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Foreword

This final version is the result of dialogue between all the stakeholders involved in the study: the Special Evaluation Office, the Directorate General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid, non-governmental cooperation stakeholders and independent consultants.

The publicly accessible sources used in this report have been identified. This report also contains a number of extracts from preparatory documents for individual interventions, used as concrete examples. In order to protect sources and because we do not intend these different modalities or technical and financial files to be classified according to quality, these extracts are quoted in bold and in italics, but without references. The large number of such extracts from existing texts shows that this document is, to a great extent, a collective work.
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## Abbreviations and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACNG</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Cooperation Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Agence française de développement (French Development Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEFE</td>
<td>Association pour la Promotion de l'Enseignement et de la Formation à l'Etranger (Association for the Promotion of Overseas Teaching and Training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFFS</td>
<td>Belgian Fund for Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTC</td>
<td>Belgian Development Agency (formerly Belgian Technical Cooperation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIUF</td>
<td>Conseil interuniverstaire francophone (Inter-French-Speaking University Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooperation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Aid Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG-D</td>
<td>Directorate General For Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS FA</td>
<td>Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>General Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>Indicative Cooperation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>(unless otherwise specified) the law of March 13th, 2013 on Belgian Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFDR</td>
<td>Management for Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOIP</td>
<td>Objective-Oriented Intervention Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE</td>
<td>Office of the Special Evaluator of Belgian Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVI</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Project Cycle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Decree</td>
<td>(unless otherwise specified) the Royal Decree of February 25th, 2010 on the creation of the Office of the Special Evaluator of Belgian Development Cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Specific Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STE</td>
<td>Sector and Technical Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths – Weaknesses – Opportunities – Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>(The TA) The Technical Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>Technical and Financial File (or the equivalent document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>Technical and Financial Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLIR</td>
<td>Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad (Flemish Inter-University Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVOB</td>
<td>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Technische Bijstand (Flemish Association for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The evaluability of a cooperation intervention is defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as the "extent to which an activity or a program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion".

The aim of this study is to determine the theoretical evaluability conditions for development cooperation interventions, i.e. the minimum content of the technical and financial files (TFF) necessary for the objective evaluation of these interventions on the basis of the five DAC evaluation criteria.

The methodological approach involves comparing the content of the TFF of 26 case studies with the DAC definitions of the five evaluation criteria and with our vision of the evaluation as the Office of the Special Evaluator of Belgian Development Cooperation (OSE).

This analysis allowed us first to establish a certain number of characteristics common to the three forms of cooperation analysed (governmental cooperation, non-governmental cooperation and cooperation carried out through the Belgian Fund for Food Security); and second, to conclude that:

- The TFFs for each type of intervention (governmental, non-governmental and Belgian Fund for Food Security) all have strengths and weaknesses with regard to the evaluability of any one of the various criteria. However, none of the intervention dossiers were drafted in a way that would allow the objective evaluation of this intervention across all the DAC evaluation criteria. The most problematic criteria were impact, sustainability and, to a lesser extent, efficiency.

- The less well-documented evaluability issues and the areas that limit evaluability or make it difficult/impossible to evaluate are:
  - the expectations of the beneficiaries;
  - the financing of the monitoring-evaluation system;
  - the consideration of the cross-cutting themes;
  - financial sustainability and monitoring once the intervention has ended;
  - impact, within the meaning of the DAC glossary definition and within the meaning of its definition in the application of the (quasi-)experimental methods;

- The governmental authorities on the one hand and the trade union organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) on the other may have different opinions on the perception of the priorities and on the relevance of certain actions.

- The fact that an intervention can, in theory, be evaluated based on the information contained in the TFF, does not mean that it can be evaluated in practice.

- It is more difficult to use national or international statistics as indicators of results in sectors such as education and health for 'project'-type interventions than for national
interventions. In actual fact, the geographical limits of projects are often not the same as the administrative limits used to collect the statistics.

- It is generally possible to evaluate effectiveness using the methods recommended in the legal and regulatory texts and set out in the TFF of the interventions.

A comparison of the information in the TFF with the DAC definition of the five evaluation criteria for development cooperation interventions on the one hand, and our own vision of evaluation on the other, has allowed us to produce the following evaluation preconditions:

- the notion of intervention requires a common understanding between all the stakeholders;
- the intervention TFF is available;
- the evaluation is a planned stage in the intervention management cycle;
- the TFF provides for a monitoring system;
- the TFF includes an analysis of the stakeholders, including the beneficiaries and local partners;
- the duration and schedule are set out in detail;
- the intervention budget is detailed and structured;
- there is a specific budget for monitoring and a specific budget for evaluation;
- the risks and suppositions are analysed; their influence on the results is considered and assessed;
- the objectives of the development action are described;
- the context in which the intervention takes place is described and its progress is monitored;
- the expectations of the beneficiaries and the other stakeholders are described;
- the way in which the objectives correspond to the global priorities is described;
- the partner country's policies with regard to the intervention are described and analysed critically;
- the TFF describes the way in which the Belgian strategy papers have been taken into account;
- the possible interaction between the intervention and all the cross-cutting themes is mentioned;
- the approach is logical; it consists of three levels and is results-oriented;
- the first two levels (outputs and outcomes) have indicators with baseline values and target values;
- the extent to which the indicators have been achieved can be assessed using sources of verification;
- indicators also allow the expected results to be measured with regard to the cross-cutting themes;
- the budget must be expressed per result and per year of activity;
- the TFF describes the way in which the intervention will be managed;
• the intervention management is results-based;
• the political decision-making process is documented;
• the TFF describes how the partner or beneficiary institution works;
• the installations/buildings that will house the employees implementing the intervention are described;
• the method of managing the technical equipment and the local technical/scientific personnel is described;
• the method of managing the personnel, furniture and administrative equipment is described;
• the TFF describes the financing method of the partner (or beneficiary) institution and its activities;
• the intervention fits with the socio-cultural environment in which it is implemented;
• the TFF specifies the environmental resources required for the intervention and their potential impact on climate, desertification and biodiversity;
• the expected impact (or impacts) is/are described and given specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) indicators, with baseline values, target values and sources of verification;

Finally, in order to propose the new TFF presentation plan in chapter 7, we used the many good ideas in the different generic presentation plans, the best TFF that we analysed and our own evaluation requirements.

**The additional evaluability conditions required to implement the interventions in the field are the subject of a separate study entrusted to independent consultants.**
1. Introduction

Evaluation has the twofold objective of taking account of the results obtained and drawing lessons from the past in order to improve the decision-making process in the future. Before starting an evaluation, it is therefore important to check whether all the conditions are in place for a high-quality, independent, credible and useful evaluation. It is important to check whether the intervention's objectives are clear, the intervention logic is robust and a system is in place for collecting objective data before, during and after the intervention.

As the evaluation is also an integral part of the intervention cycle, it is not exempt from the budgetary authorities' desire to rationalise the use of the available resources as much as possible in what is becoming an increasingly demanding environment. As a result, when an evaluation is planned, the first questions to be asked involve the need, feasibility, usefulness and cost-benefit ratio of the process.

The following facts are reported in the international literature on the subject (Wholey 1970, Dawkins 2010 and Rueben 2012) and can also be found in evaluation reports on interventions funded by Belgium:

For several years now, teams of evaluators have faced serious restrictions that, often through no fault of their own, reduce the quality of their reports, "for example:

- stated objectives are too broad/vague;
- goals are "grant goals";
- lack of logic in design;
- intervention theory is too general;
- many programme goals exist only on paper;
- no representative sampling;
- absence of baseline data;
- no clear indicators defined;
- data levels are too aggregated;
- intervention results - lack of use due to lack of ownership or agreement with the focus of the results;
- programmes not fully implemented or did not exist.

With regard to Belgium, below are a few phrases taken from mission or evaluation reports:

- "baseline study of unacceptable quality;
- insufficient proposals for the M&E mechanisms;

• unsuitability of the proposed indicators;
• insufficient analysis of the hypotheses and risks;
• limited ownership of results reporting;
• insufficient attention to all the links in the internal monitoring & evaluation system."

A Cooperation Attaché recently wrote in their annual report, "Despite the efforts made in this area, too many projects and programmes still do not have a baseline and have insufficiently SMART indicators and a monitoring-evaluation process largely focused on tasks and upstream results, forgetting the essential purpose of our activities, namely improving the living conditions of the target populations."

Even more recently, one of their colleagues wrote, "Baseline, monitoring/evaluation and mid-term evaluation: ... a baseline study has been carried out... whose contents only partly correspond to the project's monitoring and evaluation requirements (cf. mid-term evaluation report). The baseline has not been used in the project's annual reports. The mid-term evaluation... notes the lack of reliable data and documentation. The final report confirms that the project did not manage to set up a monitoring-evaluation system."

This opinion is confirmed in an AFD document, which states2,

"Several internal analyses and several more scientific investigations have shown that there were shortcomings in the evaluation exercises. In particular, we noted a certain degree of confusion between the different project phases, the specific and operational objectives to be achieved and the results obtained and, in particular, the absence and imprecision of the indicators to be used. Everyone concludes that the introduction of effective monitoring of the initial, final and intermediary results, based on qualitative and quantitative indicators, is an ambitious project."

"In an ideal world,3 one aspect of good intervention design would be their evaluability. Evaluability assessments would be an aspect of a quality assurance process closely associated with intervention approval. In reality, there are many reasons why approved project designs are incomplete and flawed, including:

• Political needs may drive the advocacy of particular projects and override technical concerns about coherence and quality.
• Project design processes can take much longer than expected, and then come under pressure to be completed.
• In projects with multiple partners and decentralised decision making, a de facto blueprint planning process may not be appropriate. Project objectives and strategies may have to be “discovered through on-going discussions.
• Expectations about how projects should be evaluated are expanding, along with the knowledge required to address those expectations."

In accordance with the terms of reference, this second phase of the evaluability study must make it possible to list the necessary and sufficient conditions for evaluating the interventions in theory. 'Theoretical' evaluability relates to the project design, including its intervention logic/theory of change. Checking the theoretical evaluability means checking whether the technical and financial file (TFF), the intervention

2 Impact indicators of sustainable land management projects; AFD, Working document, N°139, September 2014
3 Adapted from "Planning evaluability assessments"; DFID Working paper 40; 08/2013; point 2.10, page 9
presentation document and any other documents of the same type drafted before implementation contain the elements or provide for data collection systems that will allow an objective evaluation of the intervention. The 'theoretical' evaluability of an intervention can be assessed on the basis of a documentary study that examines whether there is a clear description of the objectives and the ways of achieving them. The theoretical evaluability examination is explained by the DAC-OECD as follows: “evaluability assessment calls for the early review of a proposed activity in order to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable”. The theoretical evaluability examination relates to intentions expressed in a document. The practical evaluability examination relates to interventions underway and inevitably includes a field visit. For the intervention to be truly evaluable, the practical evaluability conditions are added to the theoretical evaluability conditions.

**As a reminder, the general objective of our study on theoretical and practical evaluability is not to determine whether the current interventions are or are not evaluable, but to help make future interventions objectively evaluable.**

This report closes phase 2 of the ToR, which can be found in the appendix. Chapter 2 contains several methodological considerations, chapter 3 our vision of evaluation, chapter 4 our analysis findings, chapter 5 our conclusions, chapter 6 what we believe to be the necessary conditions for guaranteeing theoretical evaluability and chapter 7 a draft standard TFF plan.

Appendix 1 contains the terms of reference, appendix 2 the bibliography, appendix 3 the different budget tables and appendix 4 the analysis table used.
2. Methodological considerations

2.1. Presentation of the technical and financial files

The existence of three generic documents has considerably simplified the analysis work, insofar as almost all the traditional interventions under preparation or underway since 2013 follow one of the plans proposed in these documents.

They are:

- the TFF presentation plan for a governmental cooperation intervention proposed by the Belgian Development Agency (BTC).
- the presentation plan for a programme by the Non-Governmental Cooperation Stakeholders (ANGC) (for 2014-2016 programmes). This document contains the presentation framework for the global programme, the presentation framework for the 'North' programme in Belgium and the presentation framework for the different programmes in the Southern countries (or regions).
- the procedures manual of the Belgian Fund for Food Security (BFFS). This manual contains information on the content of the programmes and a presentation plan for a BFFS project. It also contains a specific chapter on monitoring and evaluation.

Only a few interventions fall outside these frameworks. They include research grants, study and consultancy funds and, more generally speaking, interventions consisting of other smaller interventions whose nature and budget have not been accurately determined at the time of formulation.

It does not therefore come as a surprise that the major differences that appeared in this study between the TFFs of the interventions studied were essentially along BTC – ANGC – BFFS lines. All the people responsible for producing the files have more or less scrupulously followed the presentation framework given to them either by the BTC or by the relevant services of the Directorate General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DG-D). As a result, the TFFs contain the information required by the framework and only rarely contain information not requested by the framework, including that which is potentially necessary or useful for the evaluation.

As all the case studies are created around one of the above-mentioned models, it very quickly became clear that there was no point in adding to them. We therefore restricted ourselves to studying these generic models and around 20 TFFs from specific interventions.

In the files we studied, the information necessary or useful for the evaluation was not presented in a useful order that might facilitate the evaluation. It would be absurd for the people responsible for the evaluation to make such a requirement, as the primary role of a TFF is to facilitate the implementation and management of the intervention. This does not mean that it is not possible to improve the presentation in order to facilitate evaluation, without negatively affecting implementation.

It is also interesting to note that the presentation plan of a BFFS project mentions that the technical and financial file must make it possible to assess whether the project meets the relevance criteria with regard to development, coherence, ..., sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, ..., synergy and...
complementarity. Similarly, the presentation plan of an ANGC programme also mentions that the programme must make it possible to assess whether the project meets the relevance criteria with regard to development, ..., sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency,..., synergy and complementarity. In its risk analysis, the BTC TFF model questions the risks of not achieving the results (ineffectiveness risks), the fiduciary and management risks (inefficiency risks) and the risks relating to a lack of sustainability. In theory, then, both the TFFs of BFFS interventions and those of ANGC and BTC interventions must be drafted in a way that allows an ex-ante evaluation (= an assessment) according to the standard evaluation criteria recommended by the DAC.

Important note:

The TFFs for governmental cooperation interventions are currently formulated within a legislative and regulatory framework that is different to that of the cases studied. This is the application of the fourth management contract between the Belgian State and the BTC on the one hand, and of the general directives on results monitoring on the other4.

These documents are too recent to have been applied to the case studies and they are not mentioned in chapter 4 on findings. However, the 'More Results' manuals were used when drafting chapters 5 and 6.

2.2. Analysis method

Following a testing and development phase for the methodological framework of this study, a sample of financial and technical files was analysed on the basis of a 68-question questionnaire (see Appendix A4). Compared to an initial questionnaire, the questions that were impossible to answer on the basis of a TFF were deleted. It also proved necessary to add several questions to allow more detail.

We extended the analysis of the six TFFs already studied during the test phase with an analysis of six standard plans (see 2.1 above) and 14 additional TFFs. A total of 26 cases were therefore studied. As far as possible, the different cases of the analysis framework were annotated with a reference to the TFF page and conversely, the different TFFs studied were annotated with references to the number of the question to which the response was mentioned.

The results were included in an Excel table and sorted according to three criteria to facilitate the interpretation of the results and attempt to highlight specific characteristics (or the absence of specific characteristics) within these different variables. These three criteria are:

- **the nature of the intervention** The following distinctions were made: global programme, country programmes, South projects (broken down into mixed projects, South investment project, South capacity-development project), study funds and 'North' aspect.

- **the nature of the partner** The following distinctions were made: CTB, FBSA, ACNG (broken down into APEFE5-VVOB6, universities and scientific institutions, NGOs and trade unions).

- **the country of the intervention** The following distinctions were made: universal, Belgium and Southern countries (broken down into Benin, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Mali, Peru, Rwanda and Tanzania).

---

4 “MORE RESULTS; part I – Monitoring and evaluation, approach and system; part II – More results at intervention level”, CTB, June 2013.

5 Association pour la Promotion de l’Enseignement et de la Formation à l’Etranger

6 Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Technische Bijstand
The analysis of the 26 cases allowed us:

- to determine a certain number of characteristics common to the three forms of cooperation analysed (governmental cooperation, non-governmental cooperation and cooperation through the Belgian Fund for Food Safety). These findings are set out in chapter 4.

- to compare the information provided in the TFF with the DAC definition of the five evaluation criteria for development cooperation interventions on the one hand, and our own vision of evaluation on the other. This comparison was used as a basis for drafting chapter 6, which sets out what we believe to be the theoretical conditions necessary for an intervention to be evaluated according to the five DAC criteria.

Finally, in order to propose the new TFF presentation plan in chapter 7, we used the many good ideas in the different generic presentation plans, the best TFF that we analysed and our own evaluation requirements.
3. Our vision of the Evaluation of Belgian Development Cooperation

In this chapter, we set out our vision of the Evaluation of Belgian Development Cooperation, which fits within the context of our evaluation policy on the one hand\(^7\) and the Belgian and international legal and regulatory framework on the other.

3.1. The DAC evaluation criteria and principles

The application of the DAC evaluation criteria is set out in Article 32 of the law of 19 March 2013 on Development Cooperation: "\textit{With a view to achieving Belgian Cooperation Development objectives..., the results are evaluated in light of the (basic) principles laid out in chapter 3 (of the law) and on the basis of the criteria defined by the DAC.}"

The Royal Degree of 25 February 2010 creating a Special Evaluation Office of Belgian International Development Cooperation clarifies the reference to the DAC criteria mentioned in Article 32 of the law and lists in full the DAC principles for the evaluation of development aid\(^8\). This document dates from 1991 and has subsequently been explained and detailed in other official documents produced by the organisation on the subject of monitoring and evaluation; it is these that must guide the SES in the performance of its duties\(^9\):

- Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management; OECD 2002; hereafter referred to as ‘the DAC Glossary’;
- Quality Standards for Development Evaluation; OECD 2010;

Both the 1999 DAC principles and the 2002 glossary definitions have since developed towards a more rigorous set-up explained in the 2010 standards. For the follow-up to this study and to allow the evaluation to take place in the light of the principles set out in chapter 3 of the law, we propose using the following terms with the following definitions:

\textbf{Evaluation}\(^{10}\): \textit{the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as

\(^7\) Evaluation policy, Special Evaluation Office of Belgian Development Corporation, FPS FA, May 2014.
\(^8\) DAC principles for the evaluation of development aid; OECD 1991 (OECD/DG(91)208)
\(^9\) Royal Decree creating the Special Evaluation Office of Belgian International Development Cooperation, Article 2, §2, line 1.
\(^{10}\) Adapted from DAC Glossary
systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention.

**Independent evaluation:** evaluation carried out by external consultants and managed by a unit independent of the authority that administers the evaluated intervention.

**External evaluation:** evaluation carried out by consultants external to the authority that administers the evaluated intervention.

**Internal evaluation:** evaluation carried out and managed by members of staff of the authority that administers the evaluated intervention.

**Self-evaluation:** evaluation carried out by the members of staff who implement the evaluated intervention.

**Relevance:** the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies. Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.\(^{11}\)

In other words, in an ex-post evaluation, an evaluator who has completed their evaluation must ask themselves the following question: *“having seen the achievements and assessed the results, can we still say that the intervention was relevant at the start and is still relevant today?”*

The relevance criterion includes the notion of coherence, defined as the internal logic and the lack of contradictions between the speech, actions and policies of the development partners involved in an intervention.\(^{12}\)

We also included in the relevance criterion the notions of excessive risk (risk of probable occurrence and serious consequence) and fatal supposition (supposition whose non-fulfilment would make the specific objective unachievable).

We also included in the relevance criterion the notions of relevance for the environment, relevance for gender equality and, more generally, relevance with regard to all the other cross-cutting themes. We believe that an intervention with negative net results for the environment, gender equality or any other cross-cutting theme is not relevant. Relevance with regards to the cross-cutting themes does not mean that an intervention objective must be devoted to these criteria.

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.\(^{13}\)

In the effectiveness criterion, we included the notion of complementarity, defined as the sharing of tasks and the absence of an overlap between the actions of one or more development partners so that each action can be added to and supplement the others.\(^{14}\)

We also included in the effectiveness criterion the notion of coordination, defined as the activities of one or more development partners in order to (i) mobilise development aid resources and (ii) harmonise policies, programmes, procedures and practices with a view to effectiveness.\(^{15}\)

\(^{11}\) DAC Glossary.

\(^{12}\) http://www.three-cs.net/, and Larousse definition

\(^{13}\) DAC glossary

\(^{14}\) http://www.three-cs.net/, and Larousse definition

\(^{15}\) http://www.three-cs.net/, and Larousse definition
Efficiency: a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.\textsuperscript{16}

In the efficiency criterion, we included the notion of synerg\textsuperscript{y}, defined as \textit{"the combining of several actions contributing to a unique effect and resulting in an economy of means"} (Larousse definition - translated). The results of a 'synergy' programme are additional added value or the difference between the results produced by a programme with several components and the sum of the results that each component could have achieved individually. Synergy may also have positive effects in terms of relevance, efficiency and sustainability. Synergy can be distinguished from complementarity by the fact that the results of complementary interventions are added together without additional added value.

