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1. PREFACE

Evaluation is a valuable tool for programme managers who are seeking to strengthen the quality of their programmes and improve the expected outcomes. The purpose of this guideline is to improve the quality and consistency of EEA and Norway Grants evaluations and enhance evaluation capacity.

According to the Regulation on the implementation of the European Economic Area (EEA) Financial Mechanism 2009-2014 and the Regulation on the implementation of the Norwegian (EEA) Financial Mechanism 2009-2014 (“the Regulations”) Beneficiary States “shall carry out evaluations of programmes to assess actual and/or expected effects at the outcome level. It shall present its evaluation plan in the Strategic Report.” (Article 9.1.1). Furthermore, the Regulations specify that evaluations “shall be carried out by experts or entities independent of the National Focal Point, the Certifying Authority and the Programme Operator in accordance with the Evaluation Guidelines.” (Article 9.1.2). “The results of the evaluations shall be sent to the donors, the National Focal Point, the Monitoring Committee and the Programme Operator, and made public. Prior to publication, the FMC, the National Focal Point and the Programme Operator shall be given the opportunity to provide comments.” (Article 9.1.3).

Secondly, the “FMC may carry out evaluations related to the overall objectives of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2009-2014, objectives of programme areas or evaluations of the overall contribution of the Financial Mechanisms (FMs) 2009-2014 to a specific Beneficiary State.” (Article 9.2.1). “The FMC may, in consultation with the Beneficiary State concerned, carry out evaluations of on-going or completed programmes to assess actual and/or expected effects at outcome level.” (Article 9.2.2).

This evaluation guideline contains the core methodology for undertaking evaluations under the FMs. The guideline also presents the key processes and tools for designing and conducting project and programme evaluations. It has been created to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of programme and project evaluations and to strengthen the accountability of Programme Operators and National Focal Points for the resources entrusted to them. More importantly, it is an effort to respond to the growing demands for public accountability to citizens in both the donor and beneficiary states on how assistance is used.

The guideline is meant for FMO staff, donors, National Focal Points, Programme Operators, project implementers and external monitoring and evaluation consultants and is an attempt to help ensure that we follow the same guidelines, streamline our reports and follow up on evaluation findings.

We hope that this guideline will help us and our partners to be even clearer about the higher-level results we want to achieve; to develop and act on strategies to achieve those results; to use systematically recommendations and lessons drawn from monitoring and evaluations to support the decision making processes; and, ultimately, to improve our contribution to the reduction of economic and social disparities within Europe and to strengthening of bilateral relations between donor and beneficiary states.
2. BACKGROUND

Evaluations intend to assist the Beneficiary States and the Donor States in learning from experience and document results. Furthermore, evaluations have a control function to assess the quality of Programmes, and determine whether grants provided are corresponding to results achieved. Communicating results from evaluations and following up on findings is an important part of the evaluation exercise.

The EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms have a strong focus on results, and the emphasis of evaluations shall be placed on the programme outcomes. The Beneficiary State shall carry out evaluations of Programmes under the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms as required in Chapter 9 of the relevant Regulation. The purpose of the Guideline is to communicate the expectations of the Donor State(s) in respect of such evaluations. The FMC may also decide to carry out evaluations of Programmes, as well as evaluations related to the overall objectives of the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms.

Evaluation is a complement to monitoring and should be used to address challenges that cannot be adequately handled by regular monitoring. The frequency and scope of evaluations shall match the nature, risk and importance of the activity. Evaluations shall follow international standards, with acceptable criteria and definitions.

3. THE PURPOSES OF EVALUATIONS

Evaluations shall seek to document the use of funds and the subsequent results for decision makers and the general public. Furthermore, evaluations shall contribute to increased understanding of the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms’ limitations and its potential to bring about social and economic development within the Beneficiary States.

The purpose of an evaluation will be four-fold: 1) to evaluate whether Programmes have performed as intended and/or whether the expected results have been achieved (control function, documentation); 2) to assess impacts and sustainability of support (documentation); 3) to produce knowledge of results and performance which can contribute to improved support in the future (learning function); and 4) to assess how the funding over-laps with or complements other sources of funding (particularly EU funding).

Evaluations will seek to establish the causes why an intervention was more or less successful, make an assessment of success according to objectives/expected outcomes and place the interventions and its contributions into a broader context (sectoral and/or national).

