, supported by a 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.
- Presentation of the Draft Final Report to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report, including an executive summary (free text format).

The evaluator will make sure that:

- the 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 among the reference group and the broader audience working in the TVET sector in Liberia.

The targeted audience will be the reference group and the broader audience working in the TVET sector in Liberia.

Main activities of evaluators

- A remote dissemination seminar of the final report explaining the key findings and conclusions will be organised for the reference group and broader audience working in the TVET sector in Liberia. The dissemination seminar will last approximately one hour supported with one slide presentation.

2.3.5 Overview of deliverables and meetings and their timing

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

Evaluation phases	Deliverables and meetings	Timing
Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kick-off meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the very beginning of the inception phase.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft inception report, including work plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four days after the kick-off meeting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final inception report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven days after the start of the inception phase.
Interim phase: desk and field activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of the preliminary findings from the desk activities supported by a slide presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three days after the start of the interim phase.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of the intermediate findings (intermediary desk and field note - both desk and field activities) and preliminary conclusions supported by a slide presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Twelve days after the start of the interim phase.
Synthesis phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft final report, including an executive summary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three days after the start of the synthesis phase.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of the draft final report supported by a slide presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four days after the start of the synthesis phase.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final report, including an executive summary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven days after the start of the synthesis phase.
Dissemination phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remote presentation of the key findings and conclusions of the final report supported by a slide presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week after the end of the synthesis phase.

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 be able to demonstrate how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The methodology should also include (if applicable) communication-related actions, messages, materials, and related managerial structures.

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 and 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 accessing the field. These may include the combination of face-to-face and remote methods of data collection, if relevant⁹.

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 20 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 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 Ramon Vivanco Mugarra, programme officer on private sector development and financial instruments at the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Liberia. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Evaluation Manager with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Services (Operations Department – Governance Team of the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Liberia), GIZ, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Youth and Sports and private sector associations in Liberia.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- to propose and validate indicative and final 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.
- to provide 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 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

⁹ 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>.

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 their 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 timeframe of the contract.

2.6 Language of the specific contract and of the deliverables

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 of staff placement¹⁰

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in Annex VI to be finalized 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 authorities or other stakeholders.

4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

All costs, other than the costs for key experts of the evaluation team will be reflected in a dedicated budget line 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.

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 Word and PDF at no extra cost.

¹⁰ As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

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. The final mid-term evaluation report 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 2 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments will be submitted within 3 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 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-LIBERIA-CRIS-FWC-OFFERS@eeas.europa.eu

ANNEXES TO TOR - PART A

The following annexes are specific to Part A of the SIEA evaluation ToR and do not include the Technical Evaluation Criteria of the offers submitted by the invited framework contractors. When finalising your Request for Service, please refer to the file “B - VII - c (ii) - Global Price Specific Contract Evaluation grid.doc”, containing these criteria for global prices contracts.

When completing the grid below on OPSYS, note that it is possible to adapt the standard grid to the specific aspects of your evaluation.

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	50
1 Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
2 Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
3 Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
4 Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	50
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

This adaptation proposes a maximum 50 points for O&M and 50 points for the proposed team.

Feel free to adapt the table and the proposed scoring to the specific needs of your evaluation. For instance, you may prefer a different weighting of the different elements included in the grid. Frequent alternatives to this table increase the weight for O&M to 60 or decrease it to 40.

If you adapt the table, please be aware that, under global price contracts, only the overall team can be scored; scoring of the individual experts is not allowed.

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

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective: impact	To enable Liberian youth to respond to economic growth opportunities (including inclusive green ones) by increasing their employability and	i. Youth employment rate (sex disaggregated) ii. Employers' perception of suitability of trainees' skills developed with EU support vis-à-			National and international (ILO) statistics Reports on analysis of private sector/ industry surveys produced by the project	