\textbf{Sustainability: the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time}\textsuperscript{17}.

\textbf{Sustainable Development: development based on satisfying current needs, without compromising the needs of future generations. Its achievement requires a process of change that takes account of limits and the need to preserve resources by changing the allocation of investments, the targeting of technological development and the institutional structures to both current and future needs. Development must reconcile three major elements: social equity, environmental preservation and economic effectiveness}\textsuperscript{18}.

\textbf{Impacts: positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended}\textsuperscript{19}. The notion of impact is developed further in point 6.6.

\textbf{Independence and impartiality}: the evaluation process must be impartial and independent of the mechanisms set up to develop the policies, the scheduling of the interventions, the delivery, the implementation and the management of the aid.

\textbf{Credibility}: to be credible, the evaluation must be carried out by skilled professionals, use reliable data, a thorough methodology and a robust analysis, cover both elements of success and elements of failure, include the participation of a local evaluator and make both the process and the results transparent and public.

\textbf{Usefulness}: to be useful, the results of the valuations must reflect the different interests and needs, not only of the main originator of the evaluation but also of the many other stakeholders. The results must be accessible both as regards form (downloadable from the Internet) and content (clear, concise presentation and in an understandable language).

\subsection*{3.2. Other definitions}

\textbf{SMART} is an acronym for ‘Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound’. In detail:

- \textbf{Specific} means well-defined and formulated practically and in detail, without the use of vague or general terms and without ambiguities or needless complications. The emphasis must be on the (immediate, short-, medium- and long-term) results to be achieved. These results must be properly described.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} DAC Glossary
  \item \textsuperscript{17} DAC Glossary
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Law of 19 March 2013 on Development Cooperation, Article 2, 12\textsuperscript{o}.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} DAC Glossary
\end{itemize}
• **Measurable** means that the extent to which the planned results are achieved must be verifiable at both quantitative and qualitative level. It is therefore important to find ways of measuring/quantifying the quality. Progress (or lack of progress) is measured using indicators whose value is registered. Visible progress and measures provide information on the extent to which the planned results are achieved and therefore make it possible to distinguish successes from failures. It is also important not to wait until the end of the intervention to measure the value of the indicators, but to do so at regular intervals. Intermediary results can provide encouragement and motivation; they can also allow better management of the rest of the intervention.

• **Achievable** means that the results must be achievable whilst remaining within the framework of control and influence of the intervention. They must also be achievable within a reasonable timeframe, if the processes, skills and priorities of the people involved are taken into consideration. Finally, they must also take account of the human, financial and material resources available. This does not mean that the planned results must not be ambitious or even relatively challenging. The chances of achieving the planned results must be high, without them being easy or simple.

• **Relevant** means that the planned results of the development action correspond to the expectations of the beneficiaries, the needs of the countries, the global priorities and the policies of the partners and donors (DAC-OECD definition). The planned results must make it possible to strengthen the capacities of the people and institutions involved. They must also fit with the mission of the partner organisations and the individuals within them.

• **Time-bound** means that there is a deadline for achieving the planned results. The deadline for achieving the results cannot be too far in the future, or it will be difficult to remain motivated. It is also useful to set intermediary milestones to assess progress during the project. If no deadlines are fixed, motivation will decline rapidly and the achievement of the results will be overtaken by other priorities. A lack of urgency will not motivate people to act.

### 3.3. Programme-Based Approach

"It is important to note that the international community does not give the same definition of the programme-based approach as the one used within Belgian Development Cooperation. For the DAC-OECD, the programme-based approach is a means of development cooperation based on the principle of coordinated support for a development programme rooted at local level, for example a national development strategy, a sector-based programme, a thematic programme or the programme of a specific organisation. Programme-Based Approaches display the following characteristics: (i) leadership by the partner country; (ii) a single, comprehensive programme and budget framework; (iii) a formalised process for donor coordination, and harmonised procedures for reporting, budgeting, financial management and procurement; (iv) efforts to increase the use of country systems for programme design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation. Donors have different means of supporting and implementing a programme-based approach and to this end can use a range of aid methods, including general or sector-based budget support, project aid, systems for combining resources or special allocation funds."

A programme is therefore much more than a simple collection/juxtaposition of 'project'-type interventions.

**Governmental cooperation** operates with a Cooperation Program\(^{20}\) (CP) for each partner country. The CP presents a certain sector-based unity, as it consists of two or at

---

\(^{20}\) Until recently, we talked about an ‘Indicative Cooperation Programme’ (ICP).
most three sector-based programmes, themselves divided into 'project'-type interventions. The CP is defined in a mixed commission (Belgium + partner country) and its execution is regularly monitored by a Partners' Committee for sector-based programmes and a Special Partners' Committee for the CP as a whole. The CPs are/will be progressively coordinated together with the other Member States of the European Union, the European Commission and, of course, the partner country within a joint programme.

At the end of 2008, an attempt to further align bilateral cooperation programmes using a programme-based approach defined by the DAC\(^{21}\), with the obligation to prepare a "country programme framework" and a "results monitoring and evaluation framework" encountered limited success.

The non-governmental cooperation stakeholders operate with a global programme for each stakeholder; this programme consists of a 'Belgium' sub-programme and several 'Southern countries' sub-programmes. Each sub-programme is composed of projects that each have their own specific objective. It has relatively few elements in common with the 'programme'-based vision of the DAC. It is true that the local partner takes ownership of the operations for the 'Southern countries' sub-programmes, but all the project-type interventions converge towards a single global objective that is inevitably very general and only slightly or not at all 'SMART'.

The programmes of the Belgian Fund for Food Security operate in an area of food insecurity in a specific country. They are composed of 'project'-type elements, each with a specific objective that contributes to the achievement of the general objective. The projects are coordinated by a coordination unit operated by a partner independent of the 'project' components. BFFS programmes are also largely co-managed with the local partner and have a real programme, budgeting, coordination and reporting framework. Their specific nature allows the use of a unique and identical general objective (food security), whose four dimensions\(^{22}\) are recognised and used internationally.

\(^{21}\) Guide to the preparation of an Indicative Cooperation Programme; FPS, AE, EC and DC, Brussels; December 2008.

\(^{22}\) The four dimensions of food security are: availability (effective presence of food), accessibility (at a price compatible with income levels), stability (throughout the year) and quality (with an acceptable nutritional value).
3.4. Intervention logic, theory of change or results chain.

We are aware that development cooperation interventions are complex, usually non-linear processes that can interact and be influenced by events, situations and people outside the intervention.

However, we also believe that this complexity does not prevent the intervention being described and summarised in the form of theoretical logical links between causes and effects, known as 'intervention logic', 'theory of change' or 'results chain'.

To reconcile the new approaches that have appeared over the last few years, current international practices and the desire to respect the spirit of the Belgian legal texts and DAC texts, we propose the following correlation table for the rest of the study:

---

23 As defined by Rick Davies in April 2012: ‘The description of a sequence of events that is expected to lead to a particular desired outcome’, but “preferably considered as a flexible approach rather than a rigid tool or methodology” (Wigboldus and Brouwers, 2011).
### Intervention logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means/Inputs/Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Intermediate results</th>
<th>1 Specific Objective</th>
<th>1 General Objective&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Progress on the indicators of intermediary results</td>
<td>Progress on the indicators of the specific objective</td>
<td>Progress on the indicators of the general objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate results</td>
<td>Short- and medium-term results</td>
<td>Long-term results&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Impacts&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the direct beneficiary and/or the local partner</td>
<td>Focus on the direct and/or indirect/neighbouring beneficiary</td>
<td>Focus on the end beneficiary and/or on society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational results</td>
<td>Development results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The expected service</td>
<td>Why we do it</td>
<td>What we would really like to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected results</td>
<td>Desired results</td>
<td>Love to see&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expect to see</td>
<td>Like to see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts per (quasi) experimental method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The most significant change(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1: Correspondence between the different conceptions of intervention logic

#### 3.5. Logic resulting from the definitions

The definitions mentioned in 2.2 above show that only relevance and effectiveness are directly evaluable criteria. It is in fact logical that if the achievement of the outputs and outcomes (effectiveness) cannot be evaluated, then the economical achievement of the outputs and outcomes (efficiency) can also not be evaluated. If the outputs and outcomes cannot be evaluated, then the continuation of these results after external support (sustainability) can also not be evaluated. Finally, if the achievement of the

---

<sup>24</sup> Intervention logic in accordance with OOIP
<sup>25</sup> Results chain according to DAC
<sup>26</sup> Intervention logic according to Managing for Development Results
<sup>27</sup> Intervention logic according to EuropAid
<sup>28</sup> Intervention logic according to Outcome mapping
outputs and outcomes cannot be evaluated, it will be even more difficult to evaluate the achievement of the impacts.

3.6. Cross-cutting themes, sector-based interventions and DAC markers

The DAC envisages that interventions should have so-called 'political' markers corresponding to cross-cutting or cross-sectoral themes such as gender equality, the environment, participative democracy/good governance, trade development, desertification, biodiversity, climate change mitigation, adaptation to climate change, children's rights, HIV-AIDS and reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health.

Value 2 is attributed to the marker if the theme is stated in the TFF as a principal (primary) objective.

Value 1 is attributed to the marker if the theme is not a principal objective but is stated in the TFF as a significant (secondary) objective.

Value 0 is attributed to the marker if the theme is not targeted in the intervention.29

The use of values 2 and 1 is explained and commented on in Appendices 17 and 18 to the "Converged statistical reporting directives, ADDENDUM 2" from the DAC, accessible at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC(2013)15-ADD2-FINAL-ENG.pdf

We advocate an understanding identical to that developed in these references, as regards both the definition and the planning of the eligibility criteria. In our opinion, the attribution of value 1 or 2 to one or several thematic markers can only be justified if the intervention anticipates concrete results for these ‘SMART’ themes with objectively verifiable indicators (with a baseline value and a target value). This means that the TFF must contain intermediate results, activities and methods likely to lead to the achievement of the thematic results in question. Only this conception of markers will make it possible to calculate and report on the results achieved for the cross-cutting themes.

This conception also has two significant consequences:

- The attribution of marker 2 to a cross-cutting theme transforms the theme into a sector for the intervention in question. For governmental cooperation, this practice is certainly not encouraged by law, but it is possible: "In the choice (of)... sectors, governmental cooperation focuses primarily on..."

- The attribution of marker 2 to a cross-cutting theme in an intervention means that no other cross-cutting sector can be given marker 2 in this intervention. This means that there can only be one principal objective per intervention.

3.7. Development Results-based Management

Managing for Development Results (MFDR), or Result-Based Management, is a management strategy focussing on performance and the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts. MFDR follows the five principles below30:

29 Value 3 has recently been added and can be attributed to the desertification marker if this theme is one of the principal objectives and in support of an action programme. Value 4 is attributed to the 'Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health' theme if it is the explicit primary objective; value 3 is attributed if most, but not all of the funding is targeted to the objective; value 2 is attributed if half of the funding is targeted to the objective; value 1 is attributed if at least a quarter of the funding is targeted to the objective; and value 0 is attributed if negligible or no funding is targeted to RMNCH activities/results. RMNCH is not an objective of the project/programme.
Principle 1. At all phases—from strategic planning through implementation to completion and beyond—focus the dialogue on results for partner countries, development agencies, and other stakeholders.

- All the phases of a development initiative require dialogue between the different stakeholders.
- All the partners and the main stakeholders are involved in defining the desired results and in results-based management. They are jointly responsible for the results.
- The risks are 'evaluated' and managed together.

Principle 2. Align actual programming, monitoring, and evaluation activities with the agreed expected results.

- The execution activities and strategies are constantly adapted over time to ensure that the results are achieved.
- The M&E strategies and the indicators are logically bound to the desired impacts and results and make it possible to clearly establish whether or not the desired results have been achieved.
- The indicators are standardised and as far as possible are not modified.

Principle 3. Keep the results reporting system as simple, cost-effective, and user-friendly as possible.

- The measurement methods and the results reporting are as simple as possible
- The results obtained are measured using selective, cost-effective and realistic indicators.
- The risk and performance indicators of the institutions make it possible to monitor the main contextual changes that may affect the results obtained.
- Countries and donors endeavour to limit costs by avoiding overlaps and using the indicators defined by the partner countries.

Principle 4. Manage for, not by, results.

- At the start of any development intervention, it is first necessary to define the expected results, then the activities required to obtain these results, then the resources and inputs necessary to perform these activities (and not the other way round, as was the case in the past).
- During the development initiative, the responsible managers have room for manoeuvre and the necessary authority to reorganise the resources in order to achieve the expected results.
- If certain targets are not achieved, the stakeholders and managers together analyse how and why the plans and strategies stalled and how the situation can be rectified. Together, they take corrective measures in a constructive and cooperative spirit so that the expected results can be obtained. There are no sanctions, as responsibility is shared.

Principle 5. Use results information for management learning and decision-making, as well as for reporting and accountability.

---

30 Promoting a Harmonized Approach to Managing for Development Results: Core Principles; Second international roundtable, Marrakesh 2004
• All the stakeholders can easily access information on continuous performance measurement, regardless of the development intervention.

• Whether positive or negative, this performance information is used to back up constructive and proactive management decisions and promote learning. There are no sanctions.

• The performance evaluation and the reports presenting the results take account of both the contextual factors risks and result in the necessary modifications.

• Improved management is a parallel result to the development action results.
4. Analysis findings

4.1. General information

The study has shown that a certain amount of information and minimum data that is absolutely essential for obtaining (co-)financing has always been available; however this does not mean that all this information is available in a way that is useful for the evaluation. This information is the following:

4.1.1. The TFF of the intervention

As a general rule, the intervention TFF or equivalent document is always available. It is true that we have made this condition a selection criterion within the scope of our study. It is also true that (co-)financing decisions are generally made on the basis of a minimal description of the objectives, planned activities and cost of the intervention. Only a few interventions do not have a detailed technical file, due to their specific nature. These are 'study and consultancy funds', 'aid for local initiatives funds', projects with several grants to be determined, etc. The evaluation of these type of intervention will require the collection of documents relating to each ad hoc sub-intervention.

4.1.2. Mention of the evaluation in the TFF

All the interventions studied provide for an evaluation at a certain point in their implementation. However, the evaluation practices differ considerably depending on the type of partner(s).

The TFFs of governmental cooperation interventions contain a standard chapter on "Monitoring and Evaluation" that generally provides for a mid-term evaluation that is more focused on the operational aspects and a final evaluation that is more focused on accountability.

Sometimes, however, the final evaluation can be limited to (or combined with) a final report. In this case, the evaluation is limited to a self-evaluation which is neither external nor independent. For example:

At the end of the project, the project management will draft a final evaluation report that will include:

- the results of monitoring the cooperation service and any audits or checks, as well as the monitoring of the stated recommendations;
- a final assessment of the basic service evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact;
- ....
For the general programme, the ANGCs anticipate a description of the procedure and the timing of the evaluations planned during the programme, to be linked to the recommendations of the meta-evaluation carried out by the Special Evaluator\textsuperscript{31}.

For evaluations that cover several countries: presentation of the evaluation objective. Programmes in Belgium describe the evaluations planned for development education. For the Southern countries, there is also a description in the programme of the planned evaluations in the country. In practice, most files mention the subject of evaluation because this is provided for in the standard framework, but give little detail about their real intentions (objectives, subject and field of the planned evaluations).

The BFFS provides for a mid-term evaluation for the projects within the programmes. This evaluation will be carried out by the contracting partner organisation and will primarily attempt to assess the relevance of the activities and strategies put in place to achieve the results: identify the favourable and unfavourable factors for the completion of the project; assess coherence within the context of the joint partnership programme; formulate recommendations for the rest of the project and prepare the final programme evaluation.

"A final programme evaluation will be launched once the implementation of a BFFS programme has been completed". "The objectives of the final programme evaluation are: to assess the programme's contribution to improving food security; to inform the Steering Committee of the progress of the different partner organisations with a view to achieving the programme results; to assess the relevance of the partnership strategy; to identify the favourable and unfavourable factors for the execution of the programme, to assess the risk management and identify (possible) new risks; to check whether the allocated funds have been used effectively and efficiently; to assess coordination at programme level; to assess the relevance of a consolidation programme/second phase of the programme; to formulate recommendations with a view to preparing the TFF for the second phase; to learn any lessons with a view to knowledge management; to underpin accountability with regard to the partner countries, the DGD, Parliament, the partner organisations and their members, etc."

4.1.3. Existence of a monitoring system

The understanding of monitoring differs considerably between the stakeholders and depends partly on the nature of the activities. For a programme, monitoring includes little more than the monitoring by the headquarters in Belgium of all the 'individual' project-type 'interventions'.

Each file studied makes some mention of the fact that monitoring will take place. The theme of monitoring is always discussed in a broader 'monitoring and evaluation' chapter that contains a very variable distinction between monitoring and evaluation and a more or less detailed description of the monitoring system.

Monitoring is rarely designed as an internal management instrument, but more generally as an activity carried out by the head office in Belgium, either remotely or through monitoring or backstopping missions. In general, the description of the monitoring system mentions only the frequency of the monitoring reporting ("a monitoring report will be published every six months") and the number of external missions ("external monitoring missions will be organised")\textsuperscript{32}.

\textsuperscript{31} Special Evaluation Office (2013), Meta-evaluation of the programmes of non-governmental stakeholders, FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Brussels.

\textsuperscript{32} This is a free translation of: "Cada seis meses ... publica un informe de seguimiento" and "se realizarán misiones externas de seguimiento".
Only the BFFS provides for the internal monitoring of indicators within the framework of results-based management. As a result, the "updated monitoring framework" that includes for each level of the results chain the indicators, their baseline value, their expected level at the time of the report and their expected level at the end of the project, is an integral part of the narrative reporting model for projects.

The BFFS also includes the efficient monitoring of its individual projects within the programme monitoring mechanism: "Each BFFS partner will have to play a role in monitoring (of its own interventions and (sub-)results) and in the coordination of joint program monitoring and evaluation”.

4.1.4. The description of the beneficiaries and stakeholders

Almost all the files talk about the beneficiaries with varying degrees of detail, but very few files describe the beneficiaries specifically enough. Certain files make a clear distinction between the notions of local partner, beneficiary institution, stakeholder and target group, while others do not.

The BFFS uses the more generic term 'target groups'. It generally describes how the direct and indirect levels play an active role in the intervention and reserves the term 'beneficiary' for the end beneficiaries.

The files that describe the beneficiaries do not always mention an assessment of the number of these beneficiaries and if figures are given, the calculation method used to reach these figures is rarely mentioned transparently.

There is sometimes a partial overlap between the beneficiaries and the local partner(s).

For governmental cooperation, in the vast majority of cases it is a ministry (or a specific department within the ministry) in the partner country. Sometimes, the partner is a decentralised structure or a public establishment. For governmental cooperation, the choice of partner is often imposed, for example, if the partner's request to work in the area of forestry has been accepted, the partner will generally be the water and forestry department.

For ANGCs, the local partner is often a local stakeholder operating in the same area of competence as the Belgian stakeholder: NGO/local association, trade union, university or scientific institution or training body (of trainers). Therefore, the APEFE and the VVOB can also work with governmental partners or public establishments.

The very nature of the BFFS programmes means that they work in collaboration with a large number of public or private partners. The partners of the BFFS are specific in that they almost all develop at a decentralised level.

None of the files consulted included a stakeholder analysis. Very few TFFs openly mention the differing points of view between stakeholders, even in chapters dedicated to risks. If a participative workshop has been organised with all the stakeholders, the report from this workshop may note these differences.

In the TFF of their general programme, certain ANGC clearly state their aim of offering alternative policies or influencing cooperation policies ("policy proposal and actions to influence policies").

In fact, these differing points of view are only confirmed in the TFF of interventions that aim to defend or strengthen the situation of weak groups against strong groups involved in the actions carried out, i.e. trade union action, workers' rights, protection of rights or community resources.

---

33 Organisation of the different stakeholders according to their interests and their authority in the intervention.
34 Literally, "beleidsvoorstellen en beleidsbeïnvloeding"
Several files mention actions to raise the awareness of the authorities, demonstrating a less direct desire to bring at least one stakeholder round to the other's point of view: "...appeal to make the local authorities include (project) development and promotional activities in their development plans, with separate budget lines."

4.1.5. The duration of the intervention

The duration of interventions is set at three years for ANGC programmes and five years for BFFS programmes. BFFS programmes almost systematically provide for a second five-year phase, as they consider that a long-term effort is required to achieve food security.

The BFFS approach is relatively flexible. It allows programs to launch one after the other and at a suitable time in the cultural season.

The approach of ANGC programmes is not flexible, as the vast majority of the current programmes started on 1 January 2014 and will end on 31 December 2016.

Only governmental cooperation has more freedom in fixing the duration of interventions.

4.1.6. The intervention budget (financial file)

Intervention budgets are developed according to one or more different plans for each type of partner (see Appendix A3).