The balance between the learning and the control, documentation and results aspects will vary from one evaluation to the next. Communication of knowledge to the relevant planners and decision makers is a key tool for improving future interventions and modalities of co-operation.
4. EVALUATION TERMINOLOGIES

One normally distinguishes between formative and summative evaluations, according to the purpose of the exercise. While the learning aspect is in focus in a formative evaluation, a summative evaluation is mainly undertaken for the purpose of accountability (control). Evaluations will normally have both summative and formative characteristics. In some cases a baseline study will be carried out to analyse the current situation at the start of the programme to facilitate comparisons in an evaluation at a later stage.

Evaluations are primarily backward-looking (ex-post) and focus on experiences with a type of activities that have been concluded, but may also be performed for ongoing activities. The learning function suggests priority be given to experience that will be useful also in the future. Evaluations are distinguished from reviews and systematic monitoring of ongoing or completed interventions in the sense that more thorough standards of methodology, sources, and independence apply.

An evaluation of high quality shall be based on facts, which is to say reliable data or observations. For the sake of transparency, the results must be publicly accessible, not least to enable others to check facts and the soundness of the analysis. Relevant stakeholders in both the Beneficiary State and the Donor State(s) shall be consulted in connection with the facilitation of an evaluation and its implementation, including in the formulation of the Terms of Reference (ToR) and through comments to the draft evaluation report.

Evaluations shall be impartial and provide a balanced view of strengths and weaknesses. In so far as different parties have conflicting views, the evaluation report should reflect and acknowledge these.

To ensure the greatest possible objectivity, evaluations shall be undertaken by independent professionals with no personal interest in the results; they must be thorough and their recommendations should be based on systematic collection and presentation of data. This implies that members of the evaluation team must not have been personally involved in the activities which are being evaluated, or have any personal interest in the conclusions. The consultants conducting the evaluation shall not have been involved in the planning or implementation of the intervention being evaluated.

5. FORMULATING EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Defining the purpose of the evaluation is the most important task in the evaluation process. A clear purpose will assist in the formulation of evaluation questions and increase relevance. The evaluation purpose should be formulated in a way that specifies how the information from the evaluation is to be used.

There is a high degree of international consensus with respect to criteria and quality standards to be applied in evaluations. They reflect more or less the same quality requirements.

Each evaluation shall shed light on:

- Efficiency: can the cost of the intervention be justified by the results?
• Effectiveness: to what extent were the objectives of the Programmes achieved, or expected to be achieved?
• Impact: what are the positive and negative long-term impact(s) of the interventions, direct and indirect, intended or unintended?
• Relevance: is the Programme relevant in relation to Donor States’ goals, strategies and policies? Is the intervention relevant in relation to the Beneficiary State’s needs and priorities? Is it relevant in relation to the development issue it seeks to address?
• Sustainability: will the benefits produces by the intervention be maintained after the cessation of external support?

If any of the above criteria are not included in the evaluation, this is explained in the ToR and in the report. The same applies if one or more supplementary criterion has been used.

6. SELECTION OF EVALUATION OBJECT / COVERAGE

The frequency and scope of evaluations shall be determined on the basis of the intervention’s character, risk and significance.

In addition to the above criteria, the decision to undertake an evaluation should be based on an assessment of cost-benefit. The evaluation under consideration should be relevant to and useful for the public and partners in the Beneficiary States and the Donor State(s), and other relevant stakeholders. The need for and benefits from an evaluation must clearly exceed its costs.

Questions to be asked include: who will use the findings and recommendations from the proposed evaluation? Will it be possible to make use of the evaluation findings and results within reasonable time?

7. PREPARING FOR EVALUATIONS

The National Focal Point is expected to present an evaluation plan in the Strategic Report. Preparation of this plan shall involve co-ordination and consultation with the Programme Operators with the aim of documenting the results in relation to the above criteria. Basically, this entails looking at:
- completed and ongoing Programmes;
- cross-cutting issues – completed and on-going Programmes; and
- total support to the Beneficiary State.

Before an evaluation is started and its ToR is drawn up, the following issues need to be decided:

➢ What is the reason for the evaluation?
What is the intended use of the evaluation? Who will use the evaluation? When will the results be available?

➢ What will be the scope of evaluation?
A description of the evaluation scope, the background and context, as well as the scope of the contribution of the EEA and/or Norwegian Financial Mechanism(s), and target groups directly
affected and the contribution’s relative importance in the Beneficiary State. Will the evaluation concentrate on special themes or issues? Is the main focus on the process or on the results?