	entrepreneurship potential through strengthening the TVET sector, including development of demand-driven model of TVET provision	vis skills private sector/ industry demand iii. Private sector takes a lead role in design and delivery of TVET provision in selected sectors				
Specific objective: outcome	Strengthening TVET in selected sectors (including related to green economy) through development of a demand-driven model of TVET provision under the leadership of the private sector	<p>2.1 Private sector associations constitutionally enabled to provide TVET programmes</p> <p>2.2 80% of employers enrolling employees in training programmes satisfied with training delivered</p> <p>2.3 Increased demand by employers for training programmes with 300 graduates</p> <p>2.4 70% of 300 trainees employed or self-employed within 6 months of training completion</p> <p>2.5 Results verified by independent international technical audit</p>	<p>2.1 0 Operational private sector TVET training centre (2020)</p> <p>2.2 0% of employers enrolling employees satisfied with training delivered (2020)</p> <p>2.3 0 graduates (2020)</p> <p>2.4 No trainees employed or self-employed within 6 months of training completion (2020)</p> <p>2.5 No verified international technical audit (2020)</p>	<p>2.1 1 Operational private sector TVET training centre (2024)</p> <p>2.2 80% of employers enrolling employees satisfied with training delivered (2024)</p> <p>2.3 300 graduates (2024)</p> <p>2.4 210 trainees employed or self-employed within 6 months of training completion</p> <p>2.5 1 verified international technical audit (2024)</p>	<p>2.1 TVET centre legal and administrative provisions enacted</p> <p>2.2 TVET centre internal monitoring and compliance procedures</p> <p>2.3 Programme's internal monitoring systems</p> <p>2.4 Tracer study</p> <p>2.5 Audit report</p>	<p>Liberia remains committed to the national development strategy</p> <p>Growing commitment and leadership from the GoL in relation to TVET</p> <p>The goL takes measures to ensure the security of investments of private sector organisations</p> <p>The GoL implements law-based and data-driven road maintenance</p> <p>Stakeholders are fully engaged and embrace change and sustainability</p> <p>Liberia's economic outlook does not deteriorate</p> <p>Energy and agriculture sectors willing to receive capacity development support</p> <p>Increasing demand for skilled workers</p> <p>The GoL recognises the role of the private sector</p>

						in TVET delivery
Output 2.1	Establish a TVET centre in Liberia under the leadership and ownership of private sector-based associations, including business planning and rehabilitation of facilities for the centre	<p>2.1.1 Management, legal and administrative provisions for the centre enacted</p> <p>2.1.2 Three participation sector associations with capacity assessments conducted</p> <p>2.1.3 Business plan produced and validated, including cost recovery measures</p> <p>2.1.4 Infrastructure rehabilitated, and goods and services procured</p> <p>2.1.5 The Communication and Visibility Plan implemented and evaluated</p>	<p>2.1.1 No management, legal and administrative provisions for the centre enacted (2020)</p> <p>2.1.2 0 capacity assessments (2020)</p> <p>2.1.3 0 business plan available (2021)</p> <p>2.1.4 No infrastructure rehabilitated, and no goods and services procured (2020)</p> <p>2.1.5 No Communication and Visibility Plan implemented and evaluated (2020)</p>	<p>2.1.1 Management, legal and administrative provisions for the centre is enacted (2024)</p> <p>2.1.2 Three capacity assessments (2023)</p> <p>2.1.3 Business plan available (2021)</p> <p>2.1.4 Infrastructure rehabilitated, and goods and services procured (2024)</p> <p>2.1.5 Communication and Visibility Plan implemented and evaluated (2024)</p>	<p>2.1.1 Legal and institutional statutes for the centre</p> <p>2.1.2 Minutes of meetings, outputs of workshops and/or assessments reports</p> <p>2.1.3 Business plan business plan</p> <p>2.1.4 Certificate of completion of works and equipment inventory</p> <p>2.1.5 External verification reports</p>	<p>Legal transparency by accreditation/ licensing bodies responsible</p> <p>High perception of relevance of demand-driven approach among participating associations and companies</p> <p>Effectiveness of operational planning and capacity assessment methodologies</p> <p>Transparent and efficient procurement processes followed</p>
Output 2.2	A mechanism ensuring a better match with labour market demand for quality and quantity of trainees	<p>2.2.1 An assessment of the potential matching mechanism conducted</p> <p>2.2.2 Graduate tracer studies conducted</p>	<p>2.2.1 No assessment available (2020)</p> <p>2.2.2 No tracer study available (2020)</p>	<p>2.2.1 One assessment available (2022)</p> <p>2.2.2 One graduate tracer study conducted (2023)</p>	<p>2.2.1 Operational plan for the system</p> <p>2.2.2 Tracer study</p> <p>2.2.3 External verification reports</p>	<p>Efficient processes for determining skills demand introduced into the mechanism</p> <p>Participating companies able to provide adequate and accurate data</p> <p>Appropriate open source software available</p>
Output 2.3	Design and implementation of a demand-driven training programme for up to three sectors (e.g. construction, including green/low carbon, renewable energy/ energy efficiency sustainable agriculture) in	<p>2.3.1 Three training standards and curricula developed in selected sectors</p> <p>2.3.2 Three competency based training programmes developed and provided</p> <p>2.3.3 Quantity and quality of training materials produced</p>	<p>2.3.1 One training standards and curricula (RMCT) is available (2020)</p> <p>2.3.2 One competency-based training programme developed (2020)</p> <p>2.3.3 One training material for</p>	<p>2.3.1 Three training standards and curricula (2024)</p> <p>2.3.2 Three competency-based training programmes conducted (2024)</p> <p>2.3.3 Three training materials produced (2024)</p> <p>2.3.4 12 trainers (2024)</p>	<p>2.3.1 Standards verified by occupational bodies/ sector associations/ GoL</p> <p>2.3.2 Internal M&E and reporting by the centre</p> <p>2.3.3 External verification report</p>	<p>Systems and procedures for programme standards developed in line with regional best practices</p> <p>Procedures for external verification of standards developed in line with regional best practices</p>

