



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

**Evaluation of Budget Support operations
in
[name of the partner country]
during [indicate the period]**

DRAFT

MODEL TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. PRELIMINARY SETTINGS

Budget support is defined as a method of financing a partner country's budget through a transfer of resources from an external financing agency to the partner government's national treasury. The funds thus transferred are managed in accordance with the recipient's budgetary procedures. Budget support includes General Budget Support (GBS) and Sector Budget Support (SBS).

Specificities of each one are mentioned in the attached supporting documents which give the methodological guidelines and tools.

The GBS/SBS evaluation will be guided and coordinated through a formal Management Group (MG), accompanied in **[partner country]** by a Reference Group (RG) (see chap 9. hereunder).

The Management Group will involve the Reference Group all along the process and, at least formally for the:

- Attendance at the preliminary findings meeting;
- Approval of the different versions of the final report (drafts and final version);
- Attendance at the seminar in **[partner country]**.

2. MANDATE AND OBJECTIVES

The objective of the evaluation is to assess to what extent the GBS/SBS concerned have successfully given means to the partner government to implement its national/sector strategy [*description, in two sentences, of the national/sector strategy*] and enhanced the efficiency and effectiveness of its policies, strategies, and spending actions to achieve sustainable outcomes and impacts on growth and development.

The evaluation is expected to produce results which

- besides their use for accountability in every donor country, will help to improve donors' support for the partner country's strategies.
- will give information to the partner country's government for their decision making and for their own accountability to their citizens.
- will be useful for any other stakeholder involved in or affected by budget support, e.g. citizens of the partner country or institutions located in the partner country.

The evaluation will take stock of what has been achieved with the main purpose to be forward looking and allow for lessons learnt and recommendations to inform on:

- the conditions under which GBS/SBS has an effect (or not) and the possible intensity and nature (positive or negative) of such effect in **[partner country]** and other countries where the lessons learnt will be transferred;
- the design and implementation of future GBS/SBS operations in **[partner country]**;
- improvements to be set up by the donors to maximize GBS/SBS impacts in **[partner country]** and other countries where the lessons learnt will be transferred;
- constraints in government policies, institutional structures and administrative arrangements within **[partner country]**, which might impede the overall effectiveness and impact of spending actions and targeted public policy;

3. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation follows a specific methodology, consisting of three steps:

- The first step aims at an assessment of the inputs provided by budget support and their effect on the relationship between external assistance and the partner country's budget and policy processes (direct outputs) as well as the induced changes in the financing and institutional framework for public spending, public policy, policy management and service delivery (induced outputs).
- The second step aims at an assessment of the outcomes (beneficiaries' responses) and impacts (e.g. sustainable growth, poverty reduction, etc.) which are realised by the government policy related to the explicit aims of budget support.
- Finally, based on the findings in step 1 and 2, step three aims at a synthesis and conclusions in which way budget support has contributed to changes in the partner country.

An in depth description and a more specific methodological guidance for this budget support evaluation are presented in the supporting documents attached to these Terms of Reference.

4. BACKGROUND

To be adapted for each partner country, concise and clear, maximum 1,5 pages; Content :

General background

Information on the legal basis and political commitments of the donors to the partner country (treaties, communications, programming documents) referring to the specificities of the geographical area;

Main features and evolution of the donors' co-operation with the partner country;

Evolution of the context and the major trends in the political, institutional, social and economical fields;

Budget support linked background

Summary of the policy, institutional and PFM context in the partner country (can be extracted from the main issues indicated in the assessment reports drafted during the programming/identification/formulation/review phases of GBS/SBS);

Summary of the history of budget support operations in the partner country and the present composition of budget support (volume, policy dialogue and institutional set up);

Brief summary of the budget support activities of the donors involved;

Explanation of why the evaluation will be conducted at this particular time.

5. SCOPE

5.1. Temporal and geographical scope

*Please refer here to the **temporal** and **legal** dimensions of the budget support operations with the partner country and the donors involved.*

The scope of the evaluation is the budget support design and implementation during the **[period]**.

The field phase of the evaluation will take place in **[partner country's capital]**, combined with a limited number of missions inside the partner country.