- **What limits should be fixed relative to the scope of evaluation?**

Are there special factors that decide the choice of time period, geography, target groups or Programme area?

As part of the planning process it is an advantage to document the experiences acquired from previous evaluations, reviews, other technical papers, and experience-based knowledge held by resource persons.

Based on the above the ToR are drawn up, including a timetable (see Annex 2). This forms the basis for selecting the independent consultants according to public procurement rules.

8. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION

Evaluations are normally carried out in two phases. During the first phase the evaluators, based on studies of documents and interviews of representatives of the National Focal Point, the Programme Operator, the Donor State(s) and the FMO, draw up an inception report. Here issues, feasibility, and challenges are discussed, hypotheses are presented, and the choice of methodologies is justified. A plan for further work is also included. The plan should cover data collection, method, design, field studies, analysis and the structure of the report.

For larger evaluations, the contracting party may propose to establish a reference group composed of representatives of stakeholder from the Donor State(s), the FMO, Programme Operator(s) and, when relevant, donor programme partners. The ToR of the evaluation will describe the role of the reference group. Normally the reference group would meet with the evaluation team during inception, mid-way and at the finalisation of the report. A reference group should ensure that the evaluation is adhering to the intended purpose of the evaluation as outlined in the ToR.

In evaluations where learning is a primary goal, the National Focal Point, the Donor State(s), the FMO, Programme Operator(s) and, when relevant, donor programme partners and – in some cases – the target groups shall also take part in the discussion on the results of data collection, analysis, conclusions and recommendations. Where the purpose is largely documentation of results, participation by the above will be less comprehensive and may be limited to a role in connection with document compilation, interviews, and debriefing or validation.

The second phase is based on further collection of data, such as the collection of primary data in the form of documentation, field studies, interviews and perhaps direct observation. To implement the evaluations, the consultant will need to be open to, and have good access to, written and oral sources in the Donor and Beneficiary State administrations, Programme Operators, Project Promoters and project partners.
9. FINAL REPORT

A draft evaluation report shall be submitted to the National Focal Point, the relevant Programme Operator(s), the Donor State(s) and the FMO for comments. Other relevant stakeholders may also be invited to comment on the report.

The final version of the report is a public document and the evaluators have overall responsibility for the contents of the final report. However, the National Focal Point must undertake quality assurance in accordance with acceptable evaluation standards, and ensure that the report reflects the assignment given in the ToR. This quality process demands, among other things, the following:

- findings, conclusions, recommendations and “lessons learned” should be presented separately and be logically coherent and highlight results and impacts;
- each recommendation should be directed to a specific stakeholder;
- the report should address all questions included in the ToR in a way that reflects their stated level of priority;
- the evaluation methodology should be clearly described and different options are explained and justified;
- requirements for triangulation of information (more than 2 sources, data set, theory, analysis to strengthen the argument) and validation of findings;
- partners and persons responsible for the programme or project evaluated must have an opportunity to state their views on the quality of the data, the analysis and the assessments;
- where there is a significant divergence in the views of the evaluation team and different parties in the Donor State(s) or Beneficiary State, this should be reflected in the report;
- the presentation in the report should be balanced and impartial;
- the data basis for the analysis should be verifiable; and
- the report should contain practical and useful recommendations targeted towards identified problems.

The report shall be in the national language(s) and English, and shall be made public.

For each evaluation an executive summary shall be produced. It shall contain the major findings of the evaluation, the conclusions and recommendations. The presentation needs to be in easily comprehensible language to enhance communication. The National Focal Point will distribute the report according to an established list of recipients.

10. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The National Focal Point shall have the overall responsibility for reaching the objectives of the EEA and Norway Grants 2009-2014 as well as for the implementation of mechanisms in the Beneficiary State. It shall serve as a contact point and be responsible and accountable for the implementation of the MoU.

As set forth in the Regulations (Article 9.1) the responsibilities of Beneficiary States are:
“1. The Beneficiary State shall carry out evaluations of programmes to assess actual and/or expected effects at the outcome level. It shall present its evaluation plan in the Strategic Report.
2. Evaluation shall be carried out by experts or entities independent of the National Focal Point, the Certifying Authority and the Programme Operator in accordance with the Evaluation Guidelines.
3. The results of the evaluations shall be sent to the FMC, the National Focal Point, the Monitoring Committee and the Programme Operator, and made public. Prior to publication, the FMC, the National Focal Point and the Programme Operator shall be given the opportunity to provide comments.”