The budget of governmental cooperation interventions is different for each project and consists of two tables. One table contains the year-by-year budget forecasts attributable to the activities necessary to obtain a result that contributes to the achievement of a specific objective. The second table includes the budget forecasts of the "general resources" which, as the name indicates, cannot be attributed to a specific activity: "personnel costs, investments, operating and audit costs, monitoring & evaluation".

The budget of the ANGC general programme also consists of two tables. One table contains the general budget of the ANGC programme, which includes the investment, operational and personnel expenses per country (Belgium and Southern countries) and per year, plus the investment, operational and personnel expenses for the management costs. These management costs are broken down in a second table: investments (property or furniture), operation (missions, monitoring and evaluation, other) and personnel (head office, local and expatriate).

The ANGC programme budget per country is presented in a single table called "operational costs budget", which contains the costs per year, once according to their type (investments (property or furniture), operational (missions, other), (personnel, other), and once according to their contribution to the intermediate programme results. The information on the operational costs budget is supplemented by a table summarising the resources for each budget item. There is no individual budget for each project or partner within a country programme and there is no link between the results, the activities necessary to achieve each result, the resources necessary for each activity and the budget/costs of each resource.

The budget for each project within a BFFS programme also consists of two tables. One table contains the general project budget, which includes the breakdown of the investment, operational and personnel expenses, once per result and once per year; the management costs are intended to contribute to all the results and contain, per year and per location (project, Belgium or coordination office) the forecast investment (property or furniture), operational (missions, evaluation, other) and personnel (head office, local, aid workers) expenses. The budget information is supplemented by a summary of the
resources. A budget is therefore allocated to each result, but it is not possible to link results and

- the activities necessary to achieve each result,
- the resources necessary to implement each activity and
- the budget/costs of each of these resources.

### 4.1.7. Specific budget for monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are very often processed in the same budget line, although monitoring activities are in principle continuous and evaluation takes place on an ad hoc basis. As a result, it is rarely possible to determine the exact financial effort dedicated to monitoring and/or evaluation. Dividing the amounts into separate years sometimes gives an indication of the allocation of funds. If the same amount is specified for each year of the project/programme, then the focus is on monitoring. If the monitoring-evaluation budget is greater in the middle and at the end of the intervention, this indicates the intention to fund mid-term and final evaluations.

In addition to the monitoring-evaluation budget line, monitoring costs can also be partially covered by the budgets of the (monitoring) missions or the costs of a representation office in the field (which de facto carries out more or less external monitoring).

For governmental cooperation projects, the resources granted to audits, monitoring and evaluation\(^{35}\) vary between 1 and 3% of the total budget. This means that the resources granted to evaluation per se or to monitoring activities are only part of this amount on each occasion and can also vary considerably.

For global ANGC programmes, the management costs budget contains an indication of the resources allocated to monitoring and evaluations. In the cases we studied, these resources were not sufficient to evaluate the global programme, as such an evaluation would involve evaluating each country programme individually and summarising these (often 10 + 1) evaluations. The different TFFs we consulted proposed evaluating one theme or one component rather than the entire programme.

Although a distinction between a monitoring budget and an evaluation budget is relatively rare, we only found a few additional details about the respective percentages for mid-term and final evaluations, for example (for the BFFS), an estimated budget of at least 1% of the total project budget will be provided for the mid-term evaluation.

We did not find a single TFF that provided details of the budget dedicated to the different monitoring activities (establishing the baseline value of the indicators, monitoring the results indicators, monitoring the development of the context and monitoring the potential risks).

The different stakeholders are not placed in the same financial conditions during the preparation of the interventions, as the ANGC 'formulations' come from their own resources, while bilateral or BFFS formulations are partially or fully reimbursed.

For day-to-day monitoring, the BFFS innovates by providing for the coordination and strategic monitoring of the programme through a separately financed coordination structure and the financing of its final evaluation outside the programme budget.

Only once in a TFF did we find a framework for monitoring indicators that started from a baseline and anticipated the expected results for the outcome and the different outputs after one year, after two years, mid-term, after four years, after five years and at the

---

\(^{35}\) in the Z04 budget line
end of the project. There were no details on the financing of this system, but its very presence leads us to suppose that consideration had been given to it.

Other budget lines of the different budgets also mention estimated expenditure for activities at least partly related to monitoring, such as local representation (and representative), head office missions, backstopping and a monitoring expert.

4.1.8. Other data

All the TFFs mention the different elements of the following list. However, the level of detail varies considerably from one file to another and also depends on the requirements imposed by the different presentation plans:

- the geographic, financial, sector-based, thematic, etc. limits of the intervention;
- a regular narrative report on the results/activities; and
- regular financial reporting.

The last two points determine the unlocking of the next parts of the funding for all the interventions not (co-)financed in one go. It should be noted that none of the files studied make the unlocking of the next tranche of funding conditional on the results of an evaluation.

4.2. Relevance conditions

The ex-ante relevance assessment process is carried out by the Administration for ANGC and BFFS projects and programmes. Governmental cooperation interventions do not require ex-ante assessment, as it would be inconvenient to declare that an intervention decided on by a mixed commission of Belgian ministers and the partner country was 'not relevant'. However, the BTC can evaluate the relevance of an intervention on the basis of the identification file and, if necessary, include in the TFF any modifications that would improve its relevance.

4.2.1. Description of the objectives of development action

Certain files mention a definition of the objectives using the objective-oriented intervention planning (OOIP) method, while others do not. This method involves working with all the stakeholders to establish a cause and effect relationship between the negative situations affecting them (problem tree). These negative situations are then turned round into positive solutions (objectives tree). In this objective tree, a strategy is chosen to achieve the objective(s) that the stakeholders have defined as the most important (specific objective(s)). The planning process then continues with the definition of a logical framework. This method is currently compulsory for FBSA projects: problem tree, objectives tree and "theory of change". In other interventions, the objectives are defined following a contextual analysis that involves the local partners and also, on an exceptional basis, the end beneficiaries.

However, all the stakeholders include certain elements of the OOIP approach in their TFF: The BTC TFFs contain a chapter on "strategic directions"; the ANGC describe the organisational strategy; certain stakeholders briefly describe the problems to be solved, action by action.

The BTC, the ANGCs and the BFFS still operate according to the following model: general objective → specific objective(s) → and (intermediary) results.

The BTC provides for one general objective and one specific objective for each project. The ANGC provide for one general objective for their entire programme and one or more specific objectives for each country/region of activity (including for their 'North'
programme in Belgium). For both the BTC and the ANGC, the general objectives are defined very generally and too ambitiously. For example: "The socio-economic development of the rural populations and their living conditions have improved"; "contribute to the capacity development of the institutions responsible for implementing national development policies in partner countries"; "help to create a safer common north-south future"; "contribute to sustainable human development in Southern countries", "claim the right to social protection for populations living in precarious situations", etc.

The practice of organising a participatory workshop with future beneficiaries to fix the specific objective, still widespread twenty years ago, has gradually been replaced by a definition of the specific objective produced by an elite group of stakeholders. In certain cases, this change has not affected the rather vague nature of the objective and the TFFs do not show that the problem to be solved has been analysed. In other cases, the specific objective is now the result of a more detailed analysis of the problems than in the past, even though the participative aspect of a workshop is no longer common.

The general objective (impact) of a BFFS programme is identical for each programme and described as follows: "The programme has helped to improve food security in the area of intervention."

Each component of the BFFS programmes has a specific objective that corresponds to the development problems and opportunities identified by the contextual analysis.

4.2.2. Description of the general context and its development

The notion of context covers the whole of points 4.2.3 to 4.2.8, which are examined below in the context of the relevance criterion. For many TFFs, these points are not examined separately and in the order mentioned below, but are integrated into a more global contextual analysis, with a greater or lesser degree of detail. This analysis of the context (ANGC, BFFS) or the situation (BTC) contains a SWOT analysis that is optional for the BTC, but compulsory in the ANGC presentation and also compulsory for the national public institution responsible for food security for the BFFS.

It is also important to understand that the context is not fixed. Although all the stakeholders study the context reasonably well at the time of formulation, the way in which its development is monitored varies considerably.

4.2.3. Correspondence with beneficiaries' expectations

The expectations of the end/final beneficiaries are almost never mentioned as a first-hand source. They are described through the filter of their local representatives or those that present themselves or act as such (farmers' groups, community organisations, local NGOs, trade unions) or through the filter of intermediaries (State governmental cooperation services, decentralised administrative services, micro-financing institutions, etc.).

The BFFS attaches greater importance than the other stakeholders to the expectations of beneficiaries, which it also describes as 'target groups'. At programme level, the shift from the active participation of the beneficiaries towards the greater involvement of the local stakeholders and intermediaries is confirmed in the texts: "It is important that the analysis reflect the concerns of the local stakeholders. For this purpose, during their mission in the field, the consultant (responsible for the contextual analysis) will organise a brainstorming workshop with local stakeholders in the area of intervention." At programme level, the stakeholders do not meet at the start of the identification process, but during a validation workshop held at the end of this process.
At project level, however, the response to the beneficiaries' needs is examined carefully; the projects must be prepared in a participatory manner (problem tree, objectives tree and "theory of change"), but the documents remain rather vague regarding the end beneficiaries' involvement in defining their needs.

4.2.4. Correspondence with country needs

The vision of the country's priority needs differs depending on the implementation organisation.

For governmental cooperation, this correspondence should be self-evident, as the intervention is the result of an agreement between the Belgian donor and the partner country. This agreement is first developed in a mixed commission, then during the preparation process (identification and formulation) and finally by the signing of a specific agreement between the two States. This theoretical correspondence may not be perfect in practice, but a judgement on this subject requires a field visit and in our opinion is more a question of evaluation than of theoretical evaluability.

The NGOs and trade unions frequently act as counterweights and as observers of governmental actions. It is therefore completely natural that they do not always agree with the partner government on the country's needs. Correspondence with the country's needs is at a relatively low level: "in collaboration with the Ministry...; after reading the local policy on..."

The other ANGC (universities, scientific institutions, APEFE, VVOB) must be consistent with the specific needs expressed by the institutes and ministries involved (education and research).

"(Local) coordination of the BFFS programmes is entrusted to the national public institution responsible for food security. This is the most competent body for ensuring that the programme interventions are aligned with national strategies and policies." The BFFS also explicitly provides for the involvement of civil society before and during the intervention, "To strengthen civil society initiatives, the coordination structure will set up political dialogue with the country's civil society organisations (NGOs, professional farming organisations, unions or federations of these organisations, women's organisations, etc.)".

4.2.5. Correspondence with global priorities

Global priorities are understood to mean the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

The very reason for the existence of the BFFS means that the general objective of the Fund's interventions automatically corresponds to MDG1 (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger), target 2: halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.

Almost none of the files studied included the planned action in the global priorities.

4.2.6. Correspondence with the policies of the partners

'Policies of the partners' means in particular their poverty-reduction strategy papers (PRSP) or the equivalent, as well as the more specific policies implemented in the intervention sector: policies on public health, education, agriculture, environment, etc. The quality in the description and the extent to which the policies of the partners are taken into account varies considerably from one file to another. It could be that the policies actually implemented do not fully correspond to the policies stated in the texts, but once again we think that a judgement on this subject requires a field visit and is more a question of evaluation than of theoretical evaluability.
In theory, the question does not arise for interventions in domains in the partner countries that are the exclusive competence of or heavily controlled by the State, such as electricity, rural infrastructures, education and health. However, in many partner countries, the absence or ineffectiveness of the national supervision and development services forces civil society organisations to make a substitution.

4.2.7. Correspondence with Belgian policies

It is possible to assess correspondence with Belgian policies through the way in which the different Belgian strategy papers are taken into account.

For governmental cooperation, the country strategy papers have been deleted but some TFFs explicitly mention the fact that the project forms part of Belgian support to the sector in the country. The choice of priority sectors and the justification of this choice are mentioned in the PCs and/or in the PC preparation papers.

There is very little reference to Belgian strategy papers in the files of ANGC programmes. However, there are exceptions when the intervention sector has a highly suitable strategy paper. For example, the education strategy paper is mentioned in the documents of the VLIR, the CIUF, the APEFE and the VVOB.

The BFFS has its own strategy paper. Its programmes and projects must (law of 19 January 2010) fall within this framework. Intervention documents often state that this Fund strategy is the result of a consultation, but only rarely show how it is applied.

4.2.8. Coherence with the policies, objectives and activities of the other sectors

As has already been mentioned, governmental cooperation is already or very soon will be part of the joint programming at European level. In the meantime, a number of initiatives have been launched in the area of joint - thematic or general - political dialogue between the donors and the partner governments.

For the ANGC, the question has little meaning at general multi-country programme level, as the other stakeholders all have different policies, objectives and activities. The coherence of the objectives is therefore studied at country programme level.

Collaboration with other NGOs or organisations must be specified if there is a collaboration agreement and when the other organisations involved are directly affected by the achievement of the specific objective, within the context of structural collaboration (Article 3 RD of 24/09/2006) or within the context of joint actions. Certain files go further, by mentioning past, non-structural collaboration or by mentioning the way in which they take account of the policies and activities of other stakeholders (local, Belgian or international) working in the specific sector or in the area of intervention.

The situation for the BFFS is quite specific, as the programmes bring together several Belgian, international and local stakeholders around a common general objective. These stakeholders, with their different policies, (specific) objectives and activities, must develop coherently. In each project TFF, this coherence must be explained at three levels:

- coherence of the project’s logical framework with the programme’s logical framework
- coherence of the project results with the programme results.
- coherence with the different stakeholders in the programme.
4.2.9. The cross-cutting themes

Article 11, paragraph 1 of the law mentions the integration of three priority themes: human rights, including the rights of the child; decent and sustainable work; and strengthening society.

Paragraph 2 of the same article states that "the cross-cutting integration in all interventions of the gender dimension, which targets the empowerment of women and gender equality in society; and the protection of the environment and natural resources, including combating climate change, drought and global deforestation."

With regard to governmental cooperation, Article 19 of the law states that the themes indicated in Article 11, § 1 can be the subject of specific (i.e. sector-based) initiatives and that the themes indicated in Article 11, § 2 are integrated into all sectors in a cross-cutting manner. Article 19 also states that the main focal sector, 'healthcare', includes a cross-cutting approach to HIV/AIDS.

All the files examined contain more or less detailed considerations on gender and environment.

The TFFs of BTC interventions contain a specific chapter on the following cross-cutting themes: environment, gender, social economy, rights of the child and HIV/AIDS. In certain files, cross-cutting themes may be grouped together, renamed or omitted, depending on the nature of the objective and the activities.

The ACNG must describe in their general programme how the cross-cutting themes have been taken into consideration. A value of 2, 1 or 0 (see point 3.6, page 28) must be allocated to a list of cross-cutting themes inspired by the cross-cutting themes of the law and the DAC. The country programmes must deal with the cross-cutting themes of gender and environment. They sometimes mention certain other cross-cutting themes, depending on the nature of their objectives and activities. The cross-cutting themes are generally not covered in a specific chapter.

For each project within an FBSA programme, particular attention should be paid to the cross-cutting themes in each point of the TFF. Certain themes can be stressed at programme level, for example the DRC programme provides for the specific financing of a gender coordination unit, whereas other themes are mentioned that do not have their own financing.

4.2.10. Relevance with regard to risks

With the exception of the general ANGC programmes, the risks are now examined in the TFFs of all interventions.

The TFFs of governmental cooperation programmes generally distinguish risks at implementation, management, effectiveness and sustainability level as well as the fiduciary risks. One or more risks are described for each type. Although anticipated in the standard model, the level of risk (from very low to very high) was not always mentioned in the TFFs studied. There is no requirement in the standard model for an assessment of the potential consequences (from minimum to very serious) of the risks; as a result this was not found in the files studied. However, adaptation measures are proposed.

The TFFs of the ANGC country programmes must contain a summary of the risks, with an assessment of the probability that they will occur and an assessment of

---

36 For example, gender and the rights of the child, governance,... Gender and the environment are never omitted.
their impact (in the sense of ‘consequences’), as well as the means implemented to limit them.

For FBSA programmes, the TFF must include an in-depth analysis of the internal and external risks at project and programme level... the potential consequences must be explicitly stated. The intensity (= the level) of every selected risk must be established (weak, high or very high). The TFF must also summarise the adaptation strategies for each identified risk.

4.3. Conditions relating to effectiveness

For ANGCs, the description of the programmes in each Southern country must, among other things, cover the effectiveness of the resources and the planned implementation methods.

4.3.1. Description of an intervention logic at three levels

We examine this condition in the context of our vision of development cooperation interventions (point 3.4), which distinguishes three levels that logically result from the activities: outputs, outcome(s) and impact(s).

The standard framework for governmental cooperation projects put forward by the BTC provides for the description of a general objective (GO), a specific objective (SO) and several expected results. This model is followed in all the TFFs we consulted.

For the general programme, the presentation plan for an ANGC programme specifies a single GO (briefly and clearly formulated) and one or more GO per country programme (including for the ‘North’ component in Belgium). If there are several SO, each one corresponds to a separate ‘project’-type component. The general programme of the ANGCs does not describe the 'outputs' level. All the country programmes are intended to contribute to the programme's GO. They are described separately and generally only mention the two lower levels (outputs and outcome(s)).

BFFS programmes have a four-level intervention logic: general programme objective (always the same: food security) → one GO for each project within the programme (= impact) → several SO for each project within the programme (= outcomes) → and several results for each SO (= outputs).

The assessment of the causal relationship between the different levels or the internal coherence of the intervention is a subjective exercise which requires a great deal of expertise on the part of the evaluators. With the exception of BFFS programmes, the SOs and certainly the GO are generally expressed in vague terms.

Particularly for the global programmes of the ANGC, it is difficult to establish the causal relationship between the second level (that of the SO) and the third level (that of the GO).

4.3.2. Quantitative indicators

All the stakeholders mention quantitative indicators.

The TFFs of governmental cooperation generally contain a list of the indicators (sometimes) relating to the GO, the SO and the different results. These indicators are also included in the intervention's logical framework. The 'More Results' manual, subsequently applied to the different TFFs we consulted, gives a number of useful indications regarding the definition of the indicators.

37 Certain ACNG allocate a different GO to each country programme.
The global programme of the ANGCs does not have an indicator for the GO but must contain a **maximum of three SMART indicators** for each SO. The logical frameworks of the country programmes contain two to three SMART indicators for each result. The files of the country programmes presented by the ANGC must therefore complete a framework of SO indicators and intermediary results with a baseline value and target values for years 1, 2 and 3.

**For the BFFS, the introduction of a high-performing monitoring and evaluation system begins with the choice of relevant, clear and reliable indicators.**

At GO level, BFFS programmes must have indicators relating to: (i) the four pillars of food security: availability, accessibility, stability and use (nutrition); (ii) developing the capacities of the stakeholders involved at national, regional and local level; and (iii) developing the national public institution responsible for food security. For children under eight years of age, the indicators used internationally to measure malnutrition are: weight-for-height (wasting or thinness), height-for-age (stunted growth) and weight-for-age. **Indicators relating to the cross-cutting themes of gender, the environment and climate change must also be identified.**

The different projects within the BFFS programmes also have **SMART quantitative indicators** for the three levels of the results chain.

Very few interventions are designed to allow the use of local indicators. These are essentially interventions in the areas of health (**maternal mortality rate, child mortality rate** and **prevalence of chronic malnutrition**), education, access to drinking water, etc. The territory of the area of intervention must also correspond exactly to one or more administrative entities for which statistics are regularly collected. Another procedure often used is the collection of data at source: age, size and weight of patients at dispensaries in the area of intervention, attendance registers or exam success rates in schools in the area of intervention.

### 4.3.3. Qualitative indicators

Most of the TFF consulted also contain qualitative indicators. For example: **there is a personnel plan based on needs; a farmers’ association is created; all the... have access to...; user satisfaction with ... services;**

There are specific instructions for qualitative indicators in the formats developed for FBSA projects, for which **the qualitative indicators must be objectively verifiable**, and for ANGC interventions, for which **the objectively verifiable quantitative and qualitative indicators must be SMART.**

### 4.3.4. Baseline value and target values of the indicators

The TFFs of the governmental cooperation projects examined contain indicators with no starting or target value. Examples: **number of...; quantity of...; the cost of....’ rate of access to...**

For BFFS projects, the nature of the indicators is provided deliberately and in accordance with the instructions, but their starting and target values are not. Preparation documents sometimes venture to provide a few indicative target values, but the general rule is that **it is important to have an exact baseline situation to be able to measure the progress of a programme and its projects. Reliable values (of the indicators) are rarely available during the preparatory phase of a BFFS programme. During the first half-year of the programme’s execution, it is therefore necessary to create precise baseline situations for the programme, as well as for the individual projects. The baseline and the target values of the results indicators mentioned in the logical framework are specified and validated (at the start of implementation) during the joint preparation and**
validation of the baseline. In fact, the expected progress cannot be realistically formulated if the baseline has not been established. In practice, we have verified that for each partner in the programme, there is a review of the indicators of the logical framework shortly after the start of the programme, during which baseline and target values are clearly defined or redefined. Sometimes an indicator can even be replaced or more appropriately worded.