	partnership with the private sector		RMCT produced (2020)			Procedures for assessment and certification of trainees established in line with regional best practice Participating companies provide internships and support work
Output 2.4	Jobs created, and formal employment realised in selected sectors (including green jobs)	<p>2.4.1 Quality and quantity of occupational information and career guidance services for trainees and prospective employees</p> <p>2.4.2 180 trainees successfully complete employability skills training programmes</p> <p>2.4.3 100 private sector companies participate in capacity building events</p> <p>2.4.4 Results disseminated, and best practices replicated in coordination with the private sector and the GoL</p>	<p>2.4.1 0 occupational information and career guidance services available (2020)</p> <p>2.4.2 0 participating trainees (2020)</p> <p>2.4.3 0 private sector companies participate in capacity building events (2020)</p> <p>2.4.4 No results disseminated, and no best practices replicated (2020)</p>	<p>2.4.1 One occupational information and career guidance service available (2024)</p> <p>2.4.2 180 participating trainees successfully complete employability skills training programmes (2024)</p> <p>2.4.3 100 private sector companies participate in capacity building events (2024)</p> <p>2.4.4 Results disseminated, and best practices replicated (2024)</p>	<p>2.4.1 Internal monitoring and tracking systems for the centre</p> <p>2.4.2 Attendance lists and certificates for participants</p> <p>2.4.3 Attendance lists, tests and certificates</p> <p>2.4.4 External verification reports</p> <p>2.4.5 GoL and other national programme and action reports</p>	<p>Occupational information developed in cooperation with participating companies</p> <p>Employability skills training developed in cooperation with participating companies</p> <p>Regional best practices incorporated into career guidance services and employability skills training programmes</p> <p>Coordination mechanisms established to ensure effective dialogue between the private sector and the GoL</p>

ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of 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 2.1, 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:

- legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the intervention(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.
- intervention financing agreement and addenda.
- intervention's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports.
- relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors.
- calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the intervention(s).
- any other relevant document.

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

ANNEX 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 all 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: “XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX?”				
Evaluation criteria covered ¹¹				
Judgement criteria (JC) ¹²	Indicators (Ind) ¹³	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 -			

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

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

¹³ 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

Ind¹⁴	Baseline data¹⁵	Evidence gathered/analysed	Quality of evidence¹⁶
I 1.1.1			
I 1.1.2			
I 1.1.3			
I 1.2.1			
I 1.2.2			
I 1.3.1			

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

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

¹⁶ 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 15 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"> ○ Overview of entire evaluation process and tools. ○ Consultation strategy as needed. ○ Approach to the following phase of the evaluation, including planning of field missions (work plan)
Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures	In tabular form (free style)
Ethics rules	Including, but not limited to, avoiding harm and conflict of interest, informed consent, 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. INTERMEDIARY DESK AND FIELD NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the Desk and Field phase)

The format of the Intermediary Desk and Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 10 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

list of activities conducted
difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted
intermediate/preliminary consolidated Desk and Field 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. 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 Liberia and 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 reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	
4.1 Conclusions	<p>This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.</p> <p>In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasising the three or four major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.</p>
4.2 Recommendations	<p>They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle 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>

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.
5. Annexes to the report	<p>The report should include the following annexes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference of the evaluation. • names of the evaluator (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person). • detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses. • detailed answer by judgement criteria. • 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

A self-standing executive summary will 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 ¹⁷		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk activities: total days				
•				
•				
Field activities: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹⁷ 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	
4. Validity of conclusions		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues 		
		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
5. Usefulness of recommendations		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions; are concrete, achievable and realistic; are targeted to specific addressees; are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound; (if relevant) provide advice for the intervention's exit strategy, post-intervention sustainability or for adjusting the intervention'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)		
<p>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lessons are identified; 		
		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> where 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