11. FOLLOW UP ON EVALUATION FINDINGS

Perhaps the most important part of an evaluation is how the findings in the evaluation reports are being followed up. When the Evaluation Manager distributes the evaluation report to the relevant stakeholders, a letter should be attached listing the key recommendations relevant for each specific stakeholder. The recipient should respond to this letter within a certain period (for example one month) with a list of concrete actions planned to follow up on the recommendations of the report and a proposal for how these recommendations will impact the decision making process.

Finally, the National Focal Points and Programme Operators should share information on results across programmes in the various sectors; government agencies should share information across government offices and, to the extent it is relevant; governments can share evaluation results across borders and with partners from donor countries. Horizontal sharing of information is important so that results are disseminated widely and lessons-learned are shared across multiple organisations, to enhance future programme funding results in the future.

In the annexes below we have provided some of the tools that the FMO use when planning and implementing reviews and evaluations. These include an example of how we plan the evaluation process, the approximate time planning we use, an example of how to score the different proposals, specifications for the final report and an example of a Terms of Reference. We hope some of these tools might be useful for others as well.
### ANNEX 1. EXAMPLE OF EVALUATION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/task</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Evaluation Manager</th>
<th>External Advisers</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference (ToR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Advice (if necessary)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Document</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenders</td>
<td>Submitting tenders</td>
<td>Reviewed and selected by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Contract meeting</td>
<td>Contract meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>Prepared by consultant</td>
<td>Review and feedback</td>
<td>Advice (if necessary)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised inception report</td>
<td>(in some cases only)</td>
<td>Review and feedback</td>
<td>Advice (if necessary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; draft final report</td>
<td>Prepared by consultant</td>
<td>Review and feedback. Either accepted for hearing or required 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; draft</td>
<td>Advice (if necessary)</td>
<td>Comments if 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; draft accepted by Evaluation Manager for hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; draft final report (if required before hearing)</td>
<td>If required by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Review and feedback</td>
<td>Advice (if necessary)</td>
<td>Comments on errors and substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Prepared by consultant</td>
<td>Final scrutiny for publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Published by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final comments on findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (seminar or other occasion)</td>
<td>Presented by consultant</td>
<td>Organised by Evaluation Manager and/or NFP/FMO</td>
<td>Participation (if necessary)</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo to FMC for follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written by Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copied to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 2. EXAMPLE OF EVALUATION TIME PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) month | - Discuss issues to be evaluated  
- Start drafting ToR  
- Establish stakeholder group to review key documents  
- Appoint external advisor(s) if necessary/useful |
| 2\(^{nd}\) month | - Begin dialogue with stakeholders                                                       |
| 3\(^{rd}\) month | - Comments on ToR from stakeholder group (and external advisor(s))  
- Finalise ToR  
- Prepare for tender                                                                 |
| 3\(^{rd}\) – 4\(^{th}\) month | - Tender                                                                                 |
| 4\(^{th}\) month | - Assess proposals – use score card (minimum 2 people score the proposals independently)  
- Choose consultant(s) and sign contract  
- Kick off meeting with consultant(s) and relevant stakeholders |
| 5\(^{th}\) month | - Assess 1\(^{st}\) draft inception report  
- Consultation if necessary/useful                                                                 |
| 6\(^{th}\) – 8\(^{th}\) month | - Desk review/data collection etc. by consultants                                        |
| 8\(^{th}\) month | - First draft report  
- Send to stakeholders group for comments                                                   |
| 10\(^{th}\) month | - 2nd draft with comments incorporated/rejected  
- Send to stakeholders group for comments  
- Possible meeting on findings  
- Finalise report  
- Print                                                                                  |
| 10\(^{th}\) - 12\(^{th}\) month | - Publish  
- Distribute  
- Seminar – present conclusions and recommendations                                           |
| 12\(^{th}\) month | - Draft follow-up note  
- Summary of experiences                                                                       |