For global ANGC programmes, the baseline and target (after three years) values are indicated for the SO indicators. As there are no indicators for the GO of the global programme, this GO has neither a baseline value nor target values. For the results (output level), the different country programmes mention baseline values and target values after one, two and three years. If we agree on the reasoning of the above paragraph, the compulsory mention of the baseline and target values before the start of the programme raises questions about their credibility.

In certain files, the baseline is not considered to be the strict and rigorous establishment of the value of the different indicators at the start, but at most as a general description of the situation in the area of intervention in direct (or non-direct) relation with the sector of intervention. This practice increases at the start of a second or third phase, for which some TFFs mention that as the baseline situation is well known, it is not necessary to carry out a baseline study at the start of this consolidation phase.

The achievement of a qualitative indicator can be objectively verified. For example, a development plan has (or has not) been created, a strategy has (or has not) been developed, a policy has (or has not) been put in place, the person who received training passed (or did not pass) the end-of-course test, etc.

Certain indicators quantify quality, for example, satisfaction rate for a service (quantifies the quality of the service). However, it is important to be wary of such indicators, as they end up no longer being objectively verifiable. For example, percentage of producers with a stable income (but the notion of stable revenue is not unequivocal); number of groups supported (but there are many different ways of supporting a group); and number of functional services (but is it not possible to be more or less functional?).

4.3.5. Sources of verification

All the TFFs consulted mention sources of verification However, certain ACNG do not include the sources of verification of the SO indicators in the summary description of their global programme.

4.3.6. Effectiveness with regard to the cross-cutting themes

We studied this point in the context of our vision of the way in which the cross-cutting themes should be understood (see 3.6, page 28).

Very few TFFs are created in a way that allows the first level (output) and second level (outcomes) results to be measured in relation to the cross-cutting themes.

It is true that almost all the documents mention gender and the environment (they mention the other cross-cutting themes much more rarely) at some point. However, it is exceptional to be able to evaluate the results/changes in relation to these cross-cutting themes by means of indicators, baseline values, target values and sources of specific verification. In fact, only interventions in which a cross-cutting theme is the (principal) specific objective can lay claim to a logical framework for measuring results.

This is not unique to interventions financed by Belgium, as can be seen from an IFAD evaluation report: "It was found that the gender-responsive evaluation methodologies were generally weak due to poorly designed results
frameworks, and weak and poorly articulated theories of change. Gender performance indicators were not clearly defined or sufficiently precise to permit assessment of programmes in terms of their contribution to gender equality and women’s empowerment.” 38

It is, however, rather easier to assess the results for gender equality. Even if this theme is not the principal objective, a number of interventions use statistics or measure indicators whose value is broken down according to gender or in a gender-specific way. The improvement in gender equality can then be measured relatively easily, even if this equality is not a principal or secondary objective of the intervention. For example, school attendance, participation in a healthcare cooperative or use of maternity facilities.

Education interventions also have more possibilities, because attendance lists and exam success statistics have already been broadly disaggregated for a long time.

Most national statistics on health, malnutrition, poverty, access to energy, access to drinking water, etc. are generally broken by gender (or easily can be from the primary data).

BFFS programmes pay rather more attention to the themes of gender and the environment. In principle, projects must present a specific intervention logic (+indicators) for the themes of gender and the environment. A programme anticipates results specifically focused on ‘women and youth’ and intends to use more than 50% of its budget to guarantee greater gender equality. The indicators are: percentage of women registered for ‘credit savings’ plans; percentage of women with access to information; percentage of women in local decision-making bodies; percentage of households in which women control at least 20% of the household budget; distance between the dwelling and the nearest water point, etc.

BFFS programmes provide for the setting up and specific financing of a gender coordination unit.

In addition, a real programme-based approach such as that of the BFFS means that the cross-cutting themes do not necessarily have to be covered by each of the projects within the programme, but can be delegated to one or more other projects.

4.4. Conditions relating to efficiency

We believe that the planned results are achieved economically if they are achieved within the planned budgets, within the planned time period and with the minimum management costs. As a result, we will successively examine the links between the budgets and the results, the links between the budgets and the implementation schedule and finally the description of the management system.

For ANGCs, the description of the programmes in each Southern country must, among other things, cover the efficiency of the planned means and methods of execution.

4.4.1. The budget is formulated by result

As the efficiency evaluation verifies whether the results have been achieved economically, it is important to find out the anticipated expenses for achieving each result in the TFF.

In governmental cooperation TFFs, the budget is presented in the form of two separate tables. In the first table, each result and even each activity is given a specific budget broken down by year. As well as this first results-based budget framework, the TFF also contains a second budget framework for the general means or common resources that cannot be broken down by result, such as personnel costs, investment costs, operating costs and audit, monitoring and evaluation costs. These forecasts are also broken down by year in the case studies.

**ANGC programme budgets (see Appendix 3)** are presented in the form of four separate tables.

The global ANGC programme budget ('table 1') summarises the forecast expenses per country, per year and per budget item (investment, operations and personnel). The general budget also contains a specific framework per year and per budget item for management costs.

The budget for management costs is broken down in 'table 2', which includes the forecast expenses per budget item and sub-item (investment, operations, personnel), per year and per country.

The presentation plan for a global ANGC programme stipulates that with a view to administrative simplification, ...the description of the resources in the operational costs is now required for each budget item and no longer for each result. This instruction nevertheless makes it possible to assess efficiency at SO level for each country programme, because each country programme has its own operational budget.

The operational costs budget of ANGC programme(s) in Belgium is set out in 'table 3', which, for each individual programme, includes the forecast expenses per year and per budget item on the one hand and per year and per result on the other.

The operational costs budget of ANGC programme(s) in the partner countries is set out in 'table 4', which, for each individual programme, includes the forecast expenses per year and per budget item on the one hand and per year and per result on the other. Furthermore, coordination office expenses can be considered as operational costs provided that they are clearly included in the partnership agreements and linked to the results to be achieved.

If correctly completed, the general programme budget (table 1) sets the estimated cost of each specific programme objective and therefore in principle makes it possible to assess the level of efficiency in achieving each SO of the general programme.³⁹

The specific objective, however, is not always formulated in terms of concrete result(s). This means that it is not always possible to link the forecast expenses to the achievement of the target value of indicators.

The budget for each project within a BFFS programme is also presented in two tables.

The general project budget summarises the forecast expenses per result (outcome), per year and per budget item (investment, operations and personnel). The general budget also contains an item summarising the management costs per year.

The second table describes the management costs budget per budget item, per year and per geographical situation (Belgium or coordination office).

When correctly completed, this method of presentation allows an objective assessment of the efficiency of the project outcomes and the programme outputs.⁴⁰

---

³⁹ As a reminder, the general programme of an ACNG consists of sub-programmes in Belgium and in the partner countries/regions of non-governmental cooperation.
However, in the budget plan of BFFS projects, the costs are linked to the results, but apply to the budget items that cover several results. It is difficult to believe that the personnel of a project is concerned about a specific result and that the furniture/real estate is only assigned to the achievement of a single result.

4.4.2. The budget is formulated by year of activity.

All the partners provide for annual financial reporting, relating in particular to the budget execution. It is therefore possible to make a comparison between the forecast and the budget execution.

4.4.3. Management method and responsibilities

The TFFs of government cooperation projects contain a chapter entitled 'Implementation methods'. These implementation methods are defined on the basis of the ICP and the risk analysis and in accordance with the principles of partner accountability, harmonisation and alignment; they cover:

- the decision-making responsibilities (technical, administrative and financial)
- the financial disbursement channels
- the procedures linked to public contracts (including the responsibility thresholds)
- the administrative, accounting and financial reporting procedures
- the monitoring and evaluation procedures in the context of the mixed local consultation structure
- the composition and remits of the monitoring and implementation structures if applicable

The preliminary information from the presentation plan of an ANGC programme mentions that particular attention will be paid to the application of a correct (management) methodology. Below that, the part devoted to the organisational strategy describes the management bodies and the organisation’s management capacity for the multi-year programme.

The description of the programmes in the Southern countries also covers the

- development of management capacity
- effectiveness and efficiency of the planned methods and resources.

BFFS programmes are coordinated by a partner that takes care only of the programme coordination and has a maximum budget of 5% of the global budget. This coordination takes place in close collaboration with the national public institution responsible for food security, the Belgian Embassy and the target groups (local admins, etc.) and is more or less well described depending on the cases studied.

BFFS projects must be prepared in a participatory way (problem tree, objectives tree and "theory of change") and implemented, monitored and evaluated using a logical, results-based approach. For the BFFS, the presentation plan provides some details on the obligations of this logic: This legal obligation not only requires the formal presentation of a logical framework, it also requires

---

40 In the design of the ‘overlapping logical framework’ used by the BFFS, the programme outcomes are the impacts of the projects that constitute it and the programme outputs are the outcomes of the projects that constitute it.
the partner to use this logical framework as a real management tool for achieving the expected results.

4.4.4. Results-based management

The TFFs of governmental projects contain a specific chapter entitled "modification of the technical and financial file". The following formulation is taken from a case study, but is representative of the way in which flexibility is perceived for governmental cooperation: "The TFF can be amended by the partner country and the BTC when necessary for the effective execution of the project, but with the exception of the specific objective and the total programme budget, for which any modifications must be made by an exchange of letters between the partner State and Belgium." It was noted that flexibility was based on the resources, the activities (the effective execution) and the first level of results (outputs).

For the ANGC, flexibility is included in the obligatory concept of results-based management: "particular attention will be paid to the application of... and the systematic use of results-based management." This means that almost all the case studies consulted mention that the intervention will be managed based on its results. However, although all the consulted files use the words 'results-based management', few of them demonstrate a real knowledge and grasp of the concept. We did not find a description of this management method in a single TFF.

As a reminder, "focusing management on results means managing and implementing the aid while focusing on the desired results and using the available data to improve the decision-making process." This management method requires a "transparent and monitorable performance evaluation framework", the quality of which often leaves something to be desired in the files studied.

The question is less relevant for interventions in the infrastructure sector, whose activities are entrusted to private companies through calls to tender, for example, drinking water boreholes, construction and electrification.

In our opinion, results-based management is organised and applied in more depth in the new BFFS programmes and project. In practice,

- all BFFS projects have an updated monitoring framework which, for each level of the results chain, states the indicators, their baseline value, their expected value at regular intervals and their expected value at the end of the project. This is the only instrument that can be used as a basis for real results-based management.

- For projects within the new BFFS programmes, the logical framework is updated at least once, as the procedure requires the setting of the initial and temporary target values of the indicators in order to obtain funding and the updating of these values at the start of execution (i.e. once the subsidy has been granted).

The above considerations also apply to the effectiveness criterion.

4.5. Data linked to the sustainability evaluation

Several files focus specifically on the sustainability criterion, dedicating a specific paragraph, literally entitled 'sustainability', to the subject. However, although the subject is covered, environmental sustainability is generally analysed in the 'environment' section of the chapter on cross-cutting themes.

The TFFs of governmental cooperation interventions contain a point entitled end of the service. This point focuses only on the financial and accounting end of the intervention and sometimes on the contents of the final report. The sustainability of the intervention...
may be mentioned in a comment in this final report, but the TFFs drafted by the BTC do not generally contain a specific point on sustainability as defined by the DAC.

On the other hand, several TFFs contain the following relatively generic statement: "the partner party undertakes:

• to take the institutional, administrative and budgetary provisions necessary to guarantee the continuation of the activities within the selected structures after the termination of the Belgian intervention;

• to ensure that the equipment and materials acquired before the termination of the Belgian intervention become the property of the partner after the termination of the Belgian intervention and remain with the structures for which the same activities lead to the same results."

Most of the evidence for commenting on the different aspects of sustainability is contained in the chapter on implementation methods, which is generally divided into several points including the sharing of administrative responsibilities, technical responsibilities and financial responsibilities between the BTC and the partner.

For the ANGCs, the descriptions of the programmes in each Southern country must cover the following points, among others: developing institutional and management capabilities; technical, financial and socio-cultural sustainability; …; sustainability of the results and withdrawal strategy.

The issue of the institutional sustainability of the ANGC's North actions is rarely mentioned. The North partner generally has a life of its own before and after the action, so the issue of evaluability and institutional sustainability is framed differently.

The BFFS on the other hand ensures that sustainability and withdrawal strategies are mentioned in the project documents.

The five-year programmes of the BFFS almost systematically provide for a second five-year phase after the initial five-year phase (which may follow on from an individual project-type intervention): In view of..., it is unlikely that a BFFS programme can have a lasting impact on food security in an area of intervention over a five-year period. For this reason, a BFFS programme is usually extended by means of a second programme called a "consolidation programme". Under these circumstances, it becomes more difficult to decide on the evaluability of the sustainability criteria at the start of a ten-year period.

**4.5.1. Integration into the monitoring system**

By definition, the sustainability assessment requires at least part of the monitoring system for the indicators and results to be retained after the end of the intervention. This maintenance will only be credible if it is provided for in the TFF and allocated funding and a manager.

Of the case studies consulted, very few TFF provided for any monitoring of the indicators and/or results after the end of the intervention.

The permanent measuring of the value of the indicators after the intervention is only guaranteed in the rare cases in which the local beneficiary institution already measures these indicators as part of its core business. For example, list of attendance (+ gender) in classes or routine examination in health centres (age, size, weight and gender). Permanent measurement is also guaranteed when the indicators are taken from the national statistics system (vaccination rate, percentage of students repeating the school year, child mortality, etc.).

On the other hand, the general context and the national indicators continue to be monitored in the usual main intervention sectors (education, health, development,
infrastructure, etc.), and in the other areas where there are technical dialogue groups of donors and Southern partners. In governmental cooperation, Belgium has also set itself the goal of remaining in the same sectors for a minimum of 10 years; this guarantees that the sector will be monitored (in the absence of specific indicators).

Many ANGCs also specialise in a specific field and monitor the development of the situation in this field, either locally or using the many existing sources of information. It is easy to imagine that the level of awareness in the North is monitored continually while the stakeholder continues to exist.

If, as is the case for the BFFS, provision is almost systematically made for a second five-year phase, then the planned monitoring system should continue to measure the indicators. Moving from phase 1 to phase 2 must not be confused with the end of the intervention (in the sense of the definition of the sustainability criterion).

4.5.2. Financial sustainability

The information necessary for assessing financial sustainability is available in the budget, essentially through the annual development of the allocation of operational and management costs between the donor and the partner.

For the ANGCs, Ministerial Decree 30/05/2007 implementing the Royal Decree of 24 September 2006 on subsidies for programmes and projects presented by approved non-governmental development organisations (Article 7, 7°) states that "with regard to credit guarantee funds, the partnership agreement must contain a provision that the NGO will continue to monitor the financing and prepare reports on the management of assets and current assets by the partner for six years after the transfer of ownership".

4.5.3. Institutional sustainability

Institutional sustainability is generally guaranteed during implementation by means of (i) developing the partner institutions and (ii) developing the capacities of the stakeholders working within these partner institutions.

The global objective of BFFS programmes must include indicators relating to:

- developing the capacities of the actors involved at national, regional and local level;
- developing the national public institution responsible for food security.

The vast majority of the ANGC's 'SOUTH' programmes also aim to strengthen the institutions of their respective local partners: "the emphasis is placed on developing the organisational capacity and the service offer on the one hand, and on developing institutional capacity on the other".\(^{41}\)

None of the cases cover the sustainability of the ANGC's 'NORTH' actions. It is true that these actions aim more to raise awareness than to strengthen capacities and that they also present other evaluation problems.

For governmental cooperation, many TFFs make provision for a salary supplement for local personnel working within the intervention. One TFF even states that the remuneration paid by the project is clearly better than the salary paid by the civil service, but is less attractive for (management) officials who are much in demand from large numbers of international organisations and programmes.

\(^{41}\) This is a free translation of: “Daarbij ligt het accent enerzijds op versterking van de organisatiecapaciteit en dienstverlening, en anderzijds op versterking van institutionele capaciteit”.
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4.5.4. Environmental sustainability

The issue of the environment is generally covered in the points reserved for cross-cutting themes and we did not find any cases in which environmental sustainability was dealt with as a specific issue.

4.6. Conditions relating to impact

The governmental cooperation interventions we studied only rarely included impact indicators. Even when they did, the level to which the Belgian intervention contributed to the impact was completely impossible to determine using the traditional evaluation methods. For example, a primary health project probably helps to decrease child mortality rates, but to what extent? Similarly, an electrification project probably contributes to the socio-economic development of the electrified region, but how much? One of the files studied involved a rural electrification project and mentioned impact indicators on socio-economic development and the improvement of living conditions, although it did not make use of these indicators:

- **the electrification of healthcare centres will allow improved medical care, particularly for (future) mothers and children;**
- **electricity provides access to information (radio) and to communications (mobile),**
- **electricity makes it possible to mechanise arduous work (water extraction, grain mills, etc.);**
- **electricity allows traditional craft and trade activities to take place;**
- **lighting in classrooms and homes improves learning conditions and therefore school results.**

All these indicators can be measured cheaply and there is not even an obligation to measure them all.

The ANGC global programs have a very 'general' general objective that has no indicators and therefore no baseline value or target value. As a result, it is completely impossible to determine the extent to which the general objective has been achieved or the programme's contribution to the impact. This way of working is no doubt the legacy of the first OOIP applications and of the 'logical framework' approach, as at the time no indicators were required for the general objectives and no link was established with the impact.

**BFFS programmes**, on the other hand, all have the same general objective. As already mentioned, they also have SMART indicators that are specific to the four aspects of food security. These indicators are internationally recognised and can be recreated for each health centre that systematically measures the size, age and weight of each patient. Furthermore, they are part of the statistics measured in almost every country in the world. Provided that they are broken down for gender and the area of intervention, they make it easy to evaluate the impact using quantitative methods, even if the use of quasi-experimental methods was not planned at the start. However, the counterfactual will never be ideal in view of the choice of area (the one most subject to food insecurity) and the multi-sector aspect of the fund's programmes. Nevertheless, it will be easier to make a comparison with a different area that receives less help or is helped by a different donor.

---

42 The indications often also cover the percentage of the population that visits health centres and not the population as a whole.
Through the overlapping logical framework mechanism, BFFS projects also have a general objective that is different from the general objective of the programme and is directly linked to the specific project activities. The general objectives of the different projects within the BFFS programmes also have SMART indicators with measurable baseline and final values; this makes it possible to evaluate the project's contribution to the impact.
5. Conclusions

Extending the sample to a total of 26 case studies only served to confirm the initial indications observed during the development phase of the methodological framework:

- None of the intervention TFFs were drafted in a way that would allow the objective evaluation of this intervention across all the DAC evaluation criteria. The most problematic criteria were impact, monitoring sustainability and, to a lesser extent, efficiency.

- Due to the fact that each TFF is drafted using a format imposed for governmental cooperation, the ANGCs or the BFFS, the differences detected in evaluability are very logical and depend on: bilateral cooperation project, general ANGC programme, ANGC programme in Belgium ('North' actions), ANGC programme in the Southern countries, BFFS country programme and BFFS project. Each of these intervention types has comparative advantages for the evaluability of one or other of the criteria. However, none of these intervention types can be evaluated for all the criteria.

- The less well-documented evaluability issues and the areas that limit evaluability or make it difficult/impossible to evaluate are:
  - the expectations of the beneficiaries;
  - the adequate financing of the monitoring-evaluation system;
  - the consideration of the cross-cutting themes in such a way that the results for these themes can be evaluated; more specifically, the themes of gender (except in cases such as education, where disaggregated measures have long been traditional) and the environment;
  - Financial sustainability; monitoring the context, risks and results and the takeover of operations by the local partner after the end of the intervention.
  - Impact, within the meaning of the definition in the DAC Glossary;
  - impact in the sense of the results that can be attributed to the intervention (quasi-experimental or mixed methods).
  - impact for each experimental method (none of the files consulted provided for a monitoring mechanism within a counterfactual group). It is true that the cost of applying such methods makes it difficult to roll them out to all interventions. This means that the interventions that this evaluation method will be applied to need to be defined in advance.

- The relevance criterion covers, among other things, the balance between the proposed actions and the priorities. It is not rare for the different stakeholders to have differing opinions about these priorities. Although this is not often the case for governmental cooperation, it is more common when the implementation partner is a trade union organisation or an NGO. One of the roles of these organisations is

---

43 This does not necessarily mean that these themes are not covered or that there are no specific activities to promote gender or the environment. The problem in evaluating the results for these themes is linked to their transversality.
precisely to take a critical look at the nature of the beneficiaries' needs, the global priorities, the governmental policies and the donors.

- The fact that in theory, an intervention can be evaluated based on the information contained in the TFF, does not mean that it can be evaluated in practice, for two reasons:
  - on the one hand, the TFF is a declaration of intentions that will not necessarily materialise.
  - on the other hand, in practice evaluability has additional conditions of its own: security, qualifications of the evaluators, time of year, collaboration between the stakeholders, authorisation from local authorities, etc.

- The use of national (from the Poverty-Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)) or international (malnutrition rate, for example) indicators can be difficult for 'project'-type interventions for those relating to highly specialised subsectors. However, the use of such indicators is much more common in sectors such as education and, to a lesser extent, health, because these areas produce annual national statistics that are often broken down to the lowest administrative level and almost always at gender level.

- One unexpected positive analysis is the fact that the evaluation of effectiveness (results of outputs and outcomes) using the methods recommended in the legal and regulatory texts (baseline monitoring of SMART indicators with target values) is generally possible and provided for in the TFFs.
6. Pre-conditions for evaluation

6.1. General conditions

6.1.1. Guaranteeing the common understanding by all stakeholders of the notion of intervention and an unequivocal definition of the terms and concepts used.

The concept of cooperation intervention must be understood in its broadest sense and must include 'isolated individual project'-type interventions, the projects within the programme, the country programmes, the sector-based programmes, the funds, the grant programmes, participation in joint programmes, etc.

For all interventions of a higher level than the 'isolated individual project' type, we recommend using the so-called overlapping logical framework approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General programme</th>
<th>Country sub programmes, multi-component interventions or funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>, general objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes, specific objective</td>
<td>Impact, general objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs, intermediary results</td>
<td>Outcomes, specific objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs, intermediary results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities specific to the general programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities specific to the country sub-programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources specific to the general programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resources specific to the country sub-programme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: ‘Overlapping logical framework’ approach**

The notions of impact, outcomes and output must be understood as they are explained in table 1 (point 3.4, page 27).
It is also useful to have an unequivocal definition of the other terms and concepts used, as proposed in chapter 3.

6.1.2. The technical and financial file for the intervention is available

It is difficult to plan the evaluation of an intervention without a technical and financial file or an equivalent document.

In chapter 7 of this study, we propose a standard TFF that takes account of what we consider to be the minimum evaluability requirements.

6.1.3. Evaluation is a planned stage in the intervention management cycle

Planning an evaluation means envisaging its type (self-evaluation, internal, external or independent evaluation), its timing (ex ante, mid-term, final or ex post), its subject, its objectives and its scope.

The fact that no evaluation is planned does not prevent one being carried out, but causes problems such as the reconstruction of the baseline data, the subsequent agreement of the stakeholders to the principle of an evaluation or the financing of the evaluation.

The budget reserved for the evaluation should be proportional to the expressed ambitions. Although the evaluation is an independent and ad hoc activity, it should still be linked to the monitoring and results-based management system.

6.1.4. The TFF provides for a monitoring system

The aim of a monitoring system is to generate information that will make it possible first of all to manage the intervention with a view to achieving the expected results, and then to evaluate the intervention according to the five DAC criteria. We will return to the conditions specific to these five criteria in the paragraphs dedicated to them. Such a system cannot be improvised. It is important to calibrate, then to implement and use the data it generates with a view to results-based management and, if applicable, to ensure the continuity of the system after the donor's departure. Monitoring should not be limited to the results indicators; it also involves the context and development of the intervention, the occurrence (or not) of risks - whether anticipated or not - and the external conditions. Monitoring also includes the missions carried out at the initiative of the donor or the head office of the implementation organisation in Belgium. Monitoring involves a budget that may be reduced if indicators collected by the statistics institutes of the partner country, joint studies or studies carried out by other donors are used. The obligation for ANGCs to carry out joint contextual studies from now on serves this purpose.

6.1.5. The TFF should contain an analysis of the stakeholders, including the beneficiaries and local partners

The stakeholder analysis, with a level of detail appropriate to the nature of the intervention, is an essential element of the response to a number of evaluation questions. This analysis concerns the interest – favourable or unfavourable – that each stakeholder is likely to develop in relation to the intervention and the extent to which they will contribute or resist.

The stakeholders can be classified into several categories:
• the donor, with their head office in Brussels and a representation in the developing country;
• the implementation organisation, with their head office in Belgium and a possible representation in the country of intervention;
• the local partner, whose primary role must be to act as an intermediary between the organisation implementing the programme and the beneficiary;
• the direct beneficiaries who benefit from the outputs;
• the direct and/or indirect beneficiaries who benefit from the outcomes
• the end beneficiaries who benefit from the impacts.

Is not always easy to make a clear distinction between the three levels of beneficiary. It is relatively easy in predominantly capacity-development interventions, where trained individuals are the direct beneficiaries, the institution where they work is the indirect beneficiary and the clients/users of this institution are the end beneficiaries. The distinction is less useful in predominantly ‘infrastructure’-based interventions of which the only real beneficiaries are the users (of the bridge, the distribution network, the electricity connection, the drainage network, etc.).

The local partner (or part of its personnel) may also be a beneficiary, depending on the nature of the intervention. Likewise, the target group may consist of one or more levels of beneficiary.

In any event, we recommend distinguishing as many stakeholders as possible. There are several techniques available for analysing stakeholders. We suggest using the double-entry matrix which groups stakeholders together according to their interest in the intervention and their decision-making power in the intervention (stakeholder mapping)44. Depending on the classification in the matrix, the method recommends four different management methods: engage closely and influence actively, keep satisfied, keep informed and monitor with minimum effort.

![Double-entry matrix of stakeholders](image)

**Table 3: Stakeholder analysis and management**

As with any activity, the management of stakeholders has a cost that should be passed on to the intervention budget.

---

44 File on "Stakeholder Analysis" taken from the training module of the FAO and the European Union on "Collaboration and Advocacy Techniques".
Finally, the stakeholder analysis is also a means of justifying the choice of local partner and beneficiaries.

6.1.6. Duration and detailed planning of the intervention

Not only the duration, but also the planning of the intervention are essential elements of the evaluation.

The duration of an intervention should normally be determined by the level of ambition of the objectives and the planning of the anticipated activities, taking account of their difficulties, the available resources and the specific context (cultural season, school year, etc.). An agricultural project is obviously more dependent on the seasonal calendar than a construction project, but the construction of a school must also preferably be completed before the start of the school year.

For understandable programming reasons, the duration of interventions is limited/fixed to three years for ANGC interventions and five years for BFFS interventions. Only bilateral projects have more room for manoeuvre. As a result, it is not always possible to adapt the intervention planning to the nature of the planned activities and the level of ambition of the objectives. In such cases, we recommend adopting the inverse strategy and adapting the level of ambition to the planned duration.

The total duration of an intervention is directly relevant in the efficiency evaluation. A delayed project means that it will have to be extended or that not all the planned results will be achieved by the planned end date. This extension has a cost, which therefore directly affects efficiency.

Unless mentioned during the identification of phase 1, recourse to a phase 2 or another donor to finally achieve the objectives of phase 1 in twice as much time and with twice as much money considerably decreases the overall efficiency.

We recommend using a Gantt chart for planning and for monitoring activities:\n
"A Gantt chart, commonly used in project management, is one of the most popular and useful ways of showing the progress of intervention activities. On the left of the chart is a list of the activities and along the top is a time scale most suitable for the intervention. Each activity is represented by a bar; the position and length of the bar reflects the start date, duration and end date of the activity. This allows you to see at a glance:

• what the various activities are
• when each activity begins and ends
• how long each activity is scheduled to last
• where activities overlap with other activities, and by how much
• the start and end date of the whole intervention

To summarize, a Gantt chart shows you what has to be done (the activities) and when (the schedule)“.

6.1.7. The intervention budget is detailed and structured

The budget information required to assess efficiency is described in point 6.4.

---

45 Adapted from http://www.gantt.com/ and other internet sources.
The general principle for preparing an intervention budget is that an activity that does not have sufficient financial resources will not take place, even if it is explicitly planned.

We recommend the format adopted for governmental cooperation, which distinguishes:

- one aspect containing the items attributable to activities and to very specific results; and

- one aspect for general resources, containing items not attributable to specific results, for example, personnel costs, investment costs, operational costs, training costs and monitoring, audit and evaluation costs. In other words, the recurrent costs, inherent to any organisation, that cannot be covered by activity-based financing; or a budget for general resources used for all activities: investments, personnel, operations, monitoring and evaluation.

Only this way of working will make it possible to evaluate the efficiency criterion which, let's recall, addresses the quality/price ratio of results.

6.1.8. Provide for a specific budget for monitoring and evaluation

One of the conditions necessary for the implementation of an evaluation is of course the availability of a budget for this activity. There must also be a budget for monitoring activities (definition of indicators and establishment of their baseline value, monitoring results indicators, monitoring the development of the context and monitoring the potential risks). This may encompass all monitoring activities, but a budget broken down per activity and taking account of the necessary human resources, could contribute to their concrete implementation.

We think that it is important to consider:

- setting up a monitoring system;
- determining the baseline value of the selected indicators;
- monitoring the results indicators;
- monitoring the development of the context;
- monitoring the risks and suppositions
- financial monitoring;
- the monitoring and technical backstopping missions;
- the progress or mid-term evaluations; and
- the final evaluations.

We also think that the monitoring and evaluation budget must be 'reserved', i.e. that it cannot be modified or reallocated to other activities except in exceptional circumstances and with the unanimous agreement of the stakeholders.

6.1.9. The risks must be analysed

Risk Analysis is defined by the DAC as “an analysis or an assessment of factors (called assumptions in the logframe) that affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention’s objectives. A detailed examination of the potential unwanted and negative consequences to human life, health, property, or the environment posed by development interventions; a systematic process to provide information regarding such undesirable consequences; the
process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks”.

The risks must be analysed because by definition they are outside the scope of action of the intervention, but can still influence it.

The identification, monitoring and management of risks are subjects that straddle the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluator must be able to determine whether all the risks have been identified and whether their probability and importance have been assessed (relevance), whether they have been managed so that they have the least possible effect on the results (effectiveness) and at the least cost (efficiency).

We recommend dealing with risks and suppositions at the same time, because each supposition contains the risk that it will not materialise. This is in fact the same situation, described positively for suppositions and negatively for risks.

**During the formulation of the intervention** we also recommend classifying the risks in a matrix showing the probability that the risks will occur (or the non-materialisation of the supposition) on one side and the degree of importance of the consequences on the other.

If there is a high probability that the risk will occur and the consequences of it occurring are serious, the intervention will be a net loss for the partner country and the DGD and we can therefore state that it would be inappropriate to start it.

Similarly, an intervention will not be relevant if a supposition has a very low chance of materialising and this non-materialisation would have serious consequences for the intervention (previously the ‘fatal supposition’).

The following matrix gives the different attitudes to be adopted depending on the classification of risks by their probability and consequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant consequence</th>
<th>Low probability</th>
<th>Medium probability</th>
<th>High probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low consequence</td>
<td>1. Accept the risk</td>
<td>2. Accept the risk</td>
<td>3. Monitor and take measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium consequence</td>
<td>2. Accept the risk</td>
<td>3. Monitor and take measures</td>
<td>4. Modify the TFF to reduce the probability or consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant consequence</td>
<td>3. Monitor and take measures</td>
<td>4. Modify the TFF to reduce the probability or consequence</td>
<td>5. Reject the intervention proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Analysis and risk management table**

A TFF presented to the Administration for approval and financing should no longer contain level 4 or 5 risks.

Only level 3 risks should be discussed in the TFF.

---

46 We strongly recommend reading chapter 2.4. ‘Risks’ in ‘More Results, Part 1’, BTC June 2013
6.1.10. Other points of note

We suggest that the frequency, content and level of detail of the narrative and financial reports should be standardised or at the very least harmonised. Intervention reports are essential for preparing evaluation missions in the field. Good reports do not replace field missions, which remain essential for obtaining an objective view of the perceptions/conclusions on the basis of triangulation. However, accurate written information and figures available before the mission itself generally make it possible to shorten the mission and reduce the disturbance to the normal operation of the intervention that an evaluation inevitably causes.

Choosing existing geographical limits and themes/sectors managed locally by a single administrative entity facilitates the evaluation by providing access to local statistics and limiting the number of stakeholders to be consulted.

6.2. Preconditions for the relevance evaluation

The relevance criterion answers the question of whether it is worth intervening in the field in question, in the geographical area in question, with the stakeholders in question, with the partners in question and for the period in question, in view of the many contextual elements. Relevance is not absolute or settled once and for all, as the context evolves over time. An intervention that was relevant when it was formulated may no longer be so during the mid-term or final evaluation. An initial relevance evaluation is carried out ex ante, before funding is granted, but the relevance evaluation remains important during and after the intervention.

6.2.1. The objectives of the development action are clearly described

The relevance criterion examines the objectives of the development action with regard to the different situations, priorities and needs. The relevance evaluation is therefore impossible if these objectives are not correctly described.

We recommend that an intervention's objectives correspond to the identified problems and to the determined development opportunities, taking account of points 6.2.2 to 6.2.8 below. If they are not determined in a ‘SMART’ way, it must at least be possible to give them achievement indicators that are themselves SMART.

As the general programme of an ANGC is considered to be an intervention, we encourage these stakeholders to have more realistic and more specific objectives; for most of them, this means that they need to focus more on a theme, a sector, a country or a type of partner or beneficiary.

6.2.2. The general context must be described and its development monitored

The TFF must contain a description of the contextual elements within and outside the intervention.

One way of doing this is to carry out a SWOT analysis.

---

47 The three instruments generally used for evaluations are the reading of documents, individual or group interviews with stakeholders and on-site observation.
A SWOT analysis (Strengths – Weaknesses – Opportunities – Threats) is a strategy analysis tool. It combines the study of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention with the study of the opportunities and threats in its environment. As such, it is instrumental in development strategy formulation and, in the case of evaluation, in helping to assess relevance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive aspects</th>
<th>Negative aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal factors</strong></td>
<td><strong>External factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: SWOT analysis table*

The aim of the analysis is to take into account internal and external factors, maximising the potential of strengths and opportunities, while minimising the impact of weaknesses and threats.

Strengths are positive internal factors that are controlled by the intervention, and which provide foundations for the future.

In contrast to the strengths, weaknesses are negative internal elements, which are controlled by the intervention, and for which key improvements can be made.

Opportunities are the external positive possibilities which can be taken advantage of in the context of contemporary strengths and weaknesses. They are often beyond the influence of the intervention, or at the margins.

Threats are difficulties, impediments, or external limitations which can prevent or impede the results of the intervention. Threats are often beyond the influence of the intervention, or at its margin.

As SWOT analysis is based on the participants’ judgements, it is subjective and qualitative by nature. This analysis should be carried out with representatives of all the stakeholders.

The SWOT analysis is generally not sufficient for providing a full description of the general context. It can be supplemented or possibly replaced by a narrative contextual analysis inspired by a similar exercise carried out by a different (bilateral or multilateral) donor or, even better, jointly with the donor community and the partner country.

The contextual analysis does not remove the need for the more detailed analysis of the other points below. Furthermore, its development must also be monitored, as the context is by its very nature variable over time.

**6.2.3. The expectations of the beneficiaries (and the other stakeholders) are described**

The ‘OOIP’ method of planning interventions by objectives traditionally gave a significant role to the stakeholders, who attended a participatory workshop to create a ‘problem tree’, an ‘objectives tree’, a specific objective and a strategy for achieving it.

This method is no longer systematically applied by all stakeholders.

---

However, we recommend that there is a description not only of the expectations of the stakeholders, but also of the way in which this information was collected and used.

It is important to ensure that problems are discussed with the stakeholders, as otherwise there is a risk of them losing interest and thus of the intervention failing.

It is also important to describe exactly how and at what stage the different stakeholders were or will be involved, if the evaluators are to be able to make a judgement on relevance.

If there is agreement between the stakeholders, this must be mentioned as it is an important part of relevance. Defining the area where the parties’ interests converge is difficult and important, as it is the source of all misunderstandings, whether accidental or intentional.

All the differing viewpoints between or with the stakeholders must be considered as a risk (point 6.1.9) and can often partly explain the failure/weakness of an intervention’s results, even if these different viewpoints do not always result in failure.

**6.2.4. The way in which the objectives correspond to the global priorities is described**

Global priorities should be understood as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), but the term is subject to interpretation. We could add other priorities, such as the fight against climate change, the implementation of the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action and the Buzan Forum.

For files under preparation, we propose ensuring that the objectives of the intervention do not go against the global priorities, as defined in the ‘post 2015’ sustainable development objectives. In any case, it is a good idea to bear them in mind.

While waiting for a definitive version, below is an indicative list of the objectives as currently proposed by the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals:

**Goal 1:** End poverty in all its forms everywhere.

**Goal 2:** End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture.

**Goal 3:** Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.

**Goal 4:** Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all.

**Goal 5:** Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

**Goal 6:** Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all.

**Goal 7:** Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all.

**Goal 8:** Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.

**Goal 9:** Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation.

**Goal 10:** Reduce inequality within and among countries.

**Goal 11:** Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.

**Goal 12:** Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns.
**Goal 13:** Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts.

**Goal 14:** Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development.

**Goal 15:** Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.

**Goal 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

**Goal 17:** Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

Although it is clear that the intervention objective(s) must not systematically be part of one or more of the global objectives below, it is just as clear that the interventions should not go against one or more of the global objectives. The assessment of relevance therefore requires written evidence that there is no contradiction between the objectives of the intervention and the global objectives.

### 6.2.5. The policies of the partner country are described and critically analysed

This description and critical analysis are necessary for allowing the evaluation to assess the relevance of the intervention with regard to the policies of the partner country in the sector(s) in question and, more generally, with regard to the PRSP or the equivalent document. The policies can be subject to change, after the creation of a new government, for example. In this respect, the development of the partner country’s policies must be monitored and any modification of these policies must be taken into account in the risk analysis.

### 6.2.6. The TFF describes the way in which Belgian strategy papers have been taken into account

This description is necessary to allow the evaluation to assess the relevance of the intervention with regard to Belgian strategies in the sectors and/or themes affected by the intervention. As most of the cross-cutting themes have been the subject of a strategy paper, the information contained here on these cross-cutting themes will be supplemented by that in point 6.2.7 below. Belgian strategies are also subject to change, but it is much rarer for these changes to have an effect on the relevance of the interventions.

The rare cases in which the intervention is the result of a political decision taken in collaboration or together with a political authority in a partner country should also be mentioned here.

The same applies if the intervention has taken account of the recommendations of strategic evaluations approved by a management response.

### 6.2.7. The possible interaction between the intervention and all the cross-cutting themes is mentioned

Similarly to the global objectives, the TFF must contain information that allows the evaluators to assess whether the intervention has a negative effect on any of the cross-cutting themes or priority themes. As a reminder, in accordance with the law of 19 March, this applies to:
• the consolidation of society. (Development and consolidation of democracy and the rule of law, including good governance).

• human rights, including the rights of the child. (Respect for human dignity, human rights in all their dimensions and fundamental freedoms, with particular emphasis on the fight against all forms of discrimination).

• decent and sustainable work. (Promotion of inclusive fair and sustainable economic growth, giving priority to local entrepreneurship, the social economy and the International Labour Organisation Agenda for decent work).

• the gender dimension, which strives for the empowerment of women and gender equality in society.

• the protection of the environment and natural resources, including the fight against climate change, drought and worldwide deforestation.

This is particularly valid for gender and environmental themes, which by law must be included in all cooperation interventions.

Apart from gender, the environment and good governance, certain cross-cutting themes must be examined more specifically to comply with international reporting requirements and to facilitate the encoding of markers in the ODA.be database. These are:

• trade development,
• desertification,
• biodiversity,
• mitigation of climate change,
• adaptation to climate change,
• rights of the child,
• HIV-AIDS, and
• reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health.

We examine the cross-cutting themes under the relevance criterion because we believe that an intervention that would damage one of these cross-cutting themes in any way would not be relevant, as it would contradict the spirit of the law.

In our opinion, this absence of results that go against one of the cross-cutting themes does not necessarily mean that they must systematically be made an important secondary objective (DAC 1 marker), or the principal objective of the intervention (DAC 2 marker); while conversely the attribution of a DAC 2 or 1 marker requires the principal or secondary objective to expressly focus on a cross-cutting theme. (See point 3.6).

As a reminder, in BFFS projects and programmes, it is essential to identify indicators relating to cross-cutting gender, environmental or climate change themes and thus, beyond these indicators, the result (outputs and outcomes).

### 6.3. Preconditions for the effectiveness evaluation

**A point of comparison or reference is required in order to observe the changes and impacts (Bonnet et al., 2004):**

Compare the "before the intervention" situation with that observed "after the intervention". In concrete terms, this involves repeating comparable surveys before and after the intervention;
Compare the "without an intervention" situation with the "with an intervention" situation at a given time. This requires a survey of two samples of similar people or communities in the same area, one of which has taken part in the intervention (sample of beneficiaries), unlike the other (control sample).  

6.3.1. A three-level results-based logical approach

The effectiveness evaluation involves assessing the achievement of the planned results at output and outcome level. It requires the presence of a logical results-based approach, demonstrated by:

- the distinction of (at least) three levels of result: output (immediate results, products, etc.), outcomes (short- or medium-term results, achievements, specific objective(s), etc.) and impact (long-term results, general objective(s)).

- the existence of an (admittedly theoretical) causal relationship from one level to another of the logical chain: resources (financial, material and human) → activities → outputs → outcomes → impact.

- A description of the first two levels of result (outputs and outcomes).

The intervention logic must be explained, stage by stage, with no omissions. For this purpose, we recommend including in (or annexing to) the TFF the problem tree and the objective tree which the intervention formulators used as inspiration when creating this intervention logic.

6.3.2. The outputs and outcomes must have indicators

The outputs and outcomes indicators must be as ‘SMART’ as possible in order to facilitate the evaluation. (See point 3.2).

These indicators must have a baseline value that allows progress to be measured against the first two levels of results (outputs and outcomes).

The notions of baseline value and target value apply differently to the quantitative and qualitative indicators. In both cases, however, the absence of a starting value and a target value makes it more difficult, if not impossible, to make an objective evaluation of the progress made and the degree to which the specified aim has been achieved. Setting the baseline values of the indicators is crucial for the credibility of the effectiveness conclusions and, as we will see subsequently, the efficiency, sustainability and impact conclusions.

More specifically:

- the baseline values must make it possible to assess the performance of the intervention with regard to the initial situation

- The baseline values must be specific to the intervention, i.e. they must meet the needs and interests of the key people involved.

- The baseline values must clearly describe the situation before the intervention; their (low) level helps to justify (and ensure the relevance of) the intervention.
Theoretical evaluability conditions

- The baseline values must allow an assessment of the degree and quality of the changes made thanks to the intervention.

- The indicators must be verifiable: the source of the data must be known and it must be possible to collect the data at a reasonable cost and effort level. The use of indicators that are part of an existing local system reduces the monitoring costs and makes it easier to establish comparisons between the results obtained within and outside the area of intervention.

These indicators should also have target values to be achieved every year, mid-term and at the end of the intervention. The progress of (any) qualitative indicators must be independently verifiable.

**The determination of indicators and their baseline and target values after different periods of time is an important exercise that can rarely be carried out during the preparatory phase of an intervention. It is therefore important to specify that the indicators and the different values given to them in the initial TFF are indicative and provisional.**

**The definitive indicators and the initial and target values will be established at the start of the implementation phase by means of participatory workshops, surveys or other information sources.**

As a reminder, data that has already been collected locally should be used whenever possible. This includes not only national statistics used mainly to measure the outcomes and even the impact, but also local data such as enrolment, attendance and examination success registers in schools or patient data from health centres in the area of intervention. In both these examples, the data is also broken down at gender level.

Some statistics are not collected annually, but rather during national surveys such as censuses or poverty surveys. It is more difficult to use these surveys for regular monitoring or for evaluation, but we nevertheless suggest seeing whether it is possible to use this system before inventing another.

**6.3.3. Indicators also make it possible to measure the expected results with regard to the cross-cutting themes**

If a cross-cutting theme serves as a principal or important secondary objective of an intervention, the general reasoning explained above applies to both the intervention logic and the different indicators, their initial value and their various target values.

**6.4.4. The influence of the risks and suppositions on the results is anticipated and assessed**

Logic has it that the occurrence of a risk, even if is planned and well managed and its consequences are low, leads to a reduction in the results originally anticipated for an ideal situation in which no risk materialised. As a result, the risk analysis, which is corrected at the start of the intervention, must ideally contain information on the effect the occurrence of risks has on the target values of the different indicators.

**6.4. Preconditions for the efficiency evaluation**

The definition of efficiency undoubtedly makes it the evaluation criterion most subject to interpretation. 'Economically' is an expression subject to a wide range of interpretations.
and it is not because a result was achievable for a certain amount of money in a certain project that it can/must necessarily be achieved for the same amount in a different project, in a different country or to achieve a different objective.

The efficiency assessment is not based on a simple cost-results ratio. This criterion is also based on the determinants of this report: the duration of the interventions, the modalities and the management costs as well as the flexibility in redefining the results, the activities and the allocation of the resources.

Ideally, the possibility of a comparative study (benchmarking) should be examined, either of a similar intervention financed by a different donor working in the same country, or a similar intervention (co-)financed by Belgium in a similar country.

**6.4.1. Each result has a specific budget**

According to the very definition of the criterion, in order to make a decision on efficiency, it is important to know the planned budget and the real cost of each result. To do this, both the budget and the financial reporting must be formulated in this way.

The truth about the real cost of the results also requires a proportional fraction of the management costs, the local representation costs, the head office costs and even the administrative costs of the donor to be taken into account in the calculation; all these elements make it difficult to objectively assess efficiency.

The presentation of the budget for governmental cooperation interventions as proposed by the BTC seems (the most) appropriate for evaluating this criterion (see 6.1.7). As the efficiency evaluation verifies whether the results have been achieved economically, it is important to see the anticipated expenses for achieving each result in the TFF. On this point, the OSE shares the views of the DGD financial control service which, in an internal paper, suggested checking whether a link can be established between the budget, the activities carried out and the results achieved.

The law of 19 June 2011 implementing and modifying the law of 19 January creating a Belgian Fund for Food Security seems the clearest in its definition of the different forms of cost:

- The overheads are the costs associated with the achievement of the organisation's corporate purpose and, although affected by the implementation of the project, are neither reportable nor directly attributable to the project budget.

- The management costs are reportable costs associated with the management, supervision, coordination, monitoring and evaluation required for the implementation of the project.

- The operational costs are those associated with the project results and represent expenditure inherent to the activities carried out. They cannot include any type of management cost.

The BFFS provides more detail on these definitions in its procedures manual:

- operational costs are costs that arise in the context of a project; they can be directly attributed to the implementation of activities and, as a result, directly benefit the target groups. These costs cease to exist as soon as the programme stops or reaches its conclusion. All the costs in this category are linked to a... result of a specific intervention. Contrary to what is proposed by the BFFS, we are in favour of including the cost of preparing the interventions in the management costs. In fact, as these are costs incurred during the formulation of interventions - mission expenses, logistics and personnel costs - they cannot be attributed to a specific result. The same reasoning applies to costs linked to the coordination or representation offices in the Southern countries.
• Management costs: these costs result specifically from the implementation of a project, but do not directly benefit the target groups; they include the costs associated with management, coordination, evaluation, follow-up and monitoring. These charges are directly and uniquely associated with an intervention insofar as they cease to exist as soon as the project stops or reaches its conclusion.

6.4.2. The duration of interventions is fixed and the activities planned

In order to make a decision on efficiency, it is important to know the duration of the intervention. An intervention planned to last three years and which actually achieves its objectives in three years will be much more efficient than an intervention which achieves its objectives in five years, because in the latter case it will be necessary to finance an additional two years of operation.

A comparison of the activity plan produced during formulation and possibly consolidated at the start of the intervention and the activity reports must show whether the intervention is delayed, on target or ahead of schedule on certain activities.

6.4.3. The TFF describes the way in which the intervention will be managed

We recommend result-based management (see 3.7). Results-based management is a dynamic method that allows:

• the modification of activities and of the allocation of resources (including budgetary resources) in accordance with the progress made in achieving results, the circumstances and the possible occurrence of risks.

• the possible (re)definition of the intermediary results (output) if their nature or the target values of their indicators are revealed to be too ambitious during execution.

Redefining the results at a higher level (outcomes & impact) is not normally within the remit of the people who directly implement the intervention. Such a modification can only be made by applying the recommendations of an intermediary intervention and/or with the approval of higher bodies (Partners' Committee, donors, head office missions, etc.) An evaluation would have no meaning if it did not allow any modifications to the TFF with a view to applying its recommendations. On the other hand, any modification of the desired results outside an evaluation period would no longer allow the evaluator to comment objectively on effectiveness or on the efficiency, sustainability and impact of the intervention (see points 4.4.4. and 6.4.).

The management method also includes a description of the way in which the responsibilities are shared at administrative, technical and financial level between the national personnel, the international personnel of the intervention, the local intermediaries, the local representations and the head offices in Belgium. The degree of flexibility given to each management team with regard to modifying the activities and budget posts must also be specified.

6.4.4. The TFF contains an estimation of the cost that the occurrence of the risks or the non-achievement of the suppositions may have on the results

The occurrence of a risk directly affects efficiency in the sense that either the achievement of the same result will cost more, or the planned budget will not allow the achievement of the whole of the originally planned result. As a result, the risk analysis, which is corrected at the start of the intervention, must ideally contain information on
the effect the occurrence of risks has on the costs of achieving the target values of the different indicators.

### 6.5. Preconditions for the sustainability evaluation

By definition, sustainability in the strict sense of the word can only be evaluated once an intervention has ended. However, we believe that an intervention TFF can and must contain information that allows an assessment of the chances of sustainability of the intervention results after the intervention has ended.

The community of donors and evaluators make a distinction between the notions of financial/economic sustainability, technical sustainability, organisational/operational sustainability, institutional sustainability, socio-cultural sustainability and environmental sustainability. Sometimes even political sustainability is analysed. These different elements are closely linked: an item of equipment is technically sustainable if it remains in its packaging; it is not economically sustainable if this is due to a lack of resources to operate it; it is not socio-culturally sustainable if its use goes against local practices. **We therefore consider that the element with the lowest specific level of sustainability determines the general sustainability of the intervention.**

In addition to the DAC\textsuperscript{53} definition of sustainability, it is also important to take account of the definition of sustainable development provided by law\textsuperscript{54}. Both definitions have certain points of convergence, but they are not identical. Both definitions are legal, as one is expressly contained in law and the other qualifies a DAC evaluation criterion, also mentioned in law.

The preponderance of the different aspects that determine sustainability varies according to the nature of the interventions. The sustainability criterion is evaluated differently depending on whether it is an 'investment'-type intervention, a 'capacity-development' intervention or combined interventions which mix these different aspects to differing degrees: investments to support capacity development or capacity development to make investments work properly.

Some interventions start from a 'non-developed' situation and end with a 'developed' situation, for example, in a project whose aim is to link two villages by constructing a bridge, this bridge is normally complete at the end of the intervention. The sustainability evaluation will focus primarily on maintenance planning and the financial and human resources allocated to this maintenance (through a toll system, user contributions, a bridge management committee, etc.).

In most interventions, however, the donor helps out with the development process but withdraws well before the target region and/or the target group are fully developed. The sustainability evaluation then focuses mainly on examining the continuity of the financial, material and human resources.

For the effects to continue after the end of the donor intervention, the structure of the intervention generally has to be maintained, the local personnel must be fully trained, this personnel must continue to receive a salary, the means to maintain and eventually replace the supplied equipment must remain available, the environmental resources used by the project must be replaced at the same rate they are used, etc. Sustainability is therefore something that is prepared during and even before the intervention. Just as there are results indicators, there are also objectively verifiable sustainability or non-sustainability indicators. Fortunately, most of these tools can be used 'ex ante', on the basis of the results of the formulation and description of the intervention. If it turns out
that an intervention is not sustainable once it is completed, then it is generally too late to act.

Generally speaking:

- The duration of the intervention (and the number of phases) must be linked to the degree of ambition of the objectives. Any major extension to the duration of the intervention or any plans for a phase 2 or 3 that was not provided for at the start, is a statement of failure with regard to sustainability. This way of working also gradually and subtly leads to the target group becoming dependent on external aid.

- Sustainability is not governed by a simple declaration of intent, such as: "the local party undertakes to take the institutional, administrative and budgetary measures necessary to guarantee the continuation of the activities after the end of the Belgian intervention." The TFF must allow the evaluator to verify the extent to which the local party can/will be able to respect this commitment.

- Exit strategies that take account of the duration and the planned end of the external financing must be put in place as soon as possible, in collaboration with the target/beneficiary groups, and must be monitored on a regular basis. The end of the intervention must be planned. The intervention must have an exit strategy that provides for the gradual reduction of all its external resources until they are completely removed at the end of the project.

- Integrated actions that take account of the context, the different higher levels (regional, national, etc.) and the other development stakeholders working in the area and in the sector of intervention offer a greater guarantee of sustainability than isolated actions. This is due to the fact that they cover several sectors, several target groups, several entry points, several levels and several types of activity. Integrated actions are also more likely to create synergy.

- Finally, even more attention will be paid to the sustainability criterion in interventions that aim to 'rehabilitate'. In fact, the notion of rehabilitation frequently includes the objective of 'making something that worked in the past but no longer works, work again'. The determinants of this first clear lack of viability must be analysed and carefully considered in order to avoid a new failure.

6.5.1. The political decision-making process is documented (political sustainability)

The sustainability of an intervention is influenced by the way in which it is integrated into the country's policies or, at the very least, its neutrality in relation to a possible change of policy. In the traditional sectors of Belgian intervention, it is not rare for new governments in beneficiary countries to change their priorities regarding, for example, free basic education, the development of technical education, the structure of the health system, agricultural subsidies and customs duties on the import of materials and equipment. This type of change affects relevance if it occurs at the start of the intervention, effectiveness and efficiency if it occurs during an intervention and sustainability if it occurs at or after the end of an intervention. The effects on sustainability are the most serious, because they occur at a time when it is difficult to take corrective measures.

Political sustainability can also be affected by Belgian decisions such as a change of priority sector or the withdrawal of the status of priority partner, without a transition phase.
6.5.2. The TFF describes how the partner or beneficiary institution works (institutional sustainability)

Institutional sustainability is important in interventions to develop institutional capacity: decentralisation aid, micro credit bank, non-governmental organisations, other partner institutions, etc. For example, in a project whose aim is to improve the services provided to the population by developing the capacities of an administration, the TFF must explain how this administration will continue to provide the same services once the external financing has ceased.

Institutional sustainability is more likely if the intervention is an integral part of a national programme. One indicator of the risk to sustainability is the presence of an intervention management unit that is administratively and/or physically separate from the administration or the local civil society organisation which will have to take over the tasks of the intervention when the external financing comes to an end\textsuperscript{56}.

The institutional sustainability evaluation will therefore focus mainly on the continuity of the operating resources of the partner structure, i.e. buildings, equipment, personnel and finances. The TFF should therefore contain information on the following points:

6.5.2.1. The installations/buildings that will house the employees implementing the intervention (administrative and technical sustainability).

The importance of this condition obviously varies considerably depending on the nature of the intervention. If buildings are constructed to house the equipment and personnel necessary for the intervention and the continuation of the activities once the external aid ends, the TFF must clearly state the conditions for the delivery-takeover of these buildings.

6.5.2.2. The means of managing the technical equipment and the local technical/scientific personnel (technical sustainability)

Technical sustainability principally involves the continued effects of the technical assistance, i.e. the transmission of knowledge and the transmission of technical resources.

The sustainability of the transferred technical knowledge is determined by the type, duration and timing of the training provided for the local personnel.

We recommend that this personnel should be trained at the start of the intervention and not at or after the end (which would further weaken the local partner after the departure of the technical assistance). The training received must be relevant to the work to be carried out in the future, for example, it must not cover sophisticated equipment that will be inaccessible once the technical assistance has left. Provisions must be in place to ensure that the trained personnel return to their positions within the intervention, whilst retaining their right to progress in their careers. Provision must be made for the technical assistance to pass on their knowledge and technical experience to their national counterparts by being involved as little as possible and less and less in the actual implementation of the intervention. If the technical assistants (TA) act as substitutes, i.e. if they do the work instead of the national personnel, the activities will be considerably reduced, or even abandoned, after they leave.
The theoretical evaluability conditions

The sustainability of the technical equipment provided by the intervention is determined by:

- it remaining available for the intervention. The prerequisite for the sustainability of the technical equipment is obviously that the partner party *ensures that the equipment and materials acquired during the intervention become (or remain) the property of the partner party and assigned to the structures for which they were intended.*

- the restocking of consumables and the provision of the means to carry out maintenance and repairs during and particularly after the end of the intervention. Even if it is well maintained and repaired, the equipment will not last forever or could become obsolete. **Perfect sustainability is therefore only guaranteed if depreciation is anticipated.**

The TFF must therefore mention what happens to the equipment once the external aid ends, who maintains it, who repairs it and how it will be replaced.

It is also important to take account of the fact that a local partner does not generally have the same customs and tax deduction facilities or the same ability to order on the international market as a cooperation organisation based in Belgium.

**6.5.2.3. The method of managing the personnel, furniture and administrative equipment (organisational sustainability)**

The TFF must provide information on the way in which the intervention will be managed and the way in which it will continue once the external financing comes to an end. It must show how the organisational capacities of the people, groups and/or organisations that will take over will be developed, if necessary.

We recommend developing the capacities at different levels: economic groups, local communities, decentralised authorities, etc.

As will also be mentioned in the point below on financial sustainability, the remuneration of the management personnel also has a major effect on organisational sustainability. The lack of a concerted salary policy between donors, the partner State, civil society and international organisation seriously overshadows the continuation of the activities by the management officials. The existence of widespread major salary differences for the same level of skills and experience is a doubly pernicious system, as it neither motivates the local personnel nor encourages them to remain.

Full transparency with regard to the local population in the management of resources is also a factor in organisational sustainability.

**6.5.3. The TFF explains the financing method of the partner (or beneficiary) institution and its activities (financial sustainability)**

We can distinguish:

- on the one hand, the financial resources required for the normal operation of the partner institution, i.e. the resources required to retain the infrastructures, maintain the equipment and pay the personnel; and

- on the other hand, the resources required for the administrative operation and the continuation of the development activities.

An analysis of the intervention budget allows a relatively accurate assessment of financial sustainability. With the exception of the cost of the technical assistance and the
long term investments, the programme budget must be progressively covered by the national budget, particularly and more specifically with regard to the salaries of the local personnel, the operational costs and the depreciation of the equipment and vehicles; this is very rarely included in the budget. The more the donor bears these costs in the last year of the project, the greater the risk to sustainability.

An intervention that pays a salary or a salary supplement to its local personnel must anticipate how these people will be paid once the intervention ends. In our opinion, it is clear that we cannot claim that the intervention is sustainable if the recurrent costs, particularly also the bonuses and salary supplements in addition to the State salaries, cannot be covered by the government's financial contribution, and if it will be necessary to look for financial support from a different source. Ideally, the local personnel should not receive a bonus. If their salary is doubled during the project, is it reasonable to think that they will continue to work with the same enthusiasm as before once the donor withdraws? In fact, apart from any salary increase, the local personnel usually already has substantial advantages thanks to the technical assistance, particularly in terms of equipment, working conditions, per diem, training or study visits abroad.

The financial sustainability of a (micro)credit intervention is determined by economic rules to a greater extent than other interventions. The amount of the interest requested must be enough to cover the management costs (in terms of personnel, materials and premises), the defaults (in the event of death and force majeure) and any inflation-related losses.

Particular attention must be paid to economic profitability, market opportunities and the development of the economic capacities of all the entrepreneurial initiatives promoted.

6.5.4. The intervention fits within the socio-cultural environment in which it is implemented (socio-cultural sustainability)

These conditions are real; we could mention the examples of secular prohibitions and rights linked to community structures, water consumption, land use, agricultural periods, the distribution of tasks between men and women, local public holidays, religious festivals, etc.

More generally, the TFF must show how it takes account of the local context, at social, cultural and religious levels. However, it is important to bear in mind that the intervention aims to improve this context, particularly for women, disadvantaged groups and the poorest section of the population.

The TFF must also provide information on the way in which the different stakeholders, including the traditional leaders and the end beneficiaries, both men and women, have been, are and will be involved in the creation, planning and monitoring of the intervention's implementation.

6.5.5. The TFF specifies the environmental resources required for the intervention (nature, volumes used, frequency, renewal rate, etc.) and their potential impact on climate, desertification and biodiversity.

As every intervention consumes energy and other environmental resources, it places pressure on the environment. However, some interventions by their very nature have a greater level of interaction with the environment: agriculture and farming, water and sanitation, and forestry. These activities have a significant effect on erosion and soil quality, as well as on the level and quality of the groundwater system. The net result of the intervention must be neutral or positive for it to be sustainable.
The intervention TFF must show how the natural resources are used, valued and managed, taking account of their replenishment rate.

We strongly recommend using the KLIMOS toolbox: (http://www.vub.ac.be/klimostoolkit/documents?tid_2%5B%5D=29).

*The toolkit provides information in support of environmental mainstreaming in development cooperation. The toolkit consists of two parts:*

- **A Screening Note that consists of a set of guiding questions**
  - to assess the environmental impacts of development co-operation interventions (e.g. projects) on the environment; and
  - to assess the environmental risks faced by the development co-operation interventions (e.g. projects).

- **A Database that contains environmental information, organized along three access criteria: country, theme and sector.**

### 6.6. Impact

As a reminder, we consider 'impact in the strict sense of the word', to be the DAC glossary definition and in the more general sense, to be the description in the correlation table in point 3.4.

There are three main types of approach for measuring impact, each with its own strengths and weaknesses:

- **The quantitative (quanti) or scientific, experimental or quasi-experimental method** is based on data from experiments and/or surveys. This data is processed using cutting-edge econometric and statistical tools. This method allows a conclusion to be made on attribution, i.e. the proportion of the results (outcomes and impact) that can actually be attributed to the intervention. It is not very effective if we try to explain how and why the results were obtained, nor does it look into the unexpected results.

- **The qualitative (quali) or mixed method** relies on an inductive approach, with the focus on key informers and an analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data collected. This method allows a conclusion to be made on the intervention’s contribution - sometimes even the degree of contribution - to the impacts. It allows an explanation of how and why the expected and unexpected results were obtained.

- **The participative (parti) method** is based on the involvement and participation of the key stakeholders, including the beneficiaries, at all levels of the intervention in order to determine what the intervention changed (the most). Although it is less thorough in demonstrating the impact, this method provides a better explanation of the unexpected results and is very useful for improving practices.

The three methods actually require relatively similar evaluation conditions.

#### 6.6.1. The TFF describes the expected impact

By expected impacts, we also mean the other qualifications of the same concept mentioned in point 3.4, i.e. general objective of the intervention, long-term effects brought about by a development action.
6.6.2. The impact (or the impacts) has (have) indicators

To facilitate the evaluation, the impact indicators must be as ‘SMART’ as possible (see point 3.2).

These indicators must have a baseline value that allows the measurement of the progress achieved at the third level of results (impact(s))\(^{38}\); i.e.

- **Baseline values must allow performance to be tracked against the situation prior to the intervention.**
- **Baseline values must be specific to the intervention. They must meet the needs and interests of key stakeholders.**
- **Baseline primary/secondary data must clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention; their level of quality provides reasons for the intervention (and its relevance).**
- **Baseline values must make it possible to measure the degree and quality of change during implementation.**
- **Indicators must have means of verification; Data sources are known. Data is available at reasonable cost and effort.** The use of indicators that are part of an existing local system reduces the monitoring costs and makes it easier to establish comparisons between the results obtained within and outside the area of intervention.

These indicators must also have target values to be achieved mid-term, at the end of the intervention and in the longer term. The progress of (any) qualitative indicators must be independently verifiable\(^{59}\).

As with the first two levels of the results chain, the determination of the indicators, their baseline values and their target values after different periods of time, is an important exercise that can rarely be carried out during the preparatory phase of an intervention. It is therefore important to specify that the indicators and the different values given to them in the initial TFF are indicative and provisional.

The definitive indicators and the initial and target values will be established at the start of the implementation phase by means of participatory workshops, surveys or other information sources.

Data that has already been collected by the statistics institute of the partner country must be used whenever possible.

**If the evaluation is to be carried out using the experimental method, the figures on the different indicators must also be collected in a control or counterfactual group within the target population\(^{60}\).**

**If the evaluation is to be carried out using the quasi-experimental method, it must be possible to recreate the figures on the different indicators at a later date in a counterfactual group within a community similar to the target population. If the impact indicators are statistics in the national system, the**
only thing missing is the target values, as the starting values are available in these national statistics after a certain period\textsuperscript{61}. 
7. Proposed standard plan for an intervention

TFF

The proposed TFF presentation plan has been developed for an 'individual project'-type cooperation intervention. Adapting it to higher-level interventions (country programme, sector-based or thematic programme or general programme) only requires minor modifications if we refer to the design of the overlapping logical framework set out in point 6.1.1. Each element of this overlap can be covered by a specific TFF without the need to repeat resources, activities and objectives.

Framework 1: Synthetic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers and codes attributed to the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian organisation responsible for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local partner organisation responsible for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian DGD budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian partner budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution(s) of the local partner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Estimated) start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Estimated) end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC sector code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General objective of the intervention/anticipated impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective(s) of the intervention/planned outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic marker(s) 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Framework 2: Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title:</th>
<th>(Provisional) measurable or objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Hypotheses &amp; risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention logic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General objective (impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective/outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities specific to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources specific to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective/outcome n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output n.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output n.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/output n.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities specific to n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources specific to n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preconditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Framework 3: Contextual analysis

| General context of the country (or region) of intervention (for ANGC, reference to the common contextual analysis). Include the political, social, cultural and religious information liable to influence the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the intervention. |
| Description of the specific problems that the intervention claims to solve, the participative way in which these problems were defined and the strategies adopted for solving them. Problem tree and objectives tree (annexed) |
| (Particularly) for ANGCs: presentation of the ANGC and the specific skills that make it the ideal stakeholder to help solve the identified problems. Possible SWOT analysis. |
| Presentation of the local partner organisation linked to the skills required to help solve the identified problems. Possible SWOT analysis. |
| Analysis of the other stakeholders according to their interest in the intervention and their decision-making power in the intervention. Indicators for the ownership of the intervention by these stakeholders. |
| Description of the specific context of the principal sector of the intervention, including the partner country's policy in this sector. |
| Description of the specific context of the secondary sector(s) of the intervention, including the partner country's policy in this/these sector(s). |
| Relationship with the global priorities. |
| Relationship with the PRSP of the partner country. |
| Relationship with the Belgian strategy in the principal sector and the secondary sector(s) of the intervention. |
| Relationship and possible synergies with other development activities supported by international or local donors. |
| Demonstration that the intervention does not damage any of the cross-cutting themes. |
| Demonstration that there are no (longer any) high probability and high consequence risks or fatal suppositions. Demonstration that there are no (longer any) high consequence and medium probability risks or high probability and medium consequence risks. |
### Framework 4: Operational description of the intervention

#### General objective

Description of the general objective or the expected impact.

Description of the SMART indicators that would be used to check the achievement of the general objective, with, if possible and if it makes sense, baseline values and **provisional target values for these indicators**.

Description

- of the risks and suppositions for the achievement of the GO from the specific objective(s);
- of the consequences for the expected impact of the materialisation of the risks or the non-materialisation of the suppositions at this level.

#### Specific objective A

Description of specific objective 1 or the expected outcome.

Description of the SMART indicators that would be used to verify the achievement of this specific objective, with, if possible and if it makes sense, baseline values and **provisional target values for these indicators**.

Description

- of the risks and suppositions for the achievement of this specific objective from the intermediary results (or outputs) required to achieve this specific objective;
- of the consequences for the specific objective of the materialisation of these risks or the non-materialisation of the suppositions at this level.

#### Expected result A01

Description of the expected result 1 (or output) required to achieve this specific objective.

Description of the SMART indicators that would be used to check the achievement of this result, with, if possible and if it makes sense, baseline values and **provisional target values for these indicators**.

Description

- of activities A0101 to A01n to be implemented to achieve this result.
- of the risks and suppositions for the achievement of this result from the planned activities;
- of the consequences for this result of the materialisation of these risks or the non-materialisation of the suppositions at this level.
- of the measures that will be taken to mitigate the consequences of the materialisation of the risks or the non-materialisation of the suppositions at this level.

### Expected results A02 to An

For each result, include the descriptions in the same way as for result A01.

### Specific objectives B to n

If there is one or more specific objectives, include descriptions for each one in the same way as for objective A.
Framework 5: Management method

When determining the management method, take account of the ownership, participative approach, sustainability, analysis of risks, suppositions and results-based management.

5.1. Strategic management

Sharing of responsibilities between the partner organisations, the Belgian head office, the local representation, the intervention management unit, etc.

5.2. Day-to-day management

Sharing of technical and operational responsibilities for planning, implementation and the possible revision of the activities plan.

Sharing of responsibilities in the management of the national and expatriate personnel

Regulations that will be used for public contracts

Sharing of responsibilities for monitoring the results indicators, monitoring the development of the context and monitoring risks and suppositions

Sharing of responsibilities for the narrative and financial reporting.

5.3. Financial management

Sharing of responsibilities for commitments. Delegation of authority thresholds. Who signs order forms and how is this done?

Sharing of responsibilities for liquidation. Delegation of authority thresholds. Who signs order cheques/transfer orders and how is this done?
## Framework 6: Backstopping, audits, monitoring and evaluation(s)

### 6.1. Backstopping

Describe here who will provide the ad hoc technical support for the intervention, when and how. These are generally short-term missions carried out by a technical officer from the head office or an independent expert.

### 6.2. Audit

Describe here who will carry out the checks on compliance and conformity with the financial, accounting and (possibly) administrative procedures and regulations in force and when and how this will be done.

### 6.3. Monitoring

In this part, describe:
- how the baseline values of the indicators will be measured and these indicators will be monitored;
- how the risks and suppositions will be monitored:
- how the changing context will be monitored;

at both local level (intervention + possibly representation office) and head office level (monitoring missions, their frequency and their objective).

### 6.4. Evaluation(s)

Nature of the planned evaluations (self-evaluation, internal, external or independent evaluation), their timing (ex ante, mid-term, final or ex post), their subject (exactly what will be evaluated), their objective (why the evaluation will take place) and their scope (what level of detail?).
Framework 7: Provisional activity plan (Gantt chart)

Insofar as a certain degree of flexibility is anticipated so that certain activities can be speeded up or modified, particularly to adapt them to the occurrence of a risk and to obtain the planned outcomes within the deadlines, there is no point detailing this plan beyond the first few months of implementation. The diagram below is provided as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the activity</th>
<th>1st month</th>
<th>2nd month</th>
<th>3rd month</th>
<th>4th month</th>
<th>5th month</th>
<th>6th month</th>
<th>3rd quarter</th>
<th>4th quarter</th>
<th>3rd week</th>
<th>4th week</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>Yr ...</th>
<th>Yr n-1</th>
<th>Yr n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity A0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A0102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A01...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A0201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A02...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A...01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity A... ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity B0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity B01...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity B...01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity B... ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z070101 Organisation of monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z070102 Study of the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z070103 Local monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0702 Monitoring missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0703 Mid-term and final evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Framework 8: Exit strategy

The exit strategy must be planned as soon as the TFF is drafted and implemented as soon as possible. The different points to consider when preparing the post-intervention period are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the procedure for delivering and taking over equipment and (possibly) buildings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the procedure for delivering and taking over the financial resources at the end of the intervention (any remaining budget; but primarily guarantee fund, working capital, etc.).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the activities that must be continued or the new activities that will be necessary to ensure the continuity of the results.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the human resources that will be required to maintain the continuity of the results. Describe what will happen to the other national human resources involved in the implementation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe where the necessary financial resources will come from</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• for the operation, maintenance, repair and possible replacement of the equipment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• for continuing the activities; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• for retaining the human resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(extension, phase 2, integration of the activities in a different intervention, takeover by a different donor, financing by the partner government, fixed user contribution, sales revenue, subsidy, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the institutional development planned for guaranteeing sustainability.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the human resource capacity development planned to guarantee sustainability.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe how the lessons learnt from the intervention will be used to benefit the donor, the stakeholders and the public.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Framework 9: Budget

### 9.1. Budget per result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective A</th>
<th>Belgian contribution</th>
<th>Local contribution</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year...</th>
<th>Year n-1</th>
<th>Year n</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result A01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 01 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 01 02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 01 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 01 n-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 01 n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result A02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 02 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 02 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result A...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result A n-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A n-1 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A n-1 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result A n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A n 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A n ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result B01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 01 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 01 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 01 n-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2. General resources budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 01</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 01</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 02</td>
<td>Local personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 03</td>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 04</td>
<td>Technical backstopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 05</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 02</th>
<th>Construction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 01</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 02</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 03</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 03</th>
<th>Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 01</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 02</td>
<td>Equipment (technical, IT, furniture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 03</td>
<td>Software (books, IT software, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 04</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 04</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 01</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 02</td>
<td>Water and energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 03</td>
<td>Consumables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 04</td>
<td>Vehicles (fuel, lubricant, maintenance and repairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 05</td>
<td>Buildings (maintenance and cleaning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 06</td>
<td>Bank charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 07</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 05</th>
<th>Information and awareness-raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 05 01</td>
<td>Design of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 05 02</td>
<td>Production/printing of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 05 03</td>
<td>Distribution of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 05 04</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 06</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 06 01</td>
<td>Local training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 06 02</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 06 03</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z 07</th>
<th>Monitoring, audit and evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 01</td>
<td>Creation of the monitoring system, particularly baseline values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 02</td>
<td>Local administrative monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 03</td>
<td>Local financial monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 04</td>
<td>Monitoring missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 05</td>
<td>Evaluation missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 06</td>
<td>Audit missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04 07</td>
<td>Other...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belgian contrib.</th>
<th>Local contrib.</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr n-1</th>
<th>Yr n</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total
### Framework 10: Monitoring framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Verification source + collection manager</th>
<th>Baseline value of the indicators</th>
<th>Values of the expected (e) and observed (o) indicator values, end of…</th>
<th>Mid-term indicator values</th>
<th>Values of the expected (e) and observed (o) indicator values, end of…</th>
<th>End-of-intervention indicator values (year n)</th>
<th>Ex post indicator values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 1: e</td>
<td>Yr 2: o</td>
<td>Yr 3: e</td>
<td>Yr 4: o</td>
<td>Yr 5: e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>I11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 1: e</td>
<td>Yr 2: o</td>
<td>Yr 3: e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1</td>
<td>I111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2</td>
<td>I121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output …</td>
<td>I1…1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1…2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1…3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome …</td>
<td>I…1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output…1</td>
<td>I…11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output…2</td>
<td>I…21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I…23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output…</td>
<td>I… … 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I… … 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I… … 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The monitoring framework should ideally be finalised at the start of the intervention in collaboration with the stakeholders. For the intervention to remain evaluable, neither the outcome and impact results nor the indicators of these results should be modified between two evaluation exercises. The nature of the intervention, the timing (start, middle or end of the intervention) of the measure and the nature of the indicator (impact, outcome or output) can justify the varying intervals between two consecutive measurements of the indicator values. For the same reasons, the number of indicators per impact, outcome or output can sometimes be lower than three.
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Appendix A1: Terms of Reference

A1.1. Introduction

A1.1.1. Definitions

The evaluability of a cooperation intervention is described as the:

“extent to which an activity or a program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion”69;

or:

“Evaluability Assessment is a systematic process that helps identify whether program evaluation is justified, feasible, and likely to provide useful information. It not only shows whether a program can be meaningfully evaluated, but also whether conducting the evaluation is likely to contribute to improved program performance and management.”70

For the needs of the study and in accordance with the legal provisions, the definitions, criteria, principles and standards, approved by the member countries of the DAC-OECD and widely distributed within the bilateral and multilateral development agencies, contained in the following documents will be used:
- Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management; DAC-OECD 2002.
- Evaluating Development Cooperation - Summary of Key Norms and Standards; second edition, OECD
- Quality Standards for Development Evaluation; OECD 2010
- European Commission methodology for evaluating its external assistance

These documents clearly show that to be evaluable, an intervention must allow the external consultants to make an impartial, independent, credible and useful decision on its relevance, effectiveness (achievement of the immediate, short- and medium-term results), efficiency (value for money), sustainability and impact at any time in the intervention cycle.

A1.1.2. Context and justification of the study

See Chapter 1 (introduction)

A1.1.3. Legal and regulatory framework

Article 2, §1 of the Royal Decree of 25 February 2010 creating a Special Evaluation Office of International Cooperation states that "the Special Evaluation Office of International Cooperation is authorised to evaluate Belgian development cooperation" and §2 states that
"the Special Evaluation Office performs its duties in accordance with the principles and standards approved by the member countries of the OECD DAC"... 

Furthermore, Article 33 of the Law of 19 March 2013 on development cooperation stipulates that the King determines the means of harmonising and certifying the evaluation systems of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders. The explanatory notes to the law state that ""certification targets a guarantee of quality that will be entrusted to the Special Evaluator"... Article 2/1 of the Royal Decree of 25 April 2014 modifying the Royal Decree of 25 February 2010 creating a Special Evaluation Office of International Cooperation confirms and clarifies this mandate. Paragraph 3 of this Article mentions "the Special Evaluation Office is responsible for the ex post evaluation of the quality of the harmonised monitoring and evaluation systems of the Belgian development cooperation stakeholders."

At the same time, provisions for the internal monitoring and evaluation of the actions and results of the BTC and the indirect stakeholders were included in the RD assenting to the fourth management contract, the Royal Decree on the co-financing of non-governmental stakeholders and the strategy paper on 'development results'.

**A1.2. Subject of the study**

The subject of the study is the evaluability of interventions, as described in B1.1.

**A1.3. Objectives of the study**

The objective of the study is three-fold:
- to determine, with the partners in question, the necessary, adequate and realistic conditions for the objective evaluation of cooperation interventions;
- to produce lessons for the harmonisation and certification of the stakeholders' evaluation systems as decided by the legislator; and
- to verify the extent to which the above-mentioned evaluability conditions match (or do not match) the conditions necessary for the monitoring and results-based management of interventions and the legal and regulatory framework mentioned.

At operational level, this study should be useful:
- for the Special Evaluation Office to determine and then monitor the application of the harmonisation mechanisms set out by the legislation. The application of the harmonised evaluation methods may be gradually introduced into the certification criteria also included in the legislation.
- for the DGD services and the International Cooperation Attachés. This study should help them to identify the necessary and sufficient conditions for the effective monitoring of the interventions and for high-quality interventions. The study should also make it possible to judge the participants' ability to monitor and report on progress at each level of results (output, outcomes and impact).
- for the partner bodies of bilateral and non-governmental cooperation, so they can better integrate monitoring, results-based management and evaluation as soon as the interventions are formulated.
The general objective of the study is not therefore to determine whether the current interventions can or cannot be evaluated, but to make all future interventions evaluable in the relatively short term.

The evaluability of the individual case studies is not an objective of the study; however the operators of the cases studied will be informed of their evaluability results individually and confidentially.

**A1.4. Scope of the study**

**A1.4.1. Conceptual scope**

The concept of evaluability can be examined in the following two different yet complementary ways:

1) *'Theoretical' evaluability'* involves the project design, including its intervention logic/theory of change. Verifying the theoretical evaluability means verifying whether the intervention can be evaluated as described in the technical and financial file (TFF), the intervention presentation document and any other document of the same type drafted *before* implementation. The 'theoretical' evaluability of an intervention can be assessed on the basis of a documentary study that examines whether there is a clear description of the objectives and the ways of achieving them. In this respect, the DAC-OECD clarifies the theoretical evaluability examination as follows: "evaluability assessment calls for the early review of a proposed activity in order to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable."71

2) *'Practical' evaluability* focuses on the collected and available data and on the credibility and objectivity of this data. It also examines the systems set up and the resources used to collect this data. Finally, it focuses on the contextual elements that may promote, disadvantage or even prevent the evaluation. The determination of the practical evaluability conditions implies case studies on the ground.

In order to provide the programming managers with the instruments they need to assess and monitor the 'monitoring-evaluation-results reporting' aspect of the interventions, the following extensions of the concept of evaluability should also be considered:

- examination of the usefulness of evaluating a determined intervention.
- examination of a determined intervention with a view to improving its results-based management and monitoring-evaluation system.
- examination of an intervention in the context of a quality assurance process: when carried out in this context, the evaluability examination makes it possible to verify whether all the elements necessary for the monitoring and evaluation are in place and to fill any gaps.

**A1.4.2. Modalities to be examined**

The study will focus on interventions that are financed by the Federal State and have a file in the ODA.be database:

- individual projects;
- programmes of non-governmental stakeholders;
- programmes of the Belgian Fund for Food Security;
- actions to raise awareness of development;
- delegated cooperation interventions;
- grants;
- humanitarian aid interventions;
- private sector support programmes.

The scope of this study excludes all cooperation methods not specifically mentioned in the scope above.

**A1.4.3. Stakeholders to be studied**

The study will focus on governmental and non-governmental cooperation stakeholders as indicated in Article 2, paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the law of 19 March 2013 on Development Cooperation.

However, insofar as Belgian Fund for Food Security programmes may include the involvement of a multilateral organisation, the evaluability of this programme will be examined in its entirety.

With the exception of this precise case, projects and programmes of multilateral organisations and development banks (co-)financed by Belgium are expressly excluded from the scope of the study.

**A1.4.4. Time scope**

The evaluability of a specific intervention can be assessed at different times in the intervention management cycle:

1) at the time of formulation. The assessment is then purely theoretical and its aim is to improve the quality of the formulation before approval.

2) when the monitoring-evaluation system is set up, during the start phase/year zero. The evaluation then supports the practical set-up of the M-E system with a view to its improvement.

3) just before an evaluation. The assessment then examines whether the intervention is worth an evaluation or whether an evaluation is likely to produce useful knowledge.

4) during an evaluation. Practically, most evaluators do this when they examine the limits and constraints of their mandate. The evaluation reports contain valuable information in this respect.

Evaluability will be studied for a representative sample of interventions underway at the time of the study. Those elements necessary for achieving the objectives of this study which require a field visit will, as far as possible, be studied in interventions that have gone past the 'mid-term' stage.
A1.4.5 Geographical scope

The case studies will be chosen in consultation with the members of the Steering Committee in Belgium (study grants, North actions, etc.) and in the following three partner countries: Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Benin.

A1.5. Approach and method

A1.5.1. General approach

The study is carried out in several stages and focuses on the theoretical aspects and on the implementation of the monitoring-evaluation of the interventions (co-)financed by Belgian Development Cooperation.

Theoretical evaluability will have been studied through the documentary examination of technical and financial files (TFF), the intervention presentation documents or any other document of the same type drafted prior to implementation.

Practical evaluability will be examined through the documentary examination of the documents drafted during implementation and during the field missions.

Important notes:

The results of the individual case studies will only be made public to the operators of the interventions in question.

Both the documentary study and the field visits must be limited to collecting information that is useful for achieving the objectives of the study and making a decision on the key issues.

At no time should a real evaluation of the case studies be carried out.

A1.5.2. Sampling of case studies

The interventions used as case studies for theoretical evaluability decisions were selected as follows:

- initially, all the interventions underway in 2013, i.e. 2,460 interventions, were listed and numbered from 1 to 2,460;

- a list of 200 random numbers between 1 and 2,460 was then generated.

- the interventions corresponding to the randomly-generated numbers were successively examined for the following points:
  - location within or outside the scope of the study defined in B4. For example, multilateral organisation core funding interventions or interventions financed by the provinces and communes were outside the scope of the study.
  - availability of or potential access to documents on the intervention (programme documents, technical and financial files, activity reports, etc.). If the intervention involved a project that was part of a programme, the programme as a whole was considered. If the intervention involved a programme completed in 2013, the programme starting in 2014 was considered.
  - country of intervention. If the intervention involved a (sub)programme that was part of a general multi-country programme, all the countries in the programme were considered.

- The results were included in an Excel table until there was a sufficient list of interventions in three cooperation countries - Benin, DR Congo and Rwanda - and in
Belgium ('North' activities and programme management). To include as much variability as possible, the sample of interventions obtained through sampling was supplemented by under-represented stakeholders/cooperation methods.

The case studies for judging evaluability in practice and achieving the objectives of this study, will be chosen at the start of phase 3 of the study by common agreement between the managing service, the members of the Steering Committee and the consultant, taking account of the following elements:

- countries selected: Benin, DR Congo, Rwanda and Belgium.
- interventions already studied in the context of theoretical evaluability
- variety of modalities and stakeholders.
- a total of 40 interventions: 10 in Belgium and 10 (on average) in each of the countries visited.

**A1.6. Phases of the study**

**A1.6.1. Phase 1: Analytical framework of theoretical evaluability**

This phase was carried out internally by the Special Evaluation Office of Belgian Development Cooperation. It involved reading:

- documents that constitute the legal and regulatory framework of Belgian cooperation with regard to monitoring and evaluation;
- specialised bibliography on monitoring, evaluation and results-based management methods and on the assessment of evaluability;
- development of a framework for analysing the theoretical analysis of interventions;
- testing of this analytical framework on a limited sample of six interventions;

This first phase was the subject of a report.

**A1.6.2. Phase 2: Theoretical evaluability study phase**

During the theoretical evaluability study phase, also carried out internally by the Special Evaluation Office, each selected intervention, its context and its characteristics were put through the analytical framework developed in phase 1.

A theoretical evaluability sheet was created after consulting the documents and reports on the preparation of the interventions (report of the identification and formulation mission, TFF and ANGC programme documents.

As with phase 1, the general result is being summarised in an intermediary report and will be discussed with the different stakeholders in the Steering Committee. This intermediary report will contain:

- a summary of current knowledge of the objectives of the study, obtained after studying the theoretical evaluability;
- the hypotheses to be verified during the field missions.
A1.6.3. Phase 3: Practical evaluability study phase

This phase begins with the determination of the definitive sample of interventions whose practical evaluability will be studied and the development of sheets/questionnaires for the field missions.

The field missions will be prepared:

- with the aid of DGD
  - interviews: geographical and thematic services involved in the case studies;
  - DGD: quality and results service;
  - BTC: geographic and thematic desks covered by the case studies;
  - BTC: quality/evaluation manager;
  - ANGC: managers responsible for the case studies;
  - ANGC: people responsible for monitoring-evaluation.
- by studying the preparation and monitoring-evaluation documents available for the case studies
- by a quick study of the general context of the countries to be visited, the sector-based context of the case studies and their specific context.

The missions themselves:

- observe the 'case study' interventions "in action" and assess them for real evaluability in the field.
- assess the capacity of the project/programme to collect reliable data, analyse it and assess the extent to which management is focused on achieving the results.
- identify the factors limiting and favouring the evaluability of the intervention.
- observe the elements of the local context that influence the evaluability of the interventions.
- determine, where applicable and for each case study, the extent to which (activities, outputs, outcomes and impact) an evaluation is feasible, relevant and useful.
- for each case study, meet the key people who are able to provide critical information on the implementation of the monitoring-evaluation system: data collection, data analysis, results-based management (usefulness of the data): intervention managers (Belgians and/or nationals), technical assistants, experts, members of the consultation bodies, beneficiaries.
- for each country visited, meet the different expatriates or nationals involved in the preparation, monitoring and evaluation of the studied interventions: cooperation attaché, relevant ministries, local authorities involved.
- present the main observations per country during a local debriefing meeting.
- draft a final evaluability sheet for each intervention studied. This sheet will only be provided to the operators of each intervention.

A1.6.4. Phase 4: analysis and summary

On the basis of the preceding stages, prepare a draft final report containing:

- a summary of the observations made based on the case studies:
  - determine the minimum evaluability conditions and the extent to which the examined interventions meet these conditions,
  - capitalise on the good practice observed in the preparation and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system,
• prepare an inventory of poor practices and the main gaps observed in the preparation and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system and identify the main reasons why an intervention does not meet the minimum evaluability conditions (technical expertise, financial reasons, imprecisions in the regulatory framework).

- a conclusion on all aspects of monitoring-evaluation,
- recommendations for improving evaluability in the future,
- the content of the report must also demonstrate the achievement of the different objectives of the study, as explained in B3.

The draft final report will be discussed in the Steering Committee (see point B 7.3 below), following which a definitive final report will be prepared.

A1.7 Responsibility for the management and monitoring of the study

A1.7.1. The Managing Officer (MO)

• The Special Evaluation Office (S4) is responsible for launching the study and for the administrative management of the contract. It represents the contracting department and as such is the study's Managing Officer. In this sense, it verifies the study's compliance (based on the legal framework and the special specifications) as well as the quality of the process and outputs of the study.

• S4 manages the entire study process from start to finish and, in so doing, it:
  o is responsible for the public procurement procedure (preparing the special specifications, awarding the contract, managing invoices, etc.),
  o ensures the compliance and coherence of the study, from the terms of reference to the printing and distribution of the final report,
  o coordinates and manages the activity of the various stakeholders (steering committee and team of consultants); prepares and chairs the meetings, drafts the minutes, manages potential conflicts, etc.,
  o supervises and verifies the quality of the work during the different phases (including ensuring that the conclusions are based on solid methodologies and facts),
  o guarantees the smooth running of the study (includes facilitating the consultants' work and their access to information sources),
  o guarantees the independence of the consultants. However, it ensures that the stakeholders' comments and opinions are taken into account and those that are not are the subject of a reasoned response from the consultants.
  o validates the final report by means of an assessment grid (and approves the final payments for services),
  o organises the distribution of the study results and generates the managerial response,
  o organises the final report sessions.
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- S4, in its capacity as Managing Officer, is solely responsible for carrying out this study.

**A1.7.2. The stakeholders (or actors concerned)**

- The stakeholders are the individuals, groups or organisations that have direct or indirect responsibilities and/or interests in the subject of this study (project, programme, sector, country, etc.). They may or may not be affected by the results of this study. They are consulted during the different stages of the study so they can give their opinion on the terms of reference and its outputs (including the provisional reports). In some cases, their cooperation is required for collecting information (and for organising field missions). They may also speak to consultants in the absence of S4 or other stakeholders. Some of these stakeholders may be members of the Steering Committee. Their selection/invitation to take part in this Committee is the responsibility of S4.

- For this study, the stakeholders are the DGD services responsible for bilateral and non-governmental cooperation, the DGD services responsible for checking quality and for results, the BTC internal evaluation manager, the NGO federations and the other non-governmental cooperation stakeholders.

- The Special Evaluation Office is, exceptionally, also a stakeholder.

**A1.7.3. Steering Committee**

- The Special Evaluation Office will create a Steering Committee (SC) comprised of representatives of the stakeholders concerned and independent experts. This committee contributes to the quality, credibility and usefulness of the study. It gives an opinion on the planned methodology and on the observations, conclusions and recommendations of the study. If necessary, it supplements or corrects the consultants' information.

- The SES ensures the balance of this Committee.

- This Committee comprises the following members:
  - a minimum of 2 members from the Special Evaluation Office
  - several members from the DGD involved and/or interested in the theme (particularly service D4.3).
  - representatives of the BTC and stakeholders in non-governmental cooperation.

- The SC is summoned, prepared and chaired by the Special Evaluation Office which drafts its minutes.

- The SC is a "technical" working group which has a discussion and proposition role. It is responsible for monitoring, supporting and facilitating the study process. Through its diverse composition, the SC enhances the study process with its various perspectives. The SC guarantees the consultants' access to useful sources of information (documentation, databases and people). SC members act as an interface between the services, departments and institutions to which they belong (DGD, BTC, indirect stakeholders, etc.). This means that they inform their service and/or department of the study's processes and outputs and facilitate access to information, help to organise interviews, etc. They play an active role in disseminating the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. As part of the SC, the stakeholders concerned are encouraged to take ownership of the study's results. However, the Special Evaluation Office will ensure a balance between the participative nature of the study and the efficiency of the process (ensuring that the study produces results in good time).
A1.8. Study team

As has already been said, phases 1 and 2 are carried out internally by the Special Evaluation Office.

The services relating to phases 3 and 4 of the study must be carried out by a team of independent consultants and are the subject of this public contract. The fact that these consultants have already been involved in evaluating Belgian cooperation interventions and therefore have experience of the problems encountered is an advantage. However, the consultants cannot be assigned to study a case that they have already formulated or evaluated.

Whenever possible, the expertise used must combine knowledge:
- of the monitoring & evaluation of interventions,
- of management of the cooperation intervention cycle, and
- of the traditional countries and sectors of Belgian development cooperation.

The consultants have to demonstrate experience of the practice of evaluation in the field.

A good understanding of the documents drawn up by the Belgian Administration and in the various countries selected for the case studies requires the team of consultants to have an active knowledge of French and Dutch (native language level), English (advanced level) and Spanish (advanced level).

The same linguistic conditions are required for publishing the different translations of the definitive final report.

There must be diversity within the team responsible for the study.

The team leader must have experience of managing studies of a similar size and of managing teams. He/she must also be knowledgeable about new approaches to the management, monitoring and evaluation of interventions (results-based management, outcome mapping, most significant change, theory based evaluation, quantitative methods, etc.).

A local expert is also required for the case studies in each of the countries visited.

A1.9. Indicative timetable

Phase 1 of the study has already been carried out internally.

Phase 2 (theoretical evaluability) is being carried out and will be completed in December 2014. The report on this phase will be given to the recipient in due course.

The services contract required for the completion of phases 3 and 4 will be awarded to an external consultant.

The services are scheduled to begin in January 2015.

A1.10. The reports

B10.1. Nature of the reports

The study outputs are:
- a methodological framework at the end of phase 1,
- an intermediary report and the theoretical evaluability sheets for the interventions studied at the end of the study phase (phase 2),
- the practical evaluability sheets for the interventions visited and the PowerPoint presentations from the end-of-mission debriefings (phase 3),
- a draft final report and a final report (phase 4).

**A1.10.2 Structure of the final report**

The detailed structure of the final report will be agreed during the study. The outline of the report will contain the following sections:

- summary;
- context of the study;
- summary of the responses to the questions on the evaluability of the case studies;
- other observations;
- lessons (within the meaning of the definition in the DAC Glossary);
- conclusions;
- recommendations; primarily a proposal for the necessary and sufficient conditions and the measures to be taken for the theoretical and practical evaluability of an intervention (co-)financed by Belgium;

- Compulsory Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

The final report should be short (maximum of 60 pages excluding appendices). Additional information on the background, programme or overall aspects of the methodology and analysis will be placed in the appendices.

The appendices should contain: the methodology; the questionnaires, the assessment criteria; the list of people met; the documentation list, including any bibliography; the ToR; the comments on the proposed final report that were not taken into account by the consultants and the reasons behind this; any other information used as a basis for the analysis or the tables.

**A1.10.3. Quality**

The reports will be drafted in accordance with the styles and layout provided by the Managing Officer.

The reports must be of a very high quality. The results, analysis, conclusions and recommendations must be detailed. They must reflect a methodological approach which clearly indicates the reasoning process.

The managing department will submit the reports to a quality assurance grid that will be given to the consultants in due course.

**A1.10.4. Punctuality**

The contracting department should receive the reports to be assessed by the different steering committee meetings at least 6 working days before the date set for the committee by joint agreement.

**A1.10.5. Language of the reports**

The consultants may choose to draft the provisional reports in either French or Dutch.

The final definitive report will be written either in French or Dutch and translated into the other language.
A 2-page summary should be drafted in French, Dutch and English.

The PowerPoint presentations in Belgium should be partly in French and partly in Dutch, with a certain degree of balance between the two languages.

The PowerPoint debriefing presentations from the field missions must be in an international language of the country in question.

The translations should be edited by the consultant; for the French and Dutch versions, this must be done by a team member whose native language is French or Dutch.

**A1.11. Bibliography**

See Appendix A2 Bibliography below
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Appendix A3: Table of budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>Implementatio n method</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Specific objective A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Result A01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Result A01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activity A0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Result A02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Results A03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Result A04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity A0402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Specific objective B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Result B01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity B0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity B0102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Activity B0103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Budget reserve (maximum 5% of the total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Budget reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1: Budget model by objective for governmental cooperation interventions*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>General resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z 01</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 01</td>
<td>Technical assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 02</td>
<td>National personnel bonuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 03</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 04</td>
<td>Scientific support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 05</td>
<td>Training DEP personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 06</td>
<td>Training – Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 01 07</td>
<td>Technical assistance and support for CAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02</td>
<td>Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 01</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 02</td>
<td>IT equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 03</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 04</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 02 05</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03</td>
<td>Operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 01</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 02</td>
<td>Office costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 03</td>
<td>Vehicle costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 04</td>
<td>Bank charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 03 05</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 04</td>
<td>Audit, monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

*Figure 2: Budget model for general resources for governmental cooperation interventions*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NORTH ASPECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country1</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country2</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country...</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SOUTH ASPECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT COSTS</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMME TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Programme total</th>
<th>ANG(^1)</th>
<th>DGD(^2)</th>
<th>Overheads 0.0%</th>
<th>Subsidy (= DGD +FS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are several SO in a country, please mention all of them and provide a total per country and per year.

1For the NGOs: 20% of total budget. For the other ANG: 0%.

2For the NGOs: 80% of total budget. For the other ANG: 100%

*Figure 3: General budget model for ACNG programmes (table 1)*
Figure 4: Budget model for management costs for ACNG programmes (table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Monitoring and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Head office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Expatriates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1

Rn

Figure 5: Budget model for operational costs for ACNG programmes in Belgium (table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 6: Budget model for operational costs for ACNG ‘country’ programmes (table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
<th>If subregion: Country n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 1</td>
<td>Yr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Credit fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Expatriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1
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### Project budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Result 1</th>
<th>Result 2</th>
<th>Result x</th>
<th>Result n</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Operational costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3 Other expatriates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4 Total personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Total operational costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Management costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Support costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Total costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Subsidy requested from the DGD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Own contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure7: Budget model for operational costs for BFFS programmes*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Coordination office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Head office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Aid workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8: Budget model for management costs for FBSA programmes**
Appendix A4: Analysis table used

1. Accessibility of technical and financial documents relating to the intervention.
2. The possibility of carrying out an evaluation is stated in the documents
3. There is a budget for the planned mid-term and final evaluations
4. There is financing for the system used to study the baseline situation
5. There is financing for the regular measuring system for indicators + operating resources by the person(s) responsible for monitoring
6. There is financing for monitoring the development of the context + operating resources by the person(s) responsible for monitoring
7. There is financing for monitoring the risks, preconditions and conditions + operating resources by the person(s) responsible for monitoring
8. There is a detailed budget.
9. The time, geographic, financial, sector-based, thematic, etc. limits of the interventions are defined.
10. The beneficiaries (and the non-beneficiaries) are clearly defined at all levels (direct, peripheral and end).
11. The partner organisations are clearly defined and the process that led to this definition is described.
12. There is a certain degree of flexibility in the redefinition of the immediate/short-term results (outputs), the activities and the allocation of resources.
13. The monitoring system is defined in detail (frequency, sources and responsibilities).
14. The problem(s) that the intervention plans to solve is/are defined in detail.
15. The consideration of gender as a cross-cutting theme is defined.
16. The consideration of environment as a cross-cutting theme is defined.
17. There is a description of the expectations of the beneficiaries and the process that led to the determination of the beneficiaries’ expectations.
18. There is a description of the needs of the country with regard to the object of the intervention, together with the process that led to the determination of these needs.
19. The intervention’s link with the global priorities is described.
20. Account has been taken of the strategy paper for interventions in a sector/theme/country/activity for which a Belgian strategy paper has been drafted.
21. The relations between the authorities and civil society are described in relation to the subject of the intervention.

22. The way in which the intervention fits into the local poverty reduction strategy is described.

23. The activities and objectives of the other stakeholders (local stakeholders, Belgian stakeholders, donors/international stakeholders) working in the sector or territory of intervention are described and taken into account.

24. The preconditions, suppositions and risks relating to people and factors external to the intervention but likely to have a positive or negative effect on its result or cost are analysed in detail.

25. Risk management (in terms of attenuating the consequences of their occurrence) is planned.

26. If there are differing viewpoints between the stakeholders, these differences are explained.

27. A distinction is made between (at least) three levels of results: output (immediate results, products, etc.), outcomes (short- or medium-term results, achievements, specific objective(s), etc.) and impact (long-term results, general objective(s)).

28. There is a theoretical causal link from one level to another of the logical chain: resources \(\rightarrow\) activities \(\rightarrow\) outputs \(\rightarrow\) outcomes \(\rightarrow\) impact.

29. There is a description of the first two levels of results and their qualitative and/or quantitative indicators with their baseline values and target values. Their indicators are formulated in 'SMART' terms.

30. Provision is made for the measurement of sufficient baseline data to establish a starting point that will allow the progress achieved at the first two levels of results (outputs and outcomes) to be measured.

31. The indicators are verifiable: the sources of the data are known and the data can be collected regularly, at a reasonable cost and with a reasonable amount of effort.

32. The progress of the (possible) qualitative indicators is independently verifiable.

33. Indicators that are part of an existing local system are used whenever possible.

34. The bases (participative workshop, previous experience, problem tree, etc.) of the logical approach adopted are described.

35. The consideration of gender as a cross-cutting theme is defined in a way that allows it to be evaluated.

36. The base data is broken down at gender level.

37. The consideration of the environment as a cross-cutting theme is defined in a way that allows it to be evaluated.

38. Provision is made for a regular narrative report on the results/activities.

39. The total duration of the intervention is defined.

40. The Budget is formulated by result/specific objective.

41. The resources required to implement each planned activity are defined in detail.

42. Regular financial reporting is planned.
43. This financial reporting will make it possible to calculate the cost of each result obtained.

44. The way in which the intervention will be managed is described.

45. The person(s) and institution(s) responsible for delivering the financial, material and human resources are identified.

46. Information is available on the monitoring of the results indicators after the intervention.

47. Information is available on the monitoring of the contexts (and risks) after the intervention.

48. Information is available on the consideration of (any) investment costs after the intervention.

49. Information is available on the consideration of the operating or management costs during the intervention.

50. Information is available on the consideration of the operating costs after the intervention.

51. Information is available on the maintenance of the equipment during the intervention.

52. Information is available on the maintenance of the equipment after the intervention.

53. Information is available on the consideration of management after the intervention.

54. Information is available on the capacity development of the national personnel during the intervention.

55. Information is available on status of the national personnel during and after the intervention.

56. There are already or there are plans for sufficient baseline data to establish a starting point for measuring the progress achieved at impact/general objective level.

57. There is a description of the third level of results (expected impacts and general objective) and its qualitative and quantitative indicators with their final and ex post target values.

58. The impact indicators are defined in a 'SMART' way, are part of an existing local system and are collected by a national or international body whose reliability is recognised.

59. The progress of the (possible) qualitative impact indicators is independently verifiable.

60. Provision was made for an evaluation using the quasi-experimental or mixed method when the intervention was designed.

61. The baseline situation of a counterfactual group will be measured or may be recreated.

62. The outcome and impact indicators in this counterfactual population may be measured.

63. The financing of this system is planned.

64. The evaluation will meet a need to consider, recognise or take decisions.
65. The planned evaluation will involve an implementation partner, sector, country, theme or instrument.

66. The statistics in the ODA.be database are complete and up-to-date for the sector, country, theme, instrument, partner, etc. in question.

67. The database mentions the expected results and the results obtained for interventions in the sector, country or theme in question.

68. The indicators relating to the sector/theme/country/method in question are used internationally and/or harmonised with the PRSP indicators and/or broken down by gender/region/socio-economic conditions.
Are our interventions evaluable?
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