1. Project description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project location</strong></th>
<th>Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Moldova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project name</strong></td>
<td>Promoting regional cooperation in South Eastern Europe via networking within the authorities responsible for the environment and justice sectors (Themis Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project reference number</strong></td>
<td>8284-01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project budget</strong></td>
<td>EUR 1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor(s)/ funding sources</strong></td>
<td>Austrian Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project duration</strong></td>
<td>October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing agency and partners</strong></td>
<td>The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The project goals are to strengthen regional cooperation in the SEE region and increase the administrative capacities of national authorities in the environment and justice sectors in the fields of natural resources management and environmental crimes. It is expected that these efforts will result in better preparation for EU accession and the development of environmental law enforcement mechanisms.

The expected results are enhanced cooperation and developed institutional capacities in the relevant national authorities; as well as the development of multi-agency networking, also involving the justice sector, cooperation activities, by means of well-trained key personnel, enhanced internal dialogue and regional communication tools. The project logframe matrix is provided as Annex 1 to the present document.

Project activities are grouped into **three clusters:**

1) Management of the Themis Secretariat and organisation of Executive Committee meetings.
2) Capacity building (in the fields of natural resources, nature protection, forestry and tackling environmental crime).
3) Publications, practical tools and support to national and international institutional networking.

The target groups are policy makers and legislators from ministries of justice and environment, judges and prosecutors, and practitioners from the enforcement agencies attached to the ministries of environment, forestry, and the interior.
The Regional Environmental Center (REC) is implementing the project and provides secretariat services for the Themis cooperation platform, with the help of its country office network in the beneficiary region.

For further details about the programme, please visit the project website www.themisnetwork.eu. Most of the documentation related to project activities is posted on this site. More detailed information, and information not disclosed to the public, will be made available to the selected team of evaluators.

2. Purpose of the evaluation
The goal of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of interventions, together with the impacts and sustainability of the project, based on the benchmarks and indicators identified during the planning stage.

The evaluation will also lead to recommendations on the setting of priorities and goals, and will also inform future project design at strategic and operational levels.

The main users of the evaluation will be the project management team, the donor and the beneficiary countries.

3. Budget
Financial offers will be accepted with a maximum budget of EUR 13,000, including travel costs. The offered amount is to be inclusive of VAT.

4. Bidding deadline
Bids for this call should be sent to the REC no later than June 2, 2017, 17:00 CET.

5. Objectives
The aim of the evaluation is to review the results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) and assess the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of interventions, together with their impact and the sustainability aspects of the project, with a view to providing conclusions on the lessons learnt, how project objectives were met and how resources were utilised, while also identifying areas for improvement and recommendations for the methodology, planning and implementation of similar projects and/or follow-up activities in the future.

6. Subject and focus (scope)
Unit of analysis and time period:
The evaluation covers the results achieved under the project “Promoting regional cooperation in South Eastern Europe via networking within the authorities responsible for the environment and justice sectors” (Themis Network), Contract no 8284-01/2014, for the period October 1, 2014, to September 30, 2017.

Interventions covered and target groups:
The evaluation will analyse the results achieved under the three clusters of the project, in particular the capacity-building activities and cooperation actions, as well as the overall running of the project (project management, communication). It will also cover the project benefits for the target groups, together with any weaknesses in targeting and needs assessment.
Geographical scope:
The evaluation will be carried out at regional level, as the project followed a regional approach, with a knowledge transfer component between the SEE region and Moldova. However, national-level benefits and impacts are to be identified for the beneficiary countries whenever possible. Country-level data collection and data analysis will also be carried out.

Funding for interventions:
The evaluation will provide an analysis of the overall adequacy of funds, and whether the resources were efficiently utilised, without prejudice to the financial audit of expenditures that is regularly carried out for the financial reporting.