---

1 The time planning might vary from country to country depending on national rules and procedures.
## ANNEX 3. EXAMPLE OF A SCORE SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores: Evaluation</th>
<th>Company A</th>
<th>Company B</th>
<th>Company C</th>
<th>Company D</th>
<th>Company E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Competence/experience 40/100:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Max points: 20 Does Team Leader have relevant education and experience, related to this assignment of above experts?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Max points: 20 Does team as a whole have relevant education, experience and country knowledge or language skills related to the work in the countries covered in the assignment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence/experience TOTAL 40/100:</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Quality of Technical Proposal 40/100:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Max 25 points: Design Methods Proposal for implementation Is the planned design and methodology in line with the key aspects of the ToR?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Max 10 points: Interpretation of the assignment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Max 5 points: Are there systems for quality assurance in place?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of technical proposal TOTAL 40/100:</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price TOTAL 10/100:</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing and availability TOTAL 10/100:</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4. SUGGESTED SPECIFICATIONS CONCERNING THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

The report shall be developed in two phases: a draft final report and a final report. The draft final report shall contain all the main elements and major arguments, findings, conclusions and recommendations that are to appear in the final report. The draft final report shall follow the same outline as the final report.

The report shall strive to convey its insights in an informative, clear and concise way. Professional terminology shall at best be avoided, at least defined. The report shall be delivered edited, language vetted, and proof-read, ready to be printed. The Evaluation Manager and stakeholders does nevertheless retain the right to make linguistic and numerical corrections, including editing that does not change the contents of the report, in which case the consultant shall be informed.

The evaluation consultant is expected to adhere to the internationally agreed evaluation standards and will be responsible for finding a good way to reflect these in the report.

The report shall normally not exceed 40 pages, annexes excluded, which demands giving explicit priority to the descriptions, insights, findings, conclusions and recommendations to be included in and omitted from the report. Keep footnotes to a minimum.

The text shall preferably be written in Microsoft Word. The font of the bodymatter shall be Times New Roman 12 points or equal. The margins shall be 2.5 cm.

Each report shall be submitted to the contracting Evaluation Manager in a paper copy and electronically.

2. THE CONTENTS OF THE REPORT

The report shall be structured as follows:

- Front page/title page
  The front page shall contain the title of the report
  The name of the firm(s) responsible for the report
  The name of the persons having worked on the report, including, if preferred, the specification of who has been the team leader
  The following information to be included at the bottom of the page: “Responsibility for the contents and presentation of findings and recommendations rest with the evaluation team. The views and opinions expressed in the report do not necessarily correspond with those of..............................(fill in the contracting entity)”

- Table of Contents

- Abbreviations

- Executive Summary
  The report shall contain an executive summary of maximum 4 pages. The executive summary is the most widely read part of the evaluation report. Particular emphasis must be put on the
main findings and recommendations. It should function as an independent excerpt, and not refer to other parts of the report.

- **Introduction or Background**
Presentation of the evaluation’s purpose, questions and expected usage. The introduction should include a presentation of the intervention to be evaluated, and situate it with reference to policy documents. The description of the object or evaluated intervention should contain: its purpose, logic, history, organisation and stakeholders, as well as an overview of budgets involved.

- **Chapters containing methodology and analysis**
There should be a thorough description of the methodology involved, either as a separate chapter or as a distinguishable part of other chapters of the report.

- **Chapters presenting findings and conclusions**
The findings, by preference focused on results, and the conclusions should be well documented in the preceding chapters.

- **Recommendations**
The recommendations should be few, and be based on the preceding analysis, findings and conclusions. An effort should be made to present recommendations that are realistic, and define where responsibility for the follow-up of the recommendation should lie.

**Annexes**
- Annex 1: Terms of Reference
- Annex 2: List of institutions and persons consulted
- Other annexes may be added at the discretion of the consultant

**References**
The report shall contain a full bibliography of works referred to or cited, organised alphabetically. The references shall preferably follow Oxford’s Manual of Style: In the text the last name of the author, followed by the year of publishing, shall be presented in parenthesis. At the very end of the report, the references shall be presented in alphabetical order, according to the author’s name and year of publishing as referred to in the text.
ANNEX 5. EXAMPLE OF A TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

EVALUATION OF THE SECTOR HEALTH AND CHILDCARE
UNDER THE EEA/NORWAY GRANTS

1. Background

The EEA/Norway Grants represent the contribution of the three EEA/EFTA states towards reducing the social and economic disparities in the European Economic Area and to strengthen the bilateral relations between the donor and the beneficiary states.

