



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
EuropeAid Co-operation Office

General affairs

Evaluation

I:\Evaluation Tanzania\2. ToR\FinalToR.doc

**EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN  
COMMISSION'S SUPPORT TO THE UNITED  
REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Final**

**Friday, 27 January 2005**

0-0

## Table of contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>MANDATE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>EVALUATION'S OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	<b>OBJECTIVES:</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	<b>SCOPE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ORIENTATION, APPROACH AND STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	<b>THE EVALUATION'S AUDIENCE</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	<b>THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS (EQS)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	<b>THE EVALUATION'S STRUCTURE</b> .....	<b>9</b>
	<i>Five Main Phases of Development:</i> .....	<b>9</b>
	<i>Methodological Stages:</i> .....	<b>9</b>
	<b>PREPARATION PHASE: STARTING THE EVALUATION AND PRODUCING THE LAUNCH NOTE</b> ..	<b>9</b>
	<b>DESK PHASE: THE INCEPTION REPORT</b> .....	<b>10</b>
	<b>COMPLETION OF DESK PHASE AND DELIVERY OF REPORT</b> .....	<b>11</b>
	<b>FIELD PHASE</b> .....	<b>11</b>
	<b>FINAL REPORT-WRITING PHASE</b> .....	<b>12</b>
	<b>DISSEMINATION AND FOLLOW-UP</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION OF THE EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>THE EVALUATION TEAM</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>TIMING</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>PAYMENT MODALITIES</b> .....	<b>15</b>
	<b>ANNEX 1: KEY DOCUMENTATION FOR THE EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>16</b>
	<b>ANNEX 2: OUTLINE STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT</b> .....	<b>19</b>
	<b>ANNEX 3. QUALITY GRID</b> .....	<b>22</b>
	<b>ANNEX 4. MODELS</b> .....	<b>23</b>

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S SUPPORT TO UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

### **I. MANDATE**

- 1) The European Commission (EC) is the executive body, accountable to the European Parliament and the Council for its expenditure activities. Systematic and timely evaluation of its aid support is an established priority, as a means of accounting for the management of allocated funds and as a way of promoting a lesson-learning culture throughout the organisation. Evaluations emerge as an important keystone in the results-oriented approach to development<sup>1</sup>. Of great importance also, particularly in the context of the programmes of the External Relations Directorates-General, is the increased focus on *impact* against a background both of greater concentration on results-based management and of encouraging partner Governments to focus their policies better.
- 2) The Commission Services have requested the Evaluation Unit of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office to undertake an Evaluation of the European Commission's support to the United Republic of Tanzania, hereafter referred to as Tanzania. The present evaluation is part of the 2004 evaluation programme as approved by the Board of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office<sup>2</sup>.

### **II. BACKGROUND**

- 3) The European Union's co-operation policy is based on Article 177 of the Treaty establishing the European Community (EC). It determines that the sphere of development co-operation shall have three objectives namely: fostering sustainable development of developing countries<sup>3</sup>; assisting the smooth and gradual integration of the developing countries into the world economy and campaigning against poverty in the developing countries.
- 4) In November 2000, the Council and the Commission endorsed a Development Policy Declaration<sup>4</sup> that identifies six priority themes/areas. These are: Trade and Development; Regional Integration and Co-operation; Support to Macro-economic Policies linked to Social Sector Programmes; Transport; Sustainable Rural Development and Food Security; and Institutional Capacity Building, Good Governance and the Rule of Law. Environment and Gender are considered as crosscutting issues, which needs to be integrated into all these six themes in order to make development sustainable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The European Community's Development Policy. COM (2000) 212 final (page 320).

<sup>2</sup> The 2004 evaluation programme can be consulted on the Web page of the evaluation unit [http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/programme\\_2004\\_rev1.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/programme_2004_rev1.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Sustainable Development is defined as the improvement of the standard of living and welfare of the relevant populations within the limits of the capacity of the ecosystems by maintaining natural assets and their biological diversity for the benefit of present and future generations.

<sup>4</sup> Council document 13458/00.

- 5) The EC has made Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) the point of departure for its Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) in all countries which are producing a PRSP. The PRSP approach, with its six principles: (1) national ownership, (2) results focus, (3) comprehensive, (4) prioritised, (5) longterm, and (6) partnership-oriented, forms the core for donor support, and the common framework within which all stakeholders supporting poverty reduction in a country expect to work<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore CSPs are the culmination of a joint programming process, which started with the launching of the Cotonou Agreement in January 2001 and involved many actors (the Commission, EU Member States, the Government, civil society and the private sector).
- 6) In the particular case of Tanzania, the CSP<sup>6</sup>, which covers the period from 2001 to 2007, is in fact the new framework for EC/Tanzania cooperation and combines all relevant resources and instruments. This CSP takes Tanzania's development agenda as its starting point. In fact, this CSP is the result of a highly participatory process based on Tanzania's own policy agenda and on the EC's co-operation objectives. Accordingly the overall aim of the CSP is to reduce poverty through accelerating the process of sustainable economic and social development. Support is focused on the elimination of constraints to economic growth and improvements in the capacity for social service delivery.
- 7) The 9th European Development Fund (EDF), makes available up to 355 million Euro (290M€ for envelope A and 65M€ for envelope B to cover emergencies and unforeseen needs) in financial support. Its allocations to Tanzania's CSP two main focal sectors are: transport infrastructure (roads): 116 million Euros, and basic education: 43.5 million Euros. Other non focal sectors, which include good governance and support to non-state actors, are allocated 31.9 million Euros. To macro-economic support (general budget support) is allocated 98.6 million Euros. Support to sectors like agriculture, water & sewerage and environment are covered by the 8th EDF. The CSP also refers to significant disbursements in non programmable assistance from the European Investment Bank, including in the fields of agriculture, infrastructure, mineral resources and tourism and via mechanisms such as STABEX, structural adjustment, emergency aid and community budget lines.
- 8) The total support from the EU (Member States and the European Community), which is gradually moving from project support to programme and budget support, represents more than 50 % of the Public Development Aid annually allocated to Tanzania. This country is heavily reliant on external assistance (1/3 of total revenues).
- 9) Tanzania is one of the most politically stable countries in Africa. Development partners maintain a systematic dialogue with government and other stakeholders, focusing on ways of enhancing the democratic process and strategies to improve government performance. In 2002, the government restructured various government institutions to improve efficiency and enhance accountability. Although the Tanzanian economy has been growing at a strong pace in recent years, poverty remains persistent throughout the country and aid dependency is high. The focus of

---

<sup>5</sup> PRSP review: key issues  
[http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/dev/body/theme/docs/B2/PRSP\\_review\\_key\\_issues.pdf#zoom=100](http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/dev/body/theme/docs/B2/PRSP_review_key_issues.pdf#zoom=100)

<sup>6</sup> Country Strategy Paper for URT  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/csp\\_rsp/csp\\_en.cfm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/csp_rsp/csp_en.cfm)

Tanzania's poverty reduction strategies, as enshrined in the country's PRSP, is threefold: the reduction of income poverty; improving human capabilities, survival and social well-being; and containing extreme vulnerability among the poor<sup>7</sup>. The government's poverty reduction strategy now provides the policy framework for all donors. In reality it has evolved to form the basis for external support.

- 10) The Tanzanian government has also launched new institutional arrangements for interacting with the donor community, set out in the Tanzanian Assistance Strategy (which have been reviewed), which provides specific principles to enhance Tanzanian ownership of the development process. The priority areas in the TAS are: predictability of external resources including financial management issues; rationalization of consultation missions (use of Joint Reviews); capacity building for aid coordination and external resource management<sup>8</sup>

### **III. EVALUATION'S OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

#### **OBJECTIVES:**

- To provide the relevant external co-operation services of the EC and the wider public with an **overall independent and accountable** evaluation of the Commission's past and current assistance to Tanzania; providing the Commission's policy-makers and managers with a valuable aid both for the implementation of the current Strategy and Indicative Programmes, and for future programming.
- To identify **key lessons** from the Commission's past co-operation, paying particularly attention to the impact of specific actions against their objectives;
- To present a general overall judgement of the extent to which Commission strategy, programmes and projects have contributed to the progress towards the Tanzanian PRSP objectives.

#### **SCOPE**

- 11) The main coverage of this evaluation will be:
- the relevance, logic and coherence, as well as the intended impacts of the EC Country strategy (CSP) and National Indicative Programme for 2001-2007. The consistency of the CSP with the new Tanzania Poverty Reduction Strategy;
  - the past EC co-operation strategies with Tanzania, and their implementation - actions started and finalised - over the period 2000/2005 (first semester)<sup>9</sup>, as well as the coherence between programming and implementation<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> African Economic Outlook 2003/2004 - Country Studies: Tanzania  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/38/32411720.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Tanzania Joint country assessment in 2003, DAC/OECD  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/34/13/18379608.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> The consultants will take into consideration actions, strategy documents and legal bases from before 2000, if relevant for the period under study.

- the coherence between actions undertaken at national level and those supported in relevant regional initiatives affecting Tanzania (in this case, for the ESA/IO and SADC regions), with special regard to the capacity of regional institutions and to economic integration and trade (see 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> EDF Regional Indicative programmes).
- 12) Based on the purpose of the evaluation to produce relevant lessons and recommendations for the current strategy programme, the centre of attention should be on the following areas and instruments of cooperation: transport infrastructure (see paragraph 15), basic education; good governance (should be addressed at all levels and in all sectors of the response strategy both as a prerequisite for support and as an area of support in itself) and support to non-state actors; macro-economic support (general budget support including sector dialogue - see paragraph 15<sup>11</sup>). Attention should also be given to actions in the field of trade policy and trade technical assistance as well as support to the National Authorising Officer. For the evaluation of the impact of the implementation, the actions started and finalised over the period covered by this evaluation, i.e. the past EDF actions and the ongoing areas of co-operation indicated on the CSP, shall be covered - agriculture, water, natural resources and HIV/AIDS.
  - 13) In addition to EDF funding, Commission support to Tanzania during the period 2000-2005 also involved support from several budget lines of which the following were the most important and will have to be covered by the evaluation as instruments: food aid/food security, NGO co-financing, human rights and democracy, and environment and forests. The evaluation should also show awareness of any all-ACP programmes for which Tanzania was eligible during the period under review.
  - 14) In order to cover issues of overall coherence namely the coherence between Global Budget Support and other instruments, an overall analyzes of the sectors and instruments is required.
  - 15) Previous relevant Commission evaluations, relating to Tanzania, are important reference material to be taken into account: the **transport evaluation** (including the country report on Tanzania) 2003 and the recent **joint evaluation of general budget support** should be given particular attention. Both are important documents to be considered already during the preparation of the inception note. The team should not examine the points already covered by these evaluations but use them and go beyond them. In addition other evaluations should also be considered (please see bibliography). Results Oriented Monitoring of Projects relating to Tanzania should also be taken into consideration (see CRIS database) on the assessment of the country programme.
  - 16) The assessment and judgement of current approaches must take account of the effects of the recent reforms of the RELEX services, including the deconcentration process.

---

<sup>10</sup> The team should note that in the cases where implementation is premature the relevance (identification & formulation) of the interventions under the focal sectors should be considered.

<sup>11</sup> The meaning of the term has to be understood and presented on very precisely way - sector support versus general budget support.

## **IV. ORIENTATION, APPROACH AND STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION**

### **THE EVALUATION'S AUDIENCE**

- 17) The principal evaluation users are the Commissioners with responsibility for External Relations and the Commission Services at all levels involved in policy formulation, programming and implementing external co-operation programmes. More broadly, the authors should also take account of the considerable interest likely to be shown in the evaluation report by authorities and citizens in the partner country, by EU Member States and other development partners, and by Civil Society Organisations and Non-State Actors. The Delegation will brief the National Authorizing Officer on the evaluation process during the inception phase.

### **THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS (EQS)**

- 18) As regards the approach to be taken to this evaluation, it should be noted that while always taking into account the standard evaluation criteria (endorsed by OECD-DAC) of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, this evaluation will be organised around a set of specific evaluation questions (a maximum of 10). In such an approach, the criteria will be translated into specific questions, and each question may address one or more of the criteria in its intent.
- 19) These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the evaluation criteria and to articulate the key issues of concern to stakeholders, thus optimising the focus and utility of the evaluation. The development of evaluation questions will be based upon an objectively supported reconstruction of the intervention logic (faithful – recapitulating stated aims as articulated in official documents) of the EC's support to Tanzania (drafted in the inception note and strictly based on the analysis of available documents prior to any round of interviews to EC staff).
- 20) The evaluation questions will be identified in the first instance by the evaluation team. The questions should include in their coverage the following main areas:
- **design and relevance of the strategy/programme:** this includes relevance to the EC general objectives, relevance to the country needs and priorities in particular as stated on the PRSP, consistency between the strategy and the NIP.
  - **achievement of main objectives:** an assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved (including performance against the indicators set out in the Indicative Programme). The consultants should identify all recorded impacts, including any unintended ones, and compare these to the intended impacts. The assessment will also require identifying the changes which occurred in the areas on which EC programmes were supposed to impact.
  - **efficiency:** Who actually benefits from the EC financial support directly or indirectly?

- **design of implementation and its evolution:** how do the design of implementation and its evolution answer optimally the strategy of the CSP? And to what extent the following elements - the type of intervention, the geographical distribution, the choice of beneficiaries, the support's payment channels, the type of financing, the role of the partner country, and sectoral distribution, enable to achieve the objectives defined in the CSP, taking into account the specific context of Tanzania?
- **implementation of co-operation programme:** implementation of EC co-operation taking into account the context in Tanzania and the resources of the Commission, especially the means related to funding: to the extent that the interventions were effective and efficient, an assessment of the co-operation programmes in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, logistic, administrative, time and other resources and the EC and partner country procedures, and the time-frame contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.
- **Role of non state actors (NSA) in the implementation:** to what extent NSA have been involved in the implementation of different programmes other than pure NSA support programmes including sector support programmes and general budget support programmes, in line with the provisions of the Cotonou Agreement.
- **key cross-cutting issues/ and cross sectoral issues:** for example gender, environment and human rights, as well as capacity-building cross sectoral issues; this part should aim to analyze to what extent the respective documents/annexes to the CSP - gender profile, country environmental profile, environmental impact assessments - were available during the reference period and were taken into account, and the extent to which they have contributed to achieving the objectives of the cross cutting issues.
- **the consistency and internal coherence** between EC cooperation aid to Tanzania and other EU policies like trade, ECHO policies, environment and agriculture<sup>12</sup>.
- **the coordination and complementarity** of EC support actions and strategy to Tanzania with policies / actions of Member States and other development partners in the area.
- **Sustainability of the strategy and its component programmes and of the implementation:** that is the extent to which their results and impact are being, or are likely to be, maintained over time;

21) For each Evaluation Question one or more Judgement Criterion should be identified, and for each such criterion appropriate quantitative and qualitative Indicators should be identified and specified.

22) The Evaluation Questions are agreed with the Reference Group and are validated by the Evaluation Unit.

---

<sup>12</sup> The European Commission has introduced several institutional mechanisms that will help promote coherence of external relations' policies with the poverty reduction objective. In particular, the Country and Regional Strategy Papers have become a central mechanism for strengthening policy coherence with other Community policies and for co-ordination with Member States. The European Community's legal and policy framework sets out the requirement to seek policy coherence with development objectives.



- 23) The choice of Evaluation Questions determines the subsequent phases of information and data collection, methods of analysis, and derivation of final judgements.
- 24) In addition to the specific judgements on the Evaluation Questions but based on them, the evaluators shall arrive at an overall judgement on the degree to which the EC co-operation programmes, strategies and implementation with Tanzania have contributed to the achievement of their objectives. There should be a proper balance between the Evaluation Questions section and the rest of the report.

## THE EVALUATION'S STRUCTURE

- 25) The evaluation will consist in total of **5 phases** in the course of which **several methodological stages** will be developed (in grey the consultant's part).

<i>Five Main Phases of Development:</i>	<i>Methodological Stages<sup>13</sup>:</i>
1. Preparation Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reference group constitution</li> <li>▪ ToR's drafting (evaluation unit)</li> <li>▪ Launch Note (consultants)</li> </ul>
2. Desk Phase <sup>14</sup> 3. Field Phase 4. Synthesis phase (seminar on the country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Structuring of the evaluation</li> <li>▪ Data Collection<sup>15</sup>, verification of hypotheses</li> <li>▪ Analysis</li> <li>▪ Judgements on findings</li> </ul>
5. Feedback and Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality Grid</li> <li>▪ Board summary</li> <li>▪ Evinfo (summary for OECD and Commission databases)</li> <li>▪ <i>Fiche contradictoire</i> (a statement of key recommendations followed by the Commission's response)</li> </ul>

- 26) It should be noted that the phases are included on an indicative basis, and may be subject to variation for methodological or practical reasons.

### Preparation Phase: Starting the Evaluation and producing the Launch Note

- 27) Prior to embarking on the structuring phase of this study, the consortium will present a *Launch Note*<sup>16</sup> in which the team will have to be set out in full: (i) the contractor's understanding of the Terms of Reference, (ii) the *provisional* proposed composition

<sup>13</sup> These components are not entirely sequential.

<sup>14</sup> It includes interviews in Brussels and could include a short mission to the country

<sup>15</sup> The study will draw on the contents of (i) all relevant documentation supplied by the Commission Services, and (ii) documentation from other sources which the evaluators find relevant and useful.

<sup>16</sup> See annexe 1 of the contract number: EVA/79-276.

of the core evaluation team with CVs, (iii) a budget proposal (model in annexe)<sup>17</sup>. The Launch Note will be referred to the Reference Group for comments.

### **Desk Phase: The Inception Report**

28) The Inception Report will mark an intermediate stage of the desk phase of the evaluation. The largest part of the work will be dedicated to the analysis of all relevant key documentation, including data on the pertinent policy and programming documents and instruments, and also taking account of any key documentation produced by other international donors and agencies. On the basis of the information collected the evaluation team will:

- (a) Reconstruct **on the basis of available documentation the intervention logic (a faithful logical diagram)** of development co-operation policy, programmes and activities in respect of the EC's support to Tanzania. This consists in setting out the key objectives at the various levels of the Commission's strategy towards Tanzania and their order of priority, assessing their relation to need and the intended impacts related to the respective objectives. The evaluation team should point out their logic, context and overall coherence, including relevant aspects of the programmes' external coherence in relation to other EU policies, the needs and policies of beneficiary country, other donors' activities, and other geopolitical factors. The evaluation team should also consider constraints, hypotheses/assumptions and external influences as they appear from documentation and it should include an analysis of the logic presented, in particular analysis of possible gaps in the logic. The final logical impact diagram will help in identifying the main areas for the evaluation questions and in determining the areas where EC programme is supposed to impact (it will also help in assessing the changes that occurred in those areas).
- Select the **evaluation questions** with the respective explanatory comments.

**A first meeting will be held with the reference group to present the evaluation, the logical diagram and the evaluation questions to be validated by the group.**

- c) Identify appropriate **Judgement Criteria and preliminary indicators** after validation of the evaluation questions.
- d) Include a description of the development co-operation context of Tanzania.
- e) Propose suitable working methods for data and information collection both in Brussels and in Tanzania. Present appropriate methods of data collection, information and analysis in Brussels (indicating any limitations) and the strategy for data collection and information in Tanzania.

29) The Report will also confirm (i) the final evaluation team composition, including national or regional consultants and short term experts as appropriate and (ii) the final time schedule, to be agreed between the Contractor and the Commission and

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that the Launch note is not part of the budget; it is included on the overall amount of the contract management.

confirmed through a formal exchange of letters. This time schedule should be sensitive to planned visits to the delegation and the national authorities by other Commission services (including the Inspectorate of Delegations).

- 30) This phase could include a short preparatory and exploratory visit by the team leader and selected members of the evaluation team to Tanzania.

### **Completion of Desk Phase and Delivery of Report**

- 31) Upon formal approval of the Inception Report, the team of consultants will proceed with the final stage of the Desk Phase of the evaluation.

This final stage consists mainly in identifying and setting out proposals for:

- the **final quantitative and qualitative indicators**.
  - the **first elements to be used in responding to the evaluation questions** and the first hypothesis to be tested in the field.
  - suitable methods of data and information collection in Tanzania (already announced in the inception note) for example: interviews both structured and unstructured, focus groups, questionnaires, additional literature, seminars or workshops, case studies, etc. - indicating any limitations and describing how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.
  - appropriate methods of analysis of the information and data collected, again indicating any limitations in Tanzania. It should include a proposed list of activities, projects and programmes for in-depth study in the field, examples of assessment project sheets, examples of interview guides to be used on the field, etc..
- 32) At the conclusion of this work, the evaluation team will present to the Evaluation Unit a ***Draft Desk Phase Report*** setting out the results of this first phase of the evaluation including all the above listed tasks (the major part of the Inception report will be put as an annexe of the desk phase report). The field mission shall not start before the proposed approach and methodology have been approved by the Evaluation Unit.

### **Field Phase**

- 33) Following satisfactory completion of the Desk Phase, the evaluation team will proceed to Tanzania. The fieldwork will be undertaken on the basis set out both in the Desk Phase and agreed by the Reference Group and by the EC Delegation in Tanzania. The duration of the work on the field shall be cleared with the Evaluation Unit, the Reference Group and the Delegation (typically around three weeks). If during the course of the fieldwork any major deviations from the agreed methodology or schedule are perceived as being necessary, these should be explained to the Reference Group through the Evaluation Unit.

- 34) At the beginning of the field mission the team will brief the delegation while at its conclusion the team will give a detailed on-the-spot (orally) de-briefing on their provisional findings and give a presentation to the Reference Group, shortly after the return from the field, to discuss the preliminary findings.

### **Final Report-Writing Phase**

- 35) The Final Report will be drafted in English, and will be structured as set out in Annex 2. The evaluation team will deliver the First Draft of the Final Report to the Evaluation Unit in accordance with the agreed time schedule, taking due account of comments received during de-briefings. On acceptance, the report will be circulated for comments to the Reference Group, which will convene to discuss it about 10 days after circulation, in the presence of the evaluation team. The revised draft final report will be presented and discussed at a seminar in Tanzania (the purpose is to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations) with the delegation, relevant stakeholders and other donors present in the field. The consultants should prepare a presentation (a lively power point) for the seminar. This presentation shall be considered as a product of the evaluation (like the reports).
- 36) On the basis of both the results of the seminar and further comments received from the Reference Group and the Evaluation Unit, the evaluation team will make the appropriate final amendments and submit their Final Report. The evaluators may either accept or reject the comments made by the Group members, Delegations members, or relevant stakeholders, but, in case of rejection, they shall motivate (in writing) their refusal and annex the relevant comments and their responses to the report.
- 37) The quality of the editing of the Final Report (as well as previous reports and notes) must be high (the judgement of the report's quality will be made on the basis of the evaluation grid in annex). The analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be thorough and all based on proved evidence. They should reflect a methodical and thoughtful approach, and finally the link or sequence between them should be clear.
- 40) The (power point) presentation will be revised in accordance to the final report and provided to the Evaluation Unit.

### **Dissemination and follow-up<sup>18</sup>**

- 41) After approval of the final report, the **Evaluation Unit** will proceed with the Dissemination of the results (conclusions and recommendations) contained within this Report. The Unit will: (i) make a formal Judgement on the Quality of the evaluation through the Quality Grid (see in annexe), as recommended by DG Budget; (ii) draft a 2-page Evaluation Summary; (iii) circulate a Fiche Contradictoire for discussion with the relevant Services. The fiche is the mechanism for follow-up on the use of evaluations. Its first column lists the evaluation recommendations, the

---

<sup>18</sup> per memoire item

second column includes the responses from the Services, and the third column, completed one year later, will show the actions taken by the responsible Services. Consultants could be eventually called for specify presentations.

- 42) The Quality Judgement, the DAC summary, the Fiche Contradictoire alongside the Final Report will all be published on the Europe aid Evaluation Unit Web-site <http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation>

## **V. MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION OF THE EVALUATION**

- 43) The ultimate responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the **Evaluation Unit** of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office. The evaluation manager and chair of the reference group will be *Alexandra Chambel* (tel: 02 296 7403).
- 44) The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by a Commission **Reference Group** consisting of members of all concerned departments in the External Relations family, as well as the Directorate General for the Budget and the EC Delegation in Tanzania, under the Evaluation Unit's chairmanship. The principal functions of this Reference Group will be:
- to aggregate and summarise the views of the Commission services and act as an interface between the consultants and the services, thereby supplementing bilateral contacts;
  - to discuss and comment on the Terms of Reference drawn up by the Evaluation Unit;
  - to validate the Evaluation Questions;
  - to ensure that the consultants have access to and consult all information sources and documentation on activities undertaken;
  - to discuss notes and reports produced by the consultants, as well as to give an opinion on the quality of the final report. Comments by individual members of the Steering Group will be compiled by the Evaluation Unit and subsequently transmitted to the consultants;
  - to assist in feedback of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

## **VI. THE EVALUATION TEAM**

- 45) The Evaluation Team should possess a proven level of knowledge and experience in development co-operation at the levels of policy, programming and implementation, with a particular focus on the areas of transport policy and infrastructure (including procurement issues), macroeconomic assistance (general budget support), basic

education and governance. The team should also include demonstrable capacity in the areas of regional integration, water and sanitation, agriculture, environment, trade and HIV/AIDS.

- 46) The team should possess expertise and capacity in: (1) conducting evaluations of development co-operation particularly at the country level; (2) evaluation methods in field situations; (3) the region and if possible Tanzania itself. The Evaluation Unit recommends strongly that the team should include national or regional consultants with in-depth knowledge of key areas. The national consultants should be identified at launch note stage or sufficiently early in the desk phase so that they can assist the Team during the desk phase and also prepare the field phase. The team must be prepared to work in English, and possess excellent drafting skills.
- 47) The team composition will initially be agreed between the contractor and the Evaluation Unit but may be subsequently adjusted if necessary due to the findings of the desk phase.
- 48) Regarding conflict of interest, experts who have been involved in the design or implementation of projects covered by this evaluation, are excluded from this assignment.
- 49) A declaration of absence of conflict of interest should be signed by each consultant and annexed to the launch note.

## VII. TIMING

50) The evaluation will start in January 2005 with completion of the Final Report scheduled for November 2005. The following is the *indicative* schedule<sup>19</sup>:

<i>Evaluation Phases and Stages</i>	<i>Notes and Reports</i>	<i>Dates</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
RG Composition	Notes	October - November	
ToR	Draft	December 2004	
	Final	January 2005	
Starting Stage	Launch Note	February	
<b>Desk Phase</b>		Starts February	
Structuring Stage	Short presentation (logical diagram and EQ)	March	RG Meeting (kick off meeting)
	Draft Inception Note	End of March	
	Final Inception Note	April	
Desk Study	Draft Desk Report	April or May	RG Meeting
	Final Desk Report	May	
<b>Field Phase</b>		May to June <sup>20</sup>	
	Presentation	June or beginning of July	RG Meeting
<b>Final Report-Writing Phase</b>	Draft Final Report	From July to September	
	1 <sup>st</sup> draft Final	September	RG Meeting
	2 <sup>nd</sup> draft Final		
	Seminar	October	
	Final Report	November	

## VIII. PAYMENT MODALITIES

- 51) The budget for the seminar (fees, per diems and travel) will be presented separately in the launch note (see model in annexe).
- 52) According to the service contract payments modalities shall be as follow: 30% at the acceptance of the Inception Note; 50% at acceptance of Draft Desk Report; 20% at acceptance of Final Desk report. The invoices shall be sent to the Commission only after the Evaluation Unit confirms in writing the acceptance of the reports.

<sup>19</sup> The dates mentioned in the above table may only be changed in view of optimising the evaluation performance, and with the agreement of all concerned.

<sup>20</sup> Subject to agreement by the EC Delegations concerned.

## **ANNEXES**

### **ANNEX 1: KEY DOCUMENTATION FOR THE EVALUATION**

The below list of basic documents is indicative and by no means exhaustive. The consultants are requested to take into account any other documents relevant to the present evaluation.

- Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The European Community's Development Policy. COM (2000) 212 final.  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/asia/doc/com00\\_212.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/asia/doc/com00_212.pdf)
- Lome Convention / Cotonou Agreement
- Country Strategy Paper for Tanzania  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/csp\\_rsp/csp\\_en.cfm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/csp_rsp/csp_en.cfm)
- All National Indicative Programmes for the period covered
- All Regional Strategy papers for the period covered
- Mid-term review for the period covered
- Annual report 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the EC development policy and the implementation of the External Assistance: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/reports/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/reports/index_en.htm)
- Communication 373/2004 “European Neighbourhood Policy, Strategy Paper” (12.05.2004)
- Handbook on promoting good governance in EC development and cooperation
- Communication 615/2003 “Governance and Development
- Council conclusions 19 November 2003, 14453/03 “Governance in the Context of Development Cooperation”
- Regulation (EC) No 2493/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 7/11/2000. On measures to promote the full integration of the environmental dimension in the development process of developing countries:  
[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2000/l\\_288/l\\_28820001115en00010005.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2000/l_288/l_28820001115en00010005.pdf)
- Regulation (ec) no 2494/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 November 2000 on measures to promote the conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests and other forests in developing countries:  
[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2000/l\\_288/l\\_28820001115en00060010.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2000/l_288/l_28820001115en00060010.pdf)
- Council Regulation (EC) No 722/97 of 22/04/97 on environmental measures in developing countries in the context of sustainable development:  
[http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga\\_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31997R0722&model=guichett](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31997R0722&model=guichett)



- COM (2000) 264 of 18.05.2000 on "Integrating environment and sustainable development into economic and development co-operation. Elements of a comprehensive strategy": [http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2000/com2000\\_0264en02.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2000/com2000_0264en02.pdf)
- DG Development - Water Page (Introduction to Sectoral Policy on Water Resource, etc.) [http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/water\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/water_en.htm)
- Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.
- Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: "Water Management in Developing Countries - Policy and Priorities for EU Development Cooperation (Brussels, 12.03.2002; COM(2002) 132 final) [http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2002/com2002\\_0132en01.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2002/com2002_0132en01.pdf)
- COM (2002) 132 (01 <http://europa.eu.int/cgi-bin/eur-lex/udl.pl?REQUEST=Service-Search&LANGUAGE=fr&GUILANGUAGE=fr&SERVICE=all&COLLECTION=com&DOCID=502PC0132>
- EC Development (1998): Guidelines for water resources development co-operation. Towards sustainable water resources management - A strategic approach.
- European Development Council Resolution on water management in developing countries policy and priorities for EU development cooperation from 2002 <http://register.consilium.eu.int/pdf/en/02/st09/09696en2.pdf>
- Water for life EU water initiative from 2003. [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/water-initiative/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/water-initiative/index_en.html)
- (see websites: EuropeAid, DG Dev and Inter-service Quality Support Group, DG TRADE website (trade and development): <http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/miti/devel>)
- Other Commission/Government Agreements
  
- Relevant documentation from local authorities and other local partners
- The PRSPs
- PRSP review: key issues [http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/dev/body/theme/docs/B2/PRSP\\_review\\_key\\_issues.pdf#zoom=100](http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/dev/body/theme/docs/B2/PRSP_review_key_issues.pdf#zoom=100)
- Joint Annual Report Commission / Tanzania National Authorizing Officer (2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004.
- Helleiner Report from 1995.
- ECHO Tanzania Global Plans for the period being evaluated (2001-5)
- Key Local Organisations and Government Policy and Planning Documents

- OECD/DAC: A better world for all: <http://www.paris21.org/betterworld/goals.htm>
- Review of the Development co-operation policies and programmes of the European Community, DAC/OECD, 2001.
- African Economic Outlook 2003/2004 - Country Studies: Tanzania - <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/38/32411720.pdf>
- Tanzania Joint country assessment in 2003, DAC/OECD <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/34/13/18379608.pdf>
  
- Previous Evaluations and Monitoring Reports relating specifically to Tanzania  
Evaluations: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/index.htm>
  - Transport evaluation country report on Tanzania 2003,
  - Thematic evaluation of the EC assistance to third countries supporting good governance (on going)
  - EC support to water and sanitation evaluation (on going)
  - Food aid/food security evaluation 2004,
  - Private sector evaluation (on going),
  - Environment and forests regulations evaluation 2004,
  - 8th EDF support to PEDP evaluation 2004,
  - Joint evaluation of external support to Basic Education in Developing Countries 2003, EDF support to Human Resource Development in Tanzania evaluation in 2000,
  - Final Report of the Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support in Tanzania 1995-2004, ODI/Daima Associates, November 2004
  
- Projects and projects evaluation documents will be made available to the evaluation team by the Commission Services concerned.

## ANNEX 2: OUTLINE STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT

### 1. C. Outline Structure of the Final Report

*Length:* The Final Report should not be longer than 60 pages (including the executive summary). Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

#### 1. Executive Summary (*length: 3 pages maximum*)

This Executive Summary must contain the following information:

- 1.1 – Purpose of the evaluation;
- 1.2 – Methodology;
- 1.3 – Analysis and main findings
- 1.4 – Main conclusions;\*
- 1.5 – Main recommendations.\*

*\* Conclusions and recommendations must be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance to the evaluation and their importance, and they should also be cross-referenced back to the key findings. Length-wise, the parts dedicated to the conclusions and recommendations should represent about 40 % of the executive summary*

#### 2. Introduction (*length 5 pages*)

- 2.1. Synthesis of the Commission's Strategies and Programmes: their objectives, how they are prioritised and ordered, their logic both *internally* (ie. The existence – or not – of a logical link between the EC policies and instruments and expected impacts) and *externally* (ie. within the context of the needs of partner country, government policies, and the programmes of other donors); the implicit assumptions and risk factors; the intended impacts of the Commission's interventions in URT.
- 2.2. Context: very brief analysis of the political, economic, social and cultural dimensions affecting URT (including Commission strategies, objectives and programmes for URT as well as regional programmes if relevant).
- 2.3. Purpose of the Evaluation: presentation of the evaluative questions and of how they will permit to assess the support to URT.

#### 3. Methodology (*length 6-10 pages*)

In order to answer the evaluative questions a number of methodological instruments must be presented by the consultants:

- 3.1. Judgement Criteria: which should have been selected (for each Evaluation Question) and agreed upon by the Reference Group;
- 3.2. Indicators: attached to each judgement criterion. This in turn will determine the scope and methods of data collection;
- 3.3. Data and Information Collection: can consist of literature review, interviews, questionnaires, case studies, etc. The consultants will indicate any limitations and will describe how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.
- 3.4. Methods of Analysis: of the data and information obtained for each Evaluation Question (again indicating any eventual limitations);

### 3.5 Methods of Judgement

#### 4. Main Findings and Analysis (length 20 to 30 pages)

- 4.1. Answers to each Evaluation Question, indicating findings and conclusions for each;
- 4.2. Overall judgement. This assessment should cover:
  - Relevance to needs and overall context, including development priorities and co-ordination with other donors;
  - Actual Impacts: established, as well as unforeseen impacts and compare to intended impacts;
  - Effectiveness in terms of how far the intended results were achieved;
  - Efficiency: in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievement of results;
  - Sustainability: whether the results can be maintained over time without EC funding or other external support.

#### 5. A Full Set of Conclusions and Recommendations (length up to 15 pages)

A full set of Conclusions\* and Recommendations\* (i) for each evaluation question; (ii) as an overall judgement of the country programme and strategy vis a vis the country needs. (As an introduction to this chapter a short mention of the main objectives of the country programme and whether they have been achieved.

All conclusions should be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate findings.

Provide **detailed and operational recommendations**, pertinent within the Commission context, organised by target groups, principally focused on Commission Services both in headquarters (strategy programming and operational thematic and geographical services) and in delegations. These recommendations should be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation. Options to implement the recommendations with the indication of the respective limits and possible risks should be presented. Recommendations will in all cases need to be cross-referenced to the corresponding conclusions. Furthermore the evaluation team should select (and justify) the 3 most important recommendations that should be highlighted to the Commission management. It should provide the Commission's policy-makers and managers with a valuable support both for the implementation of the current Strategy and Indicative Programmes, in addition to an aid for future programming.

Annexes can include:

- logical diagrams of EC strategies;
- methodology;
- judgement Criteria Forms;
- overview of EC intervention; Intervention Forms;

- list of people met;
- list of documentation;
- ToR;
- any other info which contains factual basis used in the evaluation or tables (for example tables with economic and social indicators or the MDG indicators);
- list of the projects and programmes specifically assessed;
- all project assessment fiches;
- all questionnaires;
- acronyms and abbreviations; etc..

### ANNEX 3. QUALITY GRID

The draft and final versions of the Final Report will be assessed using the below “quality grid”. The completed quality grid for the final version of the report will be published on the Internet along with the report <http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/index.htm>.

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>1. Meeting needs:</b> Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?					
<b>2. Relevant scope:</b> Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?					
<b>3. Defensible design:</b> Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?					
<b>4. Reliable data:</b> To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate. Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?					
<b>5. Sound analysis:</b> Is the quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?					
<b>6. Credible findings:</b> Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?					
<b>7. Validity of the conclusions:</b> Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible findings?					
<b>8. Usefulness of the recommendations:</b> Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personal or stakeholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?					
<b>9. Clearly reported:</b> Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?					
<b>Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered</b>					

**ANNEX 4. MODELS**

*EVALUATION OF .....*

..... report

Volume 1

..... 2005

*Evaluation for the European Commission*



	<p><u>This evaluation was commissioned by:</u></p> <p><b>the Evaluation Unit common to:</b></p> <p>EuropeAid Co-operation Office, Directorate General for Development and External Relations Directorate-General</p>
--	--

This evaluation was carried out by:  
..... was the Evaluation consortium contract manager.

*The evaluation was managed by the evaluation unit who also chaired the reference group composed by members of the services (EuropeAid, DG Dev, DG Budget and the EC Delegation in Tanzania) and the Embassy of Tanzania in Belgium.*

***The opinions expressed in this document represent the authors' points of view which are not necessarily shared by the European Commission or by the authorities of the countries concerned.***



EVALUATION OF THE EC's SUPPORT TO URT					
BUDGET Launch Note - date					
Description	Units	Q.ty	Unit rate euro	Price	Comments
<b>Fixed expenses</b>					
<b>FEES</b>					
<b>Inception Phase</b>					
Team leader - Mr. y	m/d				
Senior expert - Mr. A	m/d				
Medium expert - Mr. b	m/d				
Junior expert - Mr. c	m/d				
National/Regional experts	m/d				
<b>Total inception phase</b>					
<b>Desk Phase</b>					
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
<b>Total Desk Phase</b>					
<b>Field Phase (outside EU)</b>					
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
<b>Total Field Phase</b>					
<b>Synthesis Report Phase</b>					
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
	m/d				
<b>Total Synthesis Phase</b>					
<b>TOTAL A1</b>					
<b>OTHER COSTS</b>					
Translations	page				
Reports production	lump sum				
<b>TOTAL A2</b>					
<b>Reimbursable expenditure</b>					
<b>TRAVEL EXPENSES</b>					
International Travels (EU-Partner country)	Flight				
International Travels ( within EU)	Flight				
International Travels ( within EU)	train				
Local Travels (Partner country)	Flight				
<b>TOTAL B1</b>					
<b>DAILY SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES</b>					
DSA in EU Countries	m/d				
DSA in Partner countries (average)	m/d				
<b>TOTAL B2</b>					
<b>TOTAL A + B</b>					

\* On the Fees, m/d should be indicated per expert. All members of the team should appear on the budget (not an overall amount for each category).

\* The Total m/d for the inception phase shall not be repeated on the desk phase.