5.2. Thematic scope

The evaluation team must assess the GBS/SBS mentioned hereunder:

- *GBS called [name of the intervention] financed by [name of all the donors, if relevant] and the European Commission on the [name the financial instrument(s) concerned];*
- *SBS called [name of the intervention] financed by [name of all the donors, if relevant] and the European Commission on the [name the financial instrument(s) concerned].*

In particular, the evaluation will regard:

- i) the inputs provided through GBS/SBS arrangements over the period concerned;
- ii) the identification of possible specificities and complementarities (including specific value added) or trade offs among the different donors in GBS/SBS design and implementation. The specific effects of such individual donors' features, however, will be further assessed only when differences among donors appear as the cause of specific, identifiable positive or negative effects. This assessment shall never jeopardise the consideration of GBS/SBS as a whole.
- iii) the performance of the GBS/SBS inputs, in terms of direct and induced outputs;
- iv) the changes related to GBS/SBS (including level, quality and sustainability) which have occurred during the period under evaluation as regards the outputs, outcomes and impacts of government policies, strategies and actions, and the key causal factors driving those changes;
- v) the extent to which GBS/SBS have contributed to the results identified at the outcome and impact levels and the sustainability of these outcomes and impacts, considering both positive contributions to public policy-making and implementation processes and any (unwanted) negative side-effects which may have arisen;
- vi) the overall relevance of the GBS/SBS arrangements in view of the evolving partner country and sector specific contexts, the aid policies and the related goals;
- vii) the efficiency of GBS/SBS operations, considering both the process and the relation between effects (direct outputs, induced outputs and outcomes) and inputs;
- viii) the consideration of possible recommendations from previous budget support evaluations, both in the current programming cycle and in the GBS/SBS (design and implementation) under evaluation.

The recommendations will have to take into account the four bullet points mentioned at the end of the chapter 2.

6. KEY DELIVERABLES

Following approval of the technical and financial proposal / launch note, the six key deliverables are:

- The inception report
- The desk report

- The preliminary findings presentation
- The draft final report
- The final report
- The minutes, conclusions and recommendations of the national seminar in **[partner country]**

Additional to these key deliverables and as the very first document, a note in response to the ToR **[a financial and technical proposal or a launch note – depending on the lead donor]** is required and has to be accepted before any of the key deliverables become due. The note shall contain, at least:

- the understanding of the ToR;
- the provisional composition of the evaluation team with CVs;
- a proposed budget;
- a work plan.

All documents will be written in **[language]**.

The inception report as the first of the key deliverables requires formal approval, accompanied by a formal authorization to continue with the evaluation. Without the authorization to continue, the evaluation comes to a halt and may be terminated. All other key deliverables are only due if the formal approval of the inception report and the authorization to continue has been given. The delivery of the documents follows the phasing of the evaluation according to the timing given in chapter 11.

7. STANDARD PHASES AND ACTIVITIES

Normally the work to be carried out can be divided into FIVE phases. The details of each of these are outlined in the following paragraphs.

7.1. The preparatory phase

The duration of this preparatory phase depends on

- the scale of the budget support
- the number of individual GBS and SBS operations by different development agencies
- the constraints on the availability of data

The preparatory phase is aimed to involve the different stakeholders in partner country (recipient government, high institutions, central bank, non-state actors ...) and to clarify the roles of everyone. The involvement of the partner country is crucial. First contacts with the evaluation team leader will be done during this phase.

The phase also includes a check on the availability and quality of existing data.

The evaluation starts (if possible) with an *initial meeting* with the Management Group to discuss requirements stated in the ToR and to discuss the preliminary documentation. This phase ends with the submission and the discussion on a Preliminary note.

7.2. The desk phase

The desk phase is articulated in two sub-phases:

- a first sub-phase leading to (the drafting of) the inception report (inception).
- a second sub-phase leading to (the drafting of) the desk report (reporting).

7.2.1. Inception sub-phase

The inception sub-phase is aimed at structuring the evaluation and consists of:

- i. a preliminary desk-based review of documentation and the acquisition of most of the documentation available,
- ii. the identification of the main specific features to be introduced in the comprehensive evaluation framework and the ensuing presentation,
- iii. discussion of and agreement on the preliminary framework and preliminary list of Judgement Criteria (JCs) for the Key Evaluation Questions (EQs) (see section 8) with the Management Group. Following the Key EQs is mandatory in any GBS/SBS evaluation to allow comparisons between different evaluations of budget support. The list of JCs will be structured according to the compulsory EQs. Examples of JCs linked to these EQs are presented in the supporting documents; the final JCs are supposed to be discussed and chosen according to the partner country's specificities. Special attention will be given to gender equality, good governance and democratic accountability as cross cutting issues. .

If the evaluation team is not permanently based in the partner country during the execution of the evaluation, the preparation phase and the inception sub-phase will imply a visit to the partner country of no less than 10 days, by the core members of the evaluation team.

At the end of this sub-phase, the evaluation team prepares a presentation including a preliminary framework and a preliminary list of JCs linked to the compulsory EQs to be submitted to the Management Group in an *inception meeting* for discussion and agreement.

The principal objectives of the inception meeting are:

- to review with the Management Group the main motivations for the evaluation and the key concerns to be addressed;
- to discuss the preliminary framework, in order to identify the main specific features to be introduced in the Comprehensive Evaluation Framework, and a preliminary list of JCs related to the compulsory EQs;
- to identify the sources of information necessary for the evaluation;
- to collect whatever documentation and data available immediately and make arrangements for the compilation / preparation of data in the areas where there are gaps¹;
- to clarify the management arrangements for the evaluation, both within the evaluation team and in relation to the Management Group;
- to adapt, in exceptional cases, a timetable for the completion of the evaluation.

¹ The use of a questionnaire aimed at collecting preliminary information and documentation on GBS/SBS operations conducted by each DP in the country should be assessed at this stage. Information to be gathered would centre on the different aspects of GBS/SBS operation to be included in the inventory.

The inception meeting and the internal team work that will precede it, will, in most cases, provide a first opportunity for the evaluation team to meet together – particularly where the evaluation team comprises both international and national consultants, which is likely to be the case. It would also permit the evaluation team to clarify roles within the team, working methods and drafting responsibilities.

This inception sub-phase will end with the submission of the inception report. This report is the finalisation of the presentation made at the inception meeting, including the outcome of the discussions occurred in the meeting. It will consist of a number of charts (preliminary framework, relation between the content of the framework and EQs), and tables (basic documentary references, JCs list linked to EQs, relation between EQs and evaluation criteria), and the related presentation. On this basis, an agreement on the specificities to be considered in the framework and the list of the EQs and related key JCs must be reached.

Formal approval of the inception report with the official authorization to continue with the evaluation will be sent by **[name of the donor contractor among the MG]**. If there is no agreement on the inception report or some unforeseeable evaluation impediments become known, the inception report will be formally rejected by **[name of the donor contractor among the MG] and the evaluation comes to a halt. In this case, the Management Group has the right to prematurely terminate the contract with the evaluation team/evaluators without further reason.**

7.2.2. Desk sub-phase

The desk study sub-phase consists of:

- i. a more detailed desk-based review of documentation,
- ii. the undertaking of a first set of interviews with members of the Reference Group and other relevant stakeholders,
- iii. the finalisation of the framework and finalisation and completion of JCs,
- iv. the construction of a data base.

Following the submission – and approval - of the inception report, the evaluation team will review the additional information and documents collected. The purpose is to ensure that the evaluation team will get a good understanding of the budget support arrangements being evaluated and of the key features of the partner country context. This phase will be concluded with the submission of a desk study. Based on the agreement with the Management Group, the desk study will include:

- a justification of the framework;
- the list of JCs related to the EQs , including quantitative and/or qualitative indicators and, when relevant, targets;
- the first elements for responding to the EQs and the hypotheses to be tested later on;
- the methodological design, including evaluation tools to be applied in the field phase: appropriate methods for further data collection (both in the capital city and at decentralised level) and for analysis of information and, indications of any limitations in the application of those methods;
- a plan for data collection within the partner country, indicating any limitations, describing how the data will be cross-checked and specifying the sources;
- a programme of work for the in-depth analysis;
- a data base on relevant data linked to the changes related to the budget support.

This desk study will have to be approved by the Management Group prior to the principal field mission. Formal approval will be sent by **[name of the donor contractor among the MG]**.

7.3. The field phase

At this stage of the evaluation, most of the underlying analysis of available data for the evaluation will be completed and all remaining data gaps need to be addressed.

Specific tools will be used to collect missing information. Applied tools for data collection and analysis will include (as appropriate): for example interviews with key stakeholders and related institutions, focus groups, surveys, expert panel, case studies, multi-criteria analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis or any other tool/method suggested in or in accordance with the three attached background documents. These tools will be combined to ensure rigorous conclusions and thereby operational recommendations. Non exhaustive examples are given below:

- Semi-structured individual interviews based on clear guidelines and check lists. Stakeholders interviewed will include: key government and development partner stakeholders involved in budget support including members of the national parliament; oversight bodies, Central Bank staff and other key officials within the central agencies (Finance, Planning, Office of the President, etc); relevant sector ministry staff at national, regional and district levels; academics; and private sector and civil society resource persons.
- Group interviews / focus groups. Organisation of one or more thematic meetings or workshops with representatives of the different categories of stakeholders in order to collect the same type of information from different persons at the same time, to increase its validity and the overall understanding of the issue. Focus groups with members of private sector associations and other relevant sectors of civil society based on clear guidelines and check lists should be ensured.
- Case studies/Outcome and Impact studies. Undertaking of specific case studies or outcome/impact studies on sectors/themes identified during the desk phase, to complement the broader partner country analysis. Special attention will be given to outcomes and impacts concerning gender equality, good governance and democratic accountability as cross cutting issues.
- Sharing of initial data analysis with relevant stakeholders through the organisation of a workshop so as to ensure completeness and correctness. Workshops can prove to be particularly helpful in cross-checking the team's understanding of events, in resolving apparent inconsistencies, and in identifying additional relevant data and reports.
- Expert workshops at the conclusion stage.
- And other appropriate tools.

A large part of the evaluation work, especially the work concerning GBS/SBS inputs and their effects (direct and induced outputs) on public policy processes and management, is likely to be carried out in the capital. However, in order to capture different perspectives and to substantiate findings by the method of triangulation, the evaluation team will execute local visits to contact government staff, private sector and civil society representatives at the decentralised level, according to the scope of the specific evaluation. Furthermore, it will be of utmost importance to capture the perspective of citizens as the users of public services and the beneficiaries of

public policy. The opportunity to obtain a genuine ‘field perspective’ in this respect is essential, especially for gaining knowledge about the outcomes and impacts (level 4 and 5) of budget support. Therefore, the work of the evaluation team in the capital and the work in other regions of the partner country will be balanced according to the scope of the specific evaluation considering the mixture of GBS and SBS which has been or is supplied. Approaching the same evaluation question from different angles and trying to confirm findings will offer the best protection against spurious results and will ensure the quality of the final evaluation.

At the end of this phase the evaluation team will present preliminary findings to the Reference Group (RG) and the Management Group (MG) of the evaluation. The findings will be presented and discussed during a formal de-briefing meeting, through the sub-mission of an aide mémoire in the form of a PPP, or similar.

The aide mémoire (to be sent to the MG prior to the meeting) will address the following issues:

- Data collection and analysis plan;
- Problems encountered and solutions adopted;
- Assessment of the coverage and reliability of collected data including their first analysis;
- Most significant facts and preliminary findings in connection with EQs;
- Next steps pertaining to analysis and value judgement.

7.4. The analysis and synthesis phase

Immediately after the de-briefing meeting and receipt of written comments from the MG, the evaluation team will start on the overall analysis of the collected information.

7.4.1. Analysis

Due to the complexity of a budget support evaluation, often including the evaluation of GBS and SBS, an overall viewing and thorough analysis of all the information collected is essential, be it information based on documents, data, facts and figures from interviews, case studies or outcome and impact studies on certain thematic aspects. Technically more complex methods like some of those suggested in the attached supporting document “Tools for step 2” will need further analysis of data which would be too time consuming during the actual field phase.

Furthermore, in complex evaluations there will usually be some sort of division of labour applied within the evaluation team, which makes it all the more necessary to leave sufficient time for the overall analysis, putting the evaluation ‘bits and pieces’ together to form the bigger in depth evaluation picture.

Finally Step/component 3 can only be undertaken when step/component 1 and step/component 2 are finalized.

Based on the overall analysis and synthesis of information, the evaluation team shall prepare a first draft of the evaluation report, which fulfils the objectives of the evaluation, whilst addressing all the mandatory EQs.

7.4.2. Draft final report

The draft report will be presented to the MG and the RG of the evaluation. These key budget support stakeholders should be allowed enough time to comment on the draft report, both to point out any omissions or errors and to provide feedback on the conclusions and operational recommendations.

The evaluation team will submit the draft final report in conformity with a structure previously agreed with the MG. Comments received following the last meeting with the MG and the RG of the evaluation should be taken into consideration without compromising the independence of its value judgements.

The evaluation team may either accept or reject the comments but in case of rejection of the comments it must justify (in writing) the reasons for rejection (these comments and the evaluation team's responses are annexed to the report).

The draft report (*Z copies of the report and Y reports with full printed annexes*) will be sent to the MG who will distribute it to the key GBS/SBS stakeholders. These key GBS/SBS stakeholders will have **X weeks**, [*fill as appropriate, please foresee ample time to ensure that the comments of ALL stakeholders will be taken into account*] to comment on the draft report, both to point out any omissions or errors and to provide feedback on the conclusions and operational recommendations.

7.4.3. Final report

The evaluation team will prepare the final report based on the comments of the MG and the RG. *W copies* of the **Final Main Report** must be sent to the MG with an additional *Y reports* with all printed annexes. A CD-Rom with the Final Main Report and annexes has to be added to each printed report.

As for the draft final report, the evaluation team may either accept or reject the comments but in case of rejection of the MG and the RG comments they must justify (in writing) the reasons for rejection (these comments and the evaluation team's responses are annexed to the report).

The evaluators have to hand over in an appropriate format (electronic or paper) all relevant data gathered during the evaluation.

7.5. The dissemination phase (seminar in the partner country)

It is essential that the final report is presented in the partner country to the donors (and to development agency officials), the national core stakeholders involved in budget support and to the wider community of political leaders, government officials, academics, CSOs, private sector representatives, to whom the findings and recommendations would be of interest. This can be done in one or two seminars.

Seminar(s) will be organised to disseminate the results of the evaluation. The evaluation team shall prepare a presentation (*PowerPoint*) for the seminar(s). The presentation and the minutes of the seminar(s) (prepared and written by the evaluation team) with an emphasis on the conclusions/recommendations will be considered as a product of the evaluation in the same way as the reports and the data base.

After the seminar(s), *V copies* of the two documents (PowerPoint presentation and minutes of the seminars) will be sent to the MG.

8. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluators are required to follow the Methodology of budget support evaluation outlined in chapters 3 and 5 and described in more detail in the three supporting documents attached to the ToR. The methodology and its three step approach are based on a logical framework which sets out a hypothesised sequence of effects of budget support and allows them to be systematically tested.

The Evaluation Framework is divided into five levels as follows:

Level 1: The GBS/ SBS inputs

Level 2: The Direct Outputs

Level 3: The Induced Outputs

Level 4: The Outcomes

Level 5: The Impacts.

The following key evaluation questions (EQs) are structured according to the first two evaluation steps forming the base for the synthesis in step three. The EQs mandatorily have to be analysed and answered but specific EQs reflecting specificities of the country may be added. For each of the mandatory EQs clear judgement criteria (JC), indicators and targets may be formulated (suggestions for JC can be found in the supporting documents). When choosing JC it shall be kept in mind that gender equality, good governance and democratic accountability are cross cutting issues which may have some relevance for answering the EQs even if not specifically mentioned in their phrasing.

The EQs will be linked to the criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC: relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The criteria may be given different weightings based on the priority accorded to the EQs.

| Level | Key evaluation questions |
|--|--|
| Level 1: Inputs (Step One) | 1.1. Which inputs have been provided and to what extent do they correspond to the envisaged GBS/SBS inputs? |
| | 1.2. To what extent are the budget support operations put in place consistent with the countries' strategic and policy framework and with the overall Partners' development strategies? |
| | 1.3. How well was the design (including the mix of GBS/SBS inputs) adapted to the specific political, economic and institutional context (including risk analyses and entry conditions assessment)? |
| | 1.4. To what extent has budget support contributed to the provision of non-financial inputs, such as technical assistance, capacity building and policy dialogue which are strategic and focused on government priorities? |
| Level 2: Direct outputs (Step One) | 2.1. To what extent has budget support contributed over time to an increased size and share of external funding subject to government's budgetary process and improved predictability of aid flows overall? |
| | 2.2. To what extent has budget support contributed to the establishment of a coordinated framework of policy dialogue, focused on key government strategies and priorities? |
| | 2.3. To what extent has budget support contributed to harmonisation and alignment of external assistance, and reduced transaction costs over time? |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 3: Induced Outputs (Step One) | 3.1. To what extent have there been improvements in national revenues, fiscal discipline and macroeconomic management and how far has budget support contributed? |
| | 3.2. To what extent did budget management and overall Public Finance Management improve and how far has budget support contributed to those improvements? |
| | 3.3. To what extent have there been improvements in the quality of policy processes and policy implementation (including ownership and transparency), and how far has budget support contributed to those improvements? |
| | 3.4. How have the adopted budget allocations and the actual level and composition of public spending changed and with which main consequences for the production of public goods and services? |
| | 3.5. To what extent have there been improvements in governance and democratic accountability, particularly regarding the relative roles of Parliament and Civil Society in relation to the budget? |
| | 3.6. To what extent did the rule of law improve in the country? |

| | |
|--|--|
| Levels 5 + 4: Impacts and Outcomes (Step Two) | 4.1. How did the economy, in particular the enterprises, perform and interact with the economic and institutional environment? <i>For SBS, this question will highlight the relationship between the overall economic context and the sector performance.</i> |
| | 4.2. How did the overall livelihoods (impact), including citizens' security and access to services (outcome), of the target groups change over time (for example, with respect to the key social sectors, in particular health and education and/or justice for entrepreneurs, all citizens and especially the low income population)? <i>For SBS, this question will focus on the specific sectors.</i> |
| | 4.3. To what extent have there been changes in the income of the citizens and the income distribution (e.g. Gini index, income growth per income quintile) with a special focus on the poorest parts of the population? |
| | 4.4. To what extent can significant changes be identified in key cross cutting issues in the society, such as gender equality, good governance and democratic accountability, environment protection and youth participation? |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 4 + 5: the determining factors of change (Step Two) | 5.1. To what extent can changes in the performance of the economy, in particular in the performance of enterprises, be related to changes in macroeconomic and fiscal management and/or changes in other government policies or policy processes, and/or to other external or internal factors? |
| | 5.2. To what extent can changes in the overall livelihoods, including citizens' security and access to services, be related to changes in government policies or policy processes, and/or to other external or internal factors? |
| | 5.3. To what extent can changes in the income of citizens and in the income distribution be related to changes in government policies or policy processes, and/or to other external or internal factors? |
| | 5.4. To what extent can changes in some key cross-cutting themes be related to changes in government policies or policy processes, and/or to other external or internal factors? |

Further, in step 3, the role of budget support as a factor of change or as a leverage for change must be highlighted.

The evaluation team, in consultation with the MG and, if manageable, with the RG (see section 9), will formulate Judgement Criteria (JCs) for the compulsory EQs above. The JCs will be clearly linked to the EQs and at the same time adapted to the specific context in the partner country and the specific aspects of the budget support operations to be evaluated. This will be done during the inception phase of the evaluation.