Cross-cutting issues:
The addressing of gender equality and anti-corruption transparency measures will be taken into consideration in the analysis of the results. In particular, the evaluation will ascertain whether the gender considerations integrated into the project document (e.g. gender disaggregation in the purpose indicators) have been addressed.

Logframe analysis:
The intervention logic/theory of change and underlying assumptions will be analysed with a view to determining their continued relevance for a potential new project phase.

Other parameters:
The participation of the beneficiary countries and country ownership will be assessed, together with coordination issues and communication (internal/external) by the project management team.

The evaluation will rely on the five OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) and the criteria of partnerships and cooperation. The evaluators shall follow all the guidance provided in the publication “Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation”, available on the ADC website¹, and shall provide a completed template for the “Results assessment” (Annex 2 to the present document)².

7. Main evaluation questions

1) Relevance
   • How relevant is the project in the process of EU law implementation and enforcement in the field of environment (natural resources, forestry, environmental crime prevention and prosecution) and to the development and transformation of the beneficiary region?
   • How relevant are the interventions to the target groups’ needs (including the needs of women)?
   • How relevant are the actions to the intervention logic established at the project design phase? Are the expected results/outputs of the project consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the logframe

¹ http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Projektabwicklung/Englisch/Guidelines_for_Project_and_Progamme_Evaluations.PDF

² http://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation/
matrix/programme theory and the presentation of the theory of change and its underlying assumptions)?

• To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for the partner countries and beneficiaries, considering the eventual changes in programming context?

2) Efficiency
• Were the resources/inputs and capacities used in a reasonable way?
• What is the cost–benefit ratio/value for money? Were the initial resources proportional to the outcomes (i.e. was the project efficient overall)?
• How adequate was the monitoring of the implementation from the project management side?
• How adequate was the cooperation from the side of the financial support recipients (beneficiary countries/institutions)?

3) Effectiveness
• Were the planned overall objectives and results contained in the project document achieved (or are they likely to be achieved)? Were these overall objectives realistic?
• What factors were crucial to the achievement of/failure to achieve the project objectives?
• What other factors can be observed regarding the achievement of the project objectives? (Also consider any factors that were possibly beyond the control of the project.)
• To what extent was the outreach of the activities towards beneficiaries adequate?
• Were materials developed and prepared as planned? What was the quality reached as compared to the planning?
• To what extent were the planned cooperation actions with partners carried out? Were new partnerships formed or existing ones strengthened?
• To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
• Were the produced guidelines/publications used by the beneficiaries? Were they adequate compared to the use of resources and to the countries’ needs?
• To what extent were the horizontal cross-cutting issues addressed?
• If the planned outcomes were not achieved, what measures can be suggested to the project management?
• To what extent were the communication tools appropriate and properly used to reach a wide target audience?
• Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
• What was the effectiveness of the project activities compared to the objectives planned?

4) Impact
• What was the value added of the regional approach followed for achieving the project results?
• To what extent did the interventions contribute to reaching a higher level of the overall objective as stated in the logframe matrix than the objectives set at the project design phase?
• Have the project activities contributed to sustainable capacity development in the beneficiary countries?
• To what extent have the interventions led to the strengthening of the national authorities?
• What is the impact or effect of the interventions in proportion to the overall situation of the target group (individual and institutional beneficiaries), also including gender issues and to some extent age structure?
• To what extent has the project contributed, or is it likely to contribute, to long-term social, economic and technical changes for the countries, individuals and institutions benefiting from the project?

5) Sustainability
• How is the sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
• To what extent are the project results likely to continue after the project and without external/donor funding?
• What risks/opportunities can be detected as regards the sustainability of project results?
• What is the status of project ownership in the beneficiary countries? Did it increase during the project?
• Will the beneficiary countries contribute in some form to the sustainability of the project processes and results?
• To what extent was the intervention exemplary? To what extent did it create lasting structures and mechanisms?
• What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of project sustainability?
• What needs to be done (or improved) to ensure sustainability?