Priority sectors and administrative set up in the specific beneficiary country are defined by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). Examples of priority sectors agreed upon in the MoUs include environment and sustainable development, cultural heritage, health and children, and these may vary across the beneficiary states. This evaluation will focus on the sector Health and childcare. There are a total of 234 projects supported under this sector, totalling EUR 167 million. They have a wide outreach through hospital improvements and health awareness programmes in schools and local communities with an overall objective of improvement of prevention, early diagnosis and improved access to health care. This evaluation will undertake an in-depth evaluation of five of the supported countries, namely Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland and Romania.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This is primarily a formative evaluation, and it shall contribute to a learning process and inform future policy-making. The primary users of the evaluation will be the three donors, relevant stakeholders in the beneficiary states and the FMO.

The evaluation should be structured following five evaluation criteria:

- Assess the sustainability of the health projects; in other words the extent to which they are likely to create ownership and impacts that will be preserved over time without EEA/Norway Grants.

- Assess the relevance of the EEA/Norway supported health and childcare projects with respect to contributing to the objectives of the EEA and Norway Grants and national and EU health strategies including an assessment of the projects selected and how they fit into national/EU strategies. Identify major challenges, strengths and weaknesses per country.

- Assess the impact of the grants; what has been the planned and unplanned impact, including on the institutional capacity of the sector, and on the targeted areas/groups, including children, youth and vulnerable groups.

---

3 Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway
4 All MoUs can be downloaded from www.eeagrants.org
• Assess the **effectiveness** in terms of perceived results with respect to contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the sector.

• Assess to what extent the financial mechanisms are **efficient**. Are anticipated activities and outputs being delivered on time and according to specifications? What are the problems and constraints the project promoters and Focal Point faces during implementation of activities, programmes and tools? What are the different set-ups in the countries and how efficient have they been? Does it represent “good value for money” in relation to the results achieved?

Furthermore the evaluation shall identify **key lessons** that are relevant for current operations and future programming in the area of health and childcare in terms of the above criteria and overall objectives of the financial mechanisms. Finally, the evaluation should assess the **visibility** of the grants in the five countries identified.

3. **Scope of Work**

Five countries have been selected for in-depth studies of the implementation of the health and child-care grants, these are: Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland and Romania. There are 177 projects, however the evaluation should specifically focus on support going to:

• infrastructure development projects in the context of improved access to and quality of health service provisions
• life style related projects in the context of ageing population
• improved prevention and treatment: communicable diseases (HIV/AIDS in particular), mental health and cancer.

Through this evaluation we want to:

• Learn from previous experiences
• Improve the knowledge of how the projects were implemented and managed at national level. The evaluation should look at how priorities were chosen and structures were set up at the national level; compare the different national set-ups and include an analyses of what worked well and what the challenges were
• Consultants should also consider capacity building needs for the future
• The evaluation should point to synergies and complementarities with national and EU funding and strategies, including national targets and strategies
• Identify areas of improvement and recommendations for the establishment of future health programmes.

This could be done through:

• Document analysis
• Focus group discussions
• Surveys to collect data which will be analysed by the evaluation team.
• Semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders in the 5 countries
• In-depth and on-the-ground review of selected projects which are significant in size and near or at completion, as selected by the Evaluators;
• Semi-structured interviews with EU policy makers (European Commission) in health policy;

Field visits:
As a part of the process to identify how the EEA and Norway Grants has impacted on its beneficiaries states, field visits to the five selected countries are envisaged in this evaluation.
4. Evaluation Team

All members of the evaluation team are expected to have relevant academic qualifications and evaluation experience. Consultants should have a working knowledge of national and European health policy and trends and previous knowledge of evaluation of national and international health programmes.

5. Deliverables

- Attend Kick-off meeting within 2 weeks of contract notification;
- Draft inception report – 2-4 weeks after kick-off meeting
- Final inception report – 2-4 weeks after receiving comments on draft report
- **Draft Final Report** – by **31 March 2011** for feedback from donors, relevant stakeholders in the countries and Evaluation Manager. The feedback will include comments on structure, facts, content, and conclusions.
- **Final Evaluation Report** – 2-4 weeks after receiving comments from Evaluation Manager.

6. Budget

A suggested total budget can be added or number of person weeks expected for the assignment.

All presentations and reports are to be submitted in electronic form in accordance with the deadlines set in the time-schedule to be specified. FMO retains the sole rights with respect to distribution, dissemination and publication of the deliverables.

Contact persons:

Evaluation Manager:
Responsible Programme Officer:
Support: