

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Recovery Spending Watchdog Project

Contract number 441932

Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

Contracting Authority: CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC STRATEGY

Kyiv, 22 September 2025

BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country background

Russia's full-scale invasion in 2022 brought major economic and social challenges to Ukraine. The economy declined sharply by 28.8% in 2022, reflecting massive disruption to production, trade, and infrastructure. A partial rebound followed in 2023, when GDP grew by around 5%, driven largely by the low base of comparison and increased public spending. In 2024, growth slowed to 2.9%, and by the final quarter the economy had essentially stalled. Ukraine's recovery remains fragile, limited by ongoing security threats, attacks on energy infrastructure, and widespread labour shortages — all of which continue to weigh heavily on the recovery process.

The war continues to inflict extensive economic damage and physical destruction across the country. Direct damage to infrastructure and buildings has been estimated at \$176 billion, with housing accounting for one-third of losses. Reconstruction and recovery needs are projected at approximately \$524 billion over a ten-year horizon — nearly three times Ukraine's 2024 GDP. Despite ambitious planning, financing continues to be insufficient. By 2025, less than 5% of identified recovery needs had secured funding, the scale of external assistance still lags far behind urgent requirements.

To improve coordination and transparency of recovery spending, the Ukrainian government has established the DREAM web platform (Digital Restoration Ecosystem for Accountable Management). Conceived in 2022 and piloted later that year, DREAM has since expanded significantly. By mid-2023, more than 6,000 project ideas had already been entered into the system, and its public module was launched at the London Recovery Conference to allow open access to data. By September 2024, DREAM included over 7,600 projects across 11 sectors, with a combined value of nearly UAH 406 billion (USD 9.8 billion). As of 2025, all 23 regional administrations, sectoral ministries, and more than 1,200 communities actively use DREAM for planning and monitoring. In parallel, the government introduced a Single Project Pipeline (SPP) to prioritise recovery investments, currently comprising 89 projects and 60 programmes, three-quarters of which are already funded through the 2025 state budget. The platform's Business Intelligence module now enables users to track project budgets, expenditures, and implementation progress at national, regional, and local levels, creating an unprecedented level of visibility. These advances in state owned ecosystem mark a milestone in aligning recovery spending with transparency and accountability, though the gap between registered needs and secured resources remains striking.

On the ground, reconstruction progress continues to lag behind the scale of destruction. Out of more than 350,000 buildings destroyed or damaged, only around 100,000 had been restored as of June 2025. Businesses, particularly small enterprises in frontline regions, face cumulative losses of at least \$17.5 billion and remain in urgent need of financing, risk insurance, and market support. Procurement practices are another persistent weakness: over 80% of contracts in the recovery sector involve only a single bidder, raising serious risks of inflated costs and reduced competition. Civil society and media monitoring have flagged instances of overpricing and weak accountability, underscoring the importance of stronger oversight mechanisms.

Beyond the economic dimension, Ukraine faces deep social and demographic challenges. More than 6,000 education and healthcare facilities have been damaged, with only about 1,100 restored by mid-2025. The war has also accelerated a demographic crisis: out of 41 million pre-war citizens, only about 31 million

currently reside in government-controlled areas, with another 10 million displaced internally, abroad, or in temporarily occupied territories. Fertility rates have dropped below 1.0 per woman – the lowest in Europe – while emigration, premature mortality, and displacement deepen labour market imbalances. By 2024, unemployment reached 11%, with a further 22% of the working-age population outside the labour force; among internally displaced persons, employment rates were just 56%. Skilled labour shortages – particularly in male-dominated sectors such as transport and construction – are compounded by mobilisation and migration.

Despite these challenging conditions, the Government of Ukraine has introduced a series of important reforms and initiatives aimed at strengthening resilience. The government has adopted a thermal modernisation programme through 2030, created a new coordination centre for regional recovery, and prioritised investments in energy efficiency and accessibility. Demining operations have also intensified, with costs reduced significantly and advanced technologies, including remote demining machines, now in use. Collectively, these measures demonstrate Ukraine’s determination to advance recovery even under wartime conditions. Looking ahead, the country’s medium-term trajectory will depend on sustained international support, the effective implementation of reforms, and the ability to ensure that recovery financing is managed in a transparent and accountable manner, fostering the restoration of both infrastructure and economic activity.

1.2 The intervention to be evaluated

Title of the intervention to be evaluated	• Recovery Spending Watchdog Action
Budget of the intervention to be evaluated	• 2 176 580 EUR
Dates of the intervention to be evaluated	• Start: June 2023 • End: December 2025

The project aims to improve the efficiency and transparency of public spending related to recovery and reconstruction in Ukraine. It focuses on enhancing Government accountability by providing clearer communication about spending assessments. Additionally, it seeks to promote public awareness and engagement in Ukraine’s recovery process.

In the first project year, the project built the foundation for accountability in Ukraine’s recovery by creating digital tools to track spending and improve public oversight. The launched Big Recovery Portal became the main platform, bringing together procurement data, complaints, and recovery information. At the same time, a network of civil society groups and government officials began to form, helping make recovery both transparent and inclusive.

In the second year, these tools became part of Ukraine’s broader recovery system. The BRP expanded quickly, adding dashboards, open procurement data, and new training opportunities, including online courses with Diia.Education that were completed by hundreds of people. Public engagement grew through monthly webinars on recovery spending, where officials regularly took part, and through grants to NGOs that inspected more than 600 sites across the country. Communication efforts reached wide audiences, with new reports, media partnerships, and almost 3,000 participants in public events, showing rising public interest in recovery oversight.

In 2025, the project logical matrix (logframe) was updated to reflect progress and set higher goals. Targets for government accountability were increased, ensuring regular participation of officials in events. Public awareness goals shifted to cumulative measures, such as 3,000 registrations and 10,000 video views by the end of the project. New outputs included regular newsletters and stronger media outreach, such as video campaigns aimed at national audiences. The budget was adjusted: more funds went to site-visit monitoring, while less was needed for procurement analysis; communication spending moved away from offline events to media and IT upgrades for the BRP. Financial terms with the donor were also updated to improve cash flow and keep the project on track.

1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention

According to the state project registration card, issued by the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, the Ministry for Development of Communities and Territories of Ukraine is the key project beneficiary. The project Description of the Action identifies the Ukrainian citizens and businesses as the main project beneficiaries.

1. Ministry for Development of Communities and Territories of Ukraine (Ministry for Development) <https://mindev.gov.ua/en>

Ministry is the governmental body overseeing transport, infrastructure, housing/communal services, regional planning, and reconstruction.

Project role: Key project beneficiary. Engaged through Steering Committee meetings, engaged in data collection, and ongoing collaboration despite leadership reshuffles. Throughout the project, the team cooperated closely with the Ministry by engaging the Deputy Minister and other representatives as observers in the Steering Committee meetings, inviting the Ministry to public events (such as monthly monitoring overviews), maintaining regular communication with the designated department, and obtaining key data inputs from Ministry representatives.

2. State Agency for Reconstruction and Infrastructure Development (Agency for Restoration) <https://restoration.gov.ua/>

Implements national reconstruction projects and supports local governments in rebuilding infrastructure.

Project role: Steering Committee observer and data collection partner.

3. Local Governments (Communities/Municipalities)

Frontline actors in recovery, implementing projects and services at regional/community level.

Project role: Engaged through sub-grantees activities, engaged in data collection, monitoring outreach, and capacity building.

4. International Donors & Financial Institutions (EBRD, World Bank, bilateral partners)

Provide financial support, technical expertise, and policy oversight for Ukraine's recovery.

Project role: Engaged in public awareness campaigns, events.

5. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) & RISE Ukraine Coalition <https://www.rise.org.ua/>

RISE is a coalition uniting several CSOs, initiatives, and independent experts to promote transparency, accountability, efficiency, and sustainability of reconstruction. Functions as an advocacy platform and technical working group.

Project role: Project team organizations are active members of RISE, coordinating monitoring methodology design, analytical and advocacy activities, and capacity building.

Partner CSOs beyond RISE Coalition:

- **YouControl** – Provides IT tools for procurement monitoring, contractor vetting, and spending transparency.
- **Transparency International Ukraine (TI Ukraine)** – Anti-corruption NGO with expertise in procurement (Prozorro), asset management, and watchdogging.

- **Institute for Legislative Ideas** – Policy think tank improving recovery laws and regulatory impact.
- **StateWatch** – Investigative CSO monitoring public finance and recovery budget use.

The project team signed memorandums of cooperation with the Ministry for Development and the Agency for Restoration. These agreements support joint cooperation, joint initiatives at national, and local levels to consolidate efforts in recovery process in Ukraine.

1.4 Other available information

The EU interim monitoring mission (conducted in November-December 2024) evaluated the Recovery Spending Watchdog project to ensure it was on track towards its goal of strengthening transparent and accountable recovery spending. The monitoring mission documented key outputs in the first 17 months of this 30-month grant, including public events promoting transparency in recovery spending, the online intelligence tool Big Recovery Portal (BRP), comprehensive social media outreach, communication and advocacy plans.

The monitoring focused on key evaluation areas including implementation efficiency, effectiveness of outputs, and sustainability prospects, along with cross-cutting issues like visibility and inclusiveness. Monitoring activities included a thorough document review (e.g. project reports), field visits to several reconstruction sites, and stakeholder interviews with the implementing partners and local stakeholders. These activities allowed the monitoring team to observe project deliverables – such as the creation of documentation for damaged educational facilities and the publication of related data on the Big Recovery Portal.

Overall, the monitoring found that the project is progressing well toward its objectives. All planned outputs have been delivered on schedule and to a high standard, which enabled greater transparency in recovery efforts. In particular, the project successfully documented and monitored reconstruction works in war-affected communities, uploading detailed information for public access and disseminating findings through press releases, social media, and an online presentation. These efforts have raised awareness and informed government stakeholders and citizens about the efficiency of reconstruction spending.

Notably, officials at the national level (e.g. Ukraine’s Ministry for Communities and Territories Development) have acknowledged the project’s contributions – even referencing its findings in discussions on policy and planning.

The monitoring mission also concluded that engagement and impact at the community level remain different. In some target areas, local authorities and staff showed limited interest in the monitoring results compared to their focus on immediate reconstruction needs. Despite these challenges, the interim monitoring mission conclusion was that the broader grant project is achieving its core aims of promoting efficient recovery spending.

The main conclusions of the interim monitoring mission included:

- **Effective Delivery:** All outputs delivered on time and with quality, including “passports” for social infrastructure objects in various regions, shared publicly via the Big Recovery Portal.
- **Political Buy-in:** Outputs used by government for strategy and oversight. A Deputy Minister for Development highlighted their relevance for addressing regional disparities and informing regional public policy.
- **Collaboration with Subgrantees:** Strong project management enabled effective subgrantee participation, with capacity building through webinars.

The main recommendations of the interim monitoring mission included:

- Allocate more resources for community-level communication outreach (field visits, local presentations, visibility materials).
- Redesign project logframe with clear outcomes and updated indicators.

Available documentation, such as previous interim narrative and monitoring mission reports, will be presented to the evaluation team.

1.5 Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

The European Union is committed to the achievement of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development adopted by the UN in September 2015; consequently, all interventions co-financed by the European Union should reinforce and make explicit their contributions to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the core of Agenda 2030.

The intervention to be evaluated is expected to contribute to the following SDG:

Goal 1	No poverty	
Goal 2	Zero hunger	
Goal 3	Good health and well-being	
Goal 4	Quality education	
Goal 5	Gender equality	
Goal 6	Clean water and sanitation	
Goal 7	Affordable and clean energy	
Goal 8	Decent work and economic growth	
Goal 9	Industry, innovation and infrastructure	
Goal 10	Reduce inequalities	
Goal 11	Sustainable cities and communities	X
Goal 12	Responsible consumption and production	
Goal 13	Climate	
Goal 14	Life below water	
Goal 15	Life on land	
Goal 16	Peace, justice and strong institutions	
Goal 17	Partnership for the goals	

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final evaluation
Coverage	Entire Action

Geographic scope	Ukraine
Period to be evaluated	From June 2023 to December 2025

1.6 Objectives of the evaluation

Evaluation should look for evidence of why, whether or how the results of the project are linked to the planned initial intervention and seek to identify the factors driving or hindering progress.

Evaluation should provide an understanding of the cause and effect links between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluation should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The final evaluation of The Recovery Spending Watchdog will assess the project's performance and draw lessons in a challenging country context. The key objectives of this evaluation will serve to:

- **Assess Project Performance:** Measure how well the project achieved its intended outcomes and outputs, using the six OECD DAC criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact – as the evaluation framework. This includes determining the extent to which planned results were realized and examining the enabling factors or constraints that influenced the delivery of those results.
- **Analysis of the Evolving Context:** Consider the project's evolving context, notably the war and subsequent recovery in Ukraine, and analyze how this changing environment affected implementation and results. In particular, the evaluation will examine how conflict-related challenges impacted the sustainability of project and whether oversight mechanisms and transparency gains can be maintained in the future.
- **Recommendations and Lessons Learned:** Provide an evidence-based, final account of the project's achievements to ensure accountability to the EU donor, demonstrating how EU funding was utilized and what outcomes were attained. The evaluation findings will also generate lessons learned and recommendations to inform future interventions. In particular, insights will be drawn to guide and improve future projects in strengthening public oversight, transparency, and civic engagement in Ukraine's reconstruction efforts. This will not only fulfill reporting obligations but also help stakeholders apply best practices for better governance and citizen participation in post-war recovery initiatives.

The final evaluation report will serve as a resource for several key stakeholders:

- **EU Delegation to Ukraine** – particularly in relation to the *Good Governance* priority, the Delegation will use the findings to assess progress of the project, accountability, and civil society's role in monitoring recovery and reconstruction.
- **European Commission (DG NEAR and other relevant departments)** – the report will inform decision-making on the alignment of EU support to Ukraine's recovery and civil society, and provide evidence-based insights into the effectiveness of civil society's oversight and advocacy efforts.
- **Ministry for Development of Ukraine** – as the *main beneficiary of the project* and the institution shaping national recovery and local communities development policies, the Ministry will rely on the report for reference in policy discussions and strategic planning.

1.7 Evaluation criteria and issues to be addressed

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely:

- relevance;
- coherence;
- effectiveness;
- efficiency;
- sustainability;
- impact.

These widely adopted criteria, originally defined by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, serve as a framework to measure the development cooperation activities like policies, programmes, and projects. The issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. The list of issues to be addressed:

Issue 1: Alignment with National Priorities

- Was the project fully aligned with Ukraine's national reconstruction, reforms, and strategies?

Issue 2: Effectiveness of Digital Tools

- To what extent are digital tools and platforms adopted by end-users (ministries, municipalities)?
- Are these tools sustainable, with clear ownership and maintenance mechanisms?

Issue 3: Capacity & Institutional Change

- Did trainings lead to **skill improvements** and actual behavioral or procedural change?

Issue 4: Stakeholder Engagement

- Were civic actors, local communities, and non-government partners meaningfully included in planning and implementation?

Issue 5: Monitoring & Evidence of Results

- Were indicators clearly linked to outcomes and impact, or more focused on outputs/activities?

Issue 6: Coordination & Efficiency

- Were resources (financial, human, time) used efficiently, with minimal duplication?

Issue 7: Communication & Visibility

- Did outreach activities effectively raise awareness among **intended audiences** (policy-makers, citizens, donors)?

Following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager¹ and propose in their Inception Note a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

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

¹ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract.

EXPERTISE REQUIRED

1.8 Number of evaluators and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the tenderers.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Senior	1	5	0
Medium	1	14	1
Junior	0	0	0

1.9 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team:

- 2 years of experience in evaluation
- 2 years of experience in the NGO/CSO Ukrainian sector
- At least one member of the team: 1 years of experience in evaluation in EU funded projects

Language skills of the team:

- English: at least 1 member of the team shall possess a fluent level;
- Ukrainian: at least 1 member of the team shall possess a fluent level;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended and should be striven for.

LOCATION AND DURATION

1.10 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Kyiv, with at least two field visits.

1.11 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar months

Maximum duration of the assignment: **3 calendar months**.

This overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

1.12 Starting period and planning, phases of the evaluation

Provisional start of the assignment is **December 01, 2025**.

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception note). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

REPORTING

1.13 Content, timing and submission

List of final evaluation deliverables:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Memo	10 pages	• Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan of the entire evaluation	End of 1 Phase
Initial presentation	20 slides	• Key, preliminary findings of the 2 phase	End of 2 Phase
Draft Final Report	25 pages	• <u>Please see Annex III</u>	End of 3 Phase
Final report	25 pages	• Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted	1 week after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.

1.14 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send consolidated comments or the approval of the report within 5 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 7 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

1.15 Language

All reports shall be submitted in the official language of the contract.

1.16 Formatting of reports and number of report copies

All reports will be produced using Times Roman, 12 font size. They will be submitted both in Word and PDF formats.

CONTENT OF THE OFFERS

The offers to be submitted for the execution of this contract will include a Technical and a Financial Offer.

1.17 Technical offer

The Technical Offer should include:

- An introductory and short chapter detailing the comprehension by tenderers of the assignment and its main challenges.
- A chapter detailing the tentative methodology to conduct the evaluation; this methodology will then be finalised in the Inception Note. The proposed methodology will detail how the evaluation will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference.
- A short analysis of the main risks and relevant measures of the assignment.
- A chapter detailing the relevance of the team composition and competencies to the work to be undertaken and how the tasks will be organised.
- Annex: the CVs of the proposed expert(s) (max length of each CV: 3 pages).
- Annex: a table detailing the work to be undertaken by each proposed expert and their role, based on the proposed methodology.
- Annex: the proposed timetable (following template as in the Annex IV of the ToR).

The maximum length of the Technical offer is 3 pages excluding annexes.

1.18 Financial offer

The Financial Offer must respect the format provided as a template.

BUDGET OF THE PRESENT EVALUATION

The maximum budget allowed for the execution of the present contract is **5000 EUR**. This is inclusive of all fees and costs related to the assignment.

SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS

Comments and inquiries should be addressed to office@ces.org.ua no later than **06 October 2025**.

The text of the questions received, and the responses will be sent to all tenderers to ensure equal treatment.

SUBMISSION OF THE OFFERS AND THEIR ASSESSMENT

1.19 Deadline for the submission of the offers

The offers for undertaking this assignment must be received **by 13 October 2025 at 23:59**, local time of Kyiv, Ukraine. Late submission of offers leads to their disqualification.

1.20 Assessment of the offers

The offers will be assessed regarding the technical evaluation criteria described below.

We will select the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price. Technical quality is evaluated based on the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for the approach to work</i>	50
Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
Qualification of tenderer	10
Organisation of tasks including timetable	5
<i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i>	50
<i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i>	100

TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received we reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams. Phone interviews will be tentatively carried out during the period from **14 October 2025 to 16 October 2025**.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

Essential project documents, including:

- Financing agreement, including:
- Annex I: Description of the action
- Annex II: General conditions applicable to EU-financed grant contracts for external actions
- Annex II: Budget of the action
- Annex VI: Model narrative and financial report
- Inception report
- Interim narrative reports, dated June 2024 and June 2025
- Subgrantee application form example
- Passports of reconstructed facilities
- Interim EU monitoring mission report
- Relevant documentation from subgrantees regarding grants implementation
- Minutes of the meetings of the project Steering Committee
- Logframe matrix

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The structure of the evaluation report will be as follows.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported and guided by CES and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of CES nor of the European Commission, which financed the evaluated".

Executive Summary

No more than 5 pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

1. Introduction

A description of the intervention, of the relevant country background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answers to the Evaluation Questions

A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence (findings) and reasoning.

An overall assessment of the intervention is to be added, as well. It shall be based on the detailed response to the Evaluation Questions.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

The transferable lessons from this evaluation are to be included in this chapter.

3.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new one for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels.

Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs can be attached, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Evaluation methodology including tools utilised, analysis of the limitation of the methodology, remedy and degree of confidence in the conclusions.
- Evaluation Matrix (a table presenting the tools used to respond to each evaluation question as well as the indicators used).
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrix of the intervention.
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes as relevant (e.g. statistical analyses, matrix of evidence, databases)

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

To be filled by the evaluation team. The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ²		
Activity	Location	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Indicative Dates
Phase 1: total days				
•				
•				
Phase 2: total days				
•				
•				
Phase 3: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

² Add one column per each evaluator