6) Partnerships and cooperation
• To what extent have sustainable partnerships been sought and established and synergies created in the delivery of assistance?
• How have regional cooperation and partnerships developed between the countries during project implementation and beyond?

8. Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation is commissioned by the REC, as implementing partner, following the rules of the donor (ADA) on accountability and quality assurance. The exercise is carried out in the final months of project implementation to assess the adequacy of the proposed instruments and the results achieved.

The evaluation will be carried out by external evaluator(s) in line with the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and following the ADC “Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation” and international standards.

The evaluation is expected to adopt a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods (recommended) and selected approaches (e.g. focus group discussions, key informant interviews, case/comparison studies etc.) to be further refined in an inception report elaborated by the evaluator(s). The evaluator(s) is also expected to elaborate a final evaluation report resulting from desk research based on the available project documents and from bilateral interviews with the project beneficiaries and stakeholders (e.g. project management team, donor).
The following evaluation phases are envisaged:

1. Scoping and Inception: The evaluator(s) will be requested to commence the assessment with desk research, involving the screening of project documents and implementation files (reports, monitoring indicator tables, evaluations of training activities, contact lists for the beneficiary countries). A kick-off meeting will be organised to provide information and guidance to the evaluator(s).

**Output:** Draft and final inception report in compliance with the format available as an annex to the ADC “Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation”.

2. Data Collection and Preliminary Findings: The evaluator(s) will carry out definitive information and data gathering, through whatever means approved in the inception report, and will take care to include the opinions of representatives of the beneficiary countries, project team, partners, and any other stakeholders involved in the assessment. The data collection will be followed by final data analysis and the drafting of the evaluation report. For the report, data will be analysed taking into account horizontal issues (e.g. gender, anti-corruption, transparency).

3. Draft Report and Consultation: The draft final report will be sent to the project team, project beneficiaries and ADA for quality control and comments. Once the comments have been taken on board, the report will be finalised and made available to the project stakeholders.

**Output:** Draft report

4. Final Evaluation Report and Dissemination: Following the consultation process, the draft report will be finalised and disseminated in an aggregate format (e.g. PowerPoint) via various communication channels (e.g. mailing list, website).

**Output:** Final report + PowerPoint file

The total number of days dedicated to the task should be 30 working days, including on-the-spot visits.

9. **Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline: Deadline</th>
<th>Chargeable workdays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Tender acceptance</td>
<td>June 15, 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>June 19, 2017</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Desk research, screening of project documents</td>
<td>June 23, 2017</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gathering and analysing information (including on-the-spot visits) and preparation for the final report</td>
<td>July 19, 2017</td>
<td>19 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Draft final report completed and sent for comments and quality control</td>
<td>July 31, 2017</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Evaluation team and qualifications
The following main qualifications are required on the part of the evaluator or overall evaluation team:

- A profound knowledge of, and a minimum of five years’ professional experience in, environmental governance, law enforcement and EU environmental law.
- A minimum of five years’ experience with the EU accession and law harmonisation process.
- Documented participation in at least five evaluations in relevant fields and comparable projects, at least once as team leader.
- Understanding of public sector challenges and opportunities, with a view to institution development.
- Knowledge of the specificities of the beneficiary countries and the dynamics of political, economic and social transition, in particular linked to the environmental sector.
- Previous experience in South Eastern Europe and Moldova, in particular in relation to institutional capacity-building projects.
- Cross-sector and gender expertise.
- Excellent drafting skills.
- Fluency in English required. Knowledge of the national language(s) of the beneficiary countries will be considered an asset.

Candidates must submit to the REC an application package containing a technical offer and a financial offer following the instructions below.

1. The **technical offer** must include a cover letter of a maximum of two pages and a proposal presenting the profile of the evaluator/team and illustrating the evaluator’s/team members’ capacities, relevant experiences and qualifications for the envisaged tasks. For team candidates, it must be clearly visible from the offer which of the proposed evaluators will act as team leader. The methodology for executing the tasks is to be explained in the offer, together with the envisaged structure of the draft final report.

   The proposal should be accompanied by supporting documents (CVs, references, relevant certificates).

2. The **financial offer** must be submitted separately, as the two will be assessed independently.

The technical offer should be submitted to: tender.technical@rec.org
The financial offer should be submitted to: tender.financial@rec.org

The deadline for the submission of applications is **June 2, 2017, 17:00 CET**.

11. Method for evaluating the tender
Tenders will be evaluated according to the following weighting: technical offer 50%; and financial offer 50%.
In order for offers to be assessed not only from the perspective of costs, the technical offers will be assessed first, by the project team at the REC, based on a pre-defined evaluation grid. The assessment team will comprise the REC staff members responsible for project implementation (maximum four people), the project director and one representative from the REC’s Finance Department. The offer that represents best value for money will be selected.

12. Reports
The output of this task will be an evaluation report in English. The maximum length of the report is 40 pages (without annexes). As preparation for the task of evaluation and the elaboration of the final report, the evaluator(s) are also expected to produce an inception report following the format defined in the ADC “Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation”.

The structure and content of the final report should meet the requirements of the ADC “Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation” and other international standards. The final draft evaluation report and final report must be structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions.

The evaluation report must:
• contain an executive summary;
• be analytical in nature (in terms of both quantity and quality);
• be structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt;
• include conclusions;
• include recommendations; and
• include the “Results assessment” form according to the ADC guidelines and following the template in Annex 2 to the present terms of reference.

The evaluation report will be assessed against the evaluation quality criteria of the OECD/DAC. In addition, the final report should:
• comply with these terms of reference and answer all evaluation questions;
• include a separate analysis of cross-cutting issues;
• include a description and assessment of the intervention logic;
• base any conclusions and recommendations on clearly stated findings;
• include a clear methodology section (previously defined and agreed in the inception report) explaining how the information was gathered, processed and analysed;
• be realistic about the lessons learnt and other recommendations, which should be clearly addressed to concrete stakeholders, partners, etc.;
• contain a list of consulted stakeholders; and
• contain a bibliography detailing all documents used, and highlighting the most important.

13. Coordination and responsibility
The evaluator(s) shall be duly responsible for fulfilling the tasks described. The REC will provide supervision and logistical support for the desk research, by making the relevant project documents available, and for setting up interviews on the spot, if applicable.

14. Clarifications
Requests for clarifications on the present ToR and bidding process should be sent to ThemisSecretariat@rec.org
### Annex 1. Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong>&lt;br&gt;Overarching development objective, i.e. sectoral or guiding objective of the partner country and the Austrian Development Cooperation to which the intervention contributes</td>
<td>Describe the objectives of the action in an (objectively) verifiable and measurable manner. Define (SMART) how and based on what evidence the actual occurrence of a planned change can be observed or measured.</td>
<td>Are there documents, statistics, reports and other sources of information, which allow for the checking of the indicators?</td>
<td>Are there any external factors that lie outside the control of the project management but that nevertheless may have an (even decisive) influence on project success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening regional cooperation in South Eastern European countries and improving/developing environmental law enforcement mechanisms targeting the environment and justice sectors, in line with the EU accession process.</td>
<td>- 200 persons trained and involved directly in the activities (of which a minimum of 40% are women).&lt;br&gt;- 400 people reached by the dissemination of outputs and know-how — that is, the spill-over effect (of which a minimum of 30% are women).</td>
<td>- Themis interim and annual progress reports.&lt;br&gt;- Feedback from events/training participants, including results of needs assessment questionnaires and evaluation forms.&lt;br&gt;- Collection of sex-disaggregated data.</td>
<td>Assumptions:&lt;br&gt;- Adequate transparency measures to avoid corruption in the environmental sector.&lt;br&gt;Risks:&lt;br&gt;- Lack of political will necessary to achieve the project objectives and insufficient engagement of decision makers.&lt;br&gt;- Lack of institutional support and readiness of relevant authorities to engage in regional cooperation under Themis.&lt;br&gt;- Lack of effective coordination and interaction with other on-going and past initiatives resulting in overlaps, the wasting of valuable resources and no added value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Purpose</strong>&lt;br&gt;Changes projected by the intervention; sustainable benefit for the target group/s</td>
<td>Increased administrative and institutional capacities of the relevant national authorities, including the justice sector, regarding EU environmental legislation and combating environmental crimes (in particular in relation to natural resources and forestry). Cross-country and regional cooperation enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Expected Results