In the case of SBS (whether or not accompanied by GBS), it is important to apply the standard EQs both at the aggregate level (mainly ministry in charge of finances and other macroeconomic issues) and the sector levels concerned. At the aggregate level evaluators should not attempt to separate the precise effects of GBS and SBS. Only at sector level, specific effects of the SBS arrangements should be identified. The presence of two or more SBS arrangements will provide a ready source of comparative experiences, from which valuable evaluation lessons will be drawn.

9. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION

The GBS/SBS evaluation will be under the responsibility of the **[partner country]** main stakeholders: donors and government.

The evaluation will be guided and coordinated through a formal Management Group, accompanied in **[partner country]** by a Reference Group.

The Management Group comprises lead donor(s) represented by their Evaluation Unit(s) and may comprise one or two representatives of the **[partner country's]** government. It is the responsibility of the Management Group:

- Ø to ensure that the evaluation is supported by and accompanied by the **[partner country's]** government and that key stakeholders are involved in the budget support evaluation,
- Ø to ensure the financing of the evaluation,
- Ø to finalize the ToR according to the partner country context,
- Ø to compose the evaluation team according to the ToR and to the DAC quality standards,
- Ø to ensure the communication with the Reference Group according to the procedures laid down in the evaluation's ToR,
- Ø to ensure that the evaluation methodology has been followed and that it responds to the DAC quality standards.

The Reference Group is comprised of government representatives and representatives of the donors who provide budget support. The Reference Group is kept informed by the MG about the progress of the evaluation, is providing information and advice to the MG and the evaluation team. The RG comments on the draft final evaluation report (further see chap. 11 hereunder).

10. THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be composed of a minimum of five people *[up to eight or even more people might be required for more complicated evaluations]* – three senior and two junior, including both national (from the partner country) and international experts. Overall the team will combine knowledge of GBS/SBS evaluation techniques, knowledge of the partner country in question, expertise in macroeconomics, public finance management, political science and econometrics/statistics as well as a familiarity with the sectors to be analysed *[list the sectors]*. One expert can have several thematic and/or sector competences. All the experts must be fluent in **[language]**.

One international expert (preferably the specialist of GBS/SBS evaluation techniques) will be proposed by the evaluation team and approved by the Management Group as team leader. Experts must be strictly neutral. Conflicts of interests must be avoided.

TOTAL REQUIRED INPUT IN TERMS OF PERSON DAYS IS ESTIMATED AT [NUMBER] PERSON DAYS.

11. TIMING

The meetings and dates mentioned in the following section may be changed with the agreement of all concerned.

| <i>Evaluation Phases and Stages</i> | <i>Notes and Reports</i> | <i>D a t e s</i> | <i>Meetings/Communications</i> |
|---|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Starting Stage | Launch Note / Technical and financial proposition | | If applicable: Formal contract between the consultancy office and the contracting donor agency |
| Preparatory Phase | Preliminary note (internal) | | MG Meeting |
| Desk Phase (inception report and desk study) | | | |
| Inception report phase | Inception report | | MG Meeting |
| | Approval of inception report and authorization to continue with evaluation | | A formal exchange of letters between the evaluation team/consultancy office and the contracting donor agency either confirms the approval of the inception report and gives authorization to continue with the evaluation or rejects the inception report and officially brings the evaluation to a halt |
| Desk study phase | Draft Desk Study | | MG Meeting |
| | Final Desk Study | | A formal exchange of letters between the evaluation team/consultancy office and the contracting donor agency confirms the approval of the desk study. |
| Field Phase | | | |
| Data collection | Preliminary findings PPP / aide mémoire | | MG and RG <i>Meeting</i> |
| Analysis and Synthesis phase | | | |
| | 1st draft Final report | | Comments of RG and MG consolidated and sent by the MG |
| | Revised draft Final report | | Idem |
| | Final Main Report Document with all data | | A formal exchange of letters between the evaluation team and the contracting donor agency confirms the approval of the final report |
| Dissemination phase | | | |
| Preparation of the seminar | Power point presentation | | |
| National seminar | Power point presentation and discussion | | MG, RG and headquarter Evaluation Service + all stakeholders concerned in 1 or 2 meetings A formal exchange of letters between the Evaluation Team and the contracting donor agency confirms the approval of all the deliverables |