**Products and services provided by the intervention in order to achieve the planned changes at the level of the project purpose.**

1. Enhanced cooperation and dialogue among stakeholders responsible for environmental law implementation and enforcement.
2. Developed institutional capacities and knowledge transfer in the beneficiary institutions as regards natural resources management and combating environmental crimes.
3. Developed multi-agency networking within the countries through experience and best practice exchange.

### Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products and services</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Number of cooperation actions (of which one Executive Committee meeting per year).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conclusions from the cooperation activities (presentations, minutes of meetings).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of adequate resources, financial or otherwise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of interest and involvement in Moldova.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Enhanced cooperation and dialogue among stakeholders responsible for environmental law implementation and enforcement.**
   - Regularity of website maintenance and regional communication.
   - Number of visits to the website per partner country.
   - Increase in established and maintained partnerships, including those leading to integration in EU and global initiatives.
   - Cross-participation in partners’ programmes and/or other successful cooperation actions.
   - Increase in contribution to Themis activities by high-level decision makers.

2. **Developed institutional capacities and knowledge transfer in the beneficiary institutions as regards natural resources management and combating environmental crimes.**
   - Lists of participants.
   - Event reports (minutes).
   - Collection of sex-disaggregated data.
   - Feedback from events/training participants, including results of needs assessment questionnaires and evaluation forms.
   - Presentations and other documents regularly compiled and assessed by the Secretariat.

### Assumptions:

- Openness towards institutional development on the part of the beneficiary authorities.

### Risks:

- Lack of willingness of the beneficiaries to cooperate and give access to information in a transparent manner.
- Complex administrative structures.
- Insufficient ministerial capacity to absorb assistance and cooperate at the regional level.
- Failure to ensure that capacity building in the enforcement sector also involves the judiciary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme, minimum three modules, five participants per country.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Number of capacity-building events (one sub-regional event per year covering a minimum of two countries, five participants per country). Planned country grouping: Albania–Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia–Kosovo*, Serbia and Montenegro; Bosnia and Herzegovina and Moldova.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of capacity-building actions (on-the-job actions at national level, including entry-level trainings for newcomers; expected two per year, eight participants per country).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation of EU member states in the training programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in accessible records of all training outputs (knowledge management) in both Themis databases and country databases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development of joint (learning) law enforcement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of regional forums (one event).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishment of cooperation actions with international partners in the framework of the capacity-building programme (regional, sub-regional and national).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Public information sources such as websites or other knowledge transfer platforms.

3.
- Themis interim and annual progress reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Management of the Themis Secretariat and organisation of Executive Committee meetings (Cluster 1) | - Expert input from the REC.  
- International experts with particular expertise under goal-oriented contracts.  
- Cooperation with partners and other networks.  
- In-kind contributions from the countries (person-hours, meeting rooms and use of equipment, communications and local distribution and dissemination costs).  
- Project budget. | Total budget of EUR 1,161,111.11  
ADA’s contribution of EUR 1,050,000  
The REC’s contribution of EUR 111,111.11 | - Commitment from the national authorities to absorb assistance and to participate in a proactive way, in particular in national-level activities.  
- Acceptance of the Themis Secretariat as a steering force.  
- Establishment of good communication and dialogue with beneficiaries.  
- Commitment from the national authorities in Moldova. |
| 2. Capacity building (natural resources, nature protection,                |                                                                      |                                                                      | *Risks:*  
- Lack of active and responsible focal points in each of the beneficiary countries.  
- Lack of willingness on the part of the relevant authorities to enable all |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>forestry, environmental crime) (Cluster 2)</th>
<th>stakeholders to take part in Themis activities and allocate resources to that end.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Strengthening and building capacities in the competent national authorities (regional level): one train-the-trainer multi-module programme</td>
<td>- Lack of willingness of Themis partners and other networks to cooperate and exchange experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Strengthening and building capacities in the competent national authorities (sub-regional level)</td>
<td>- Lack of regular, effective communication and steering from the Themis Secretariat (many stakeholder groups and different interests).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 On-the-job training (national level) and joint law enforcement actions within the region and/or with partners</td>
<td>- Lack of observance of deadlines on the part of all actors involved in implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Regional Forum Conference</td>
<td>- Lack of capacity to identify the right experts at national and local levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Publications, practical tools and support to national and international institutional networking (Cluster 3)</td>
<td>- Lack of clear responsibilities for Themis-related tasks among beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Assisting institutional development and multi-agency networking in the beneficiary countries</td>
<td>- Lack of relevant staff with good knowledge of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconditions</td>
<td>- Weaknesses in communication with some of the beneficiary countries’ administrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government support.</td>
<td>- Government support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient responsiveness on the part of beneficiaries to provide input to activities.</td>
<td>- Sufficient responsiveness on the part of beneficiaries to provide input to activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Availability of stakeholder representatives to participate in the project.</td>
<td>- Availability of stakeholder representatives to participate in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nomination of relevant experts to participate in targeted events.</td>
<td>- Nomination of relevant experts to participate in targeted events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National follow-up to activities.</td>
<td>- National follow-up to activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Efficient communication.</td>
<td>- Efficient communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active and responsible focal points.</td>
<td>- Active and responsible focal points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMART

S = “specific”: specifically related to the objective it is supposed to measure; M = “measurable”, in quantitative or qualitative terms; A = “available at an acceptable cost”; R = “relevant”: in terms of the information needed; T = “time bound”.

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.
### Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.

(Final Format Nov. 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title of project/programme (please, spell out):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Period of project/programme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADC number of project/programme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of project/programme partner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country and Region of project/programme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget of this project/programme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of completion of evaluation/review:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick appropriate box:

- [ ] a) Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office
- [ ] b) Evaluation managed by project partner:

Please tick appropriate box:

- [ ] a) Mid-Term Evaluation
- [ ] b) Final Evaluation
- [ ] c) Mid-Term Review
- [ ] d) Final Review

Others: please, specify:
Project Outcome *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

**For Final Evaluation/Review**: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) was/were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully achieved:</th>
<th>Almost achieved:</th>
<th>Partially achieved:</th>
<th>Not achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not? (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

---

3 Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review.
**For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review**: Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box.

Outcome(s) will most likely be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully achieved:</th>
<th>Almost achieved:</th>
<th>Partially achieved:</th>
<th>Not achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please, also explain your assessment**: (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

**Project Outputs**: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate boxes.

Output 1 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix)*:

Output was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully achieved:</th>
<th>Almost achieved:</th>
<th>Partially achieved:</th>
<th>Not achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review.

5 In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.
**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

### Output 2 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output 2 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully achieved:</th>
<th>Almost achieved:</th>
<th>Partially achieved:</th>
<th>Not achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

### Output 3 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output 3 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully achieved:</th>
<th>Almost achieved:</th>
<th>Partially achieved:</th>
<th>Not achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

*In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact/Beneficiaries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations — if any — from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment:</strong> To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations — if any — from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

Overall/Other Comments: