

ANNEX 1: EQS AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA

The EQs mentioned herewith at meant to show a standard set of areas that the thorough evaluation should cover and a standard set of Judgement Criteria to explain and identify each question. In reality, EQs may be merged/ disaggregated as considered opportune, and the JCs may be decreased, increased, refocused, according to the specific contexts.

TABLE 7 : STEP 1: STANDARD EQS AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA

EQ AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	STATEMENT OF THE EQ
EQ1: Enabling factors - Opportunity framework/1	To what extent do the country historical momentum, growth and partnership opportunities, and other existing contextual factors affect the institutional context of the CD action? ¹
Judgement Criteria	<p>Growth and trade opportunities of the country create a positive context for the target institution(s) to strengthen their strategic responsibility and financial capacity</p> <p>The regional partnerships subscribed by the country provide adequate stimuli in terms of improved governance and empowerment for the targeted institution(s)</p> <p>EC participation in the regional partnerships and trade agreements with the country is based on a dialogue framework allowing specific leverage on the targeted institution(s)</p>
EQ2: Enabling factors - Opportunity framework/2	To what extent do the reform records of the government and the sectoral political economy affect the institutional context of the CD action?
Judgement Criteria	<p>The reform records and the general reform orientation of the government provide a favourable policy and financial environment for the target institution(s)</p> <p>The ongoing sectoral reform processes focus on the targeted institution(s) as key actors and provide them with the necessary means to respond to their mission</p> <p>There is an effective framework of political dialogue allowing EC to participate in joint monitoring of the development results and actual discussions on the reform implementation?</p>
EQ3: Enabling factors - Quality Criteria	To what extent does the support programme under evaluation responds to the Quality Criteria established by the EC Backbone strategy for Technical Cooperation, including relevance to the context, ownership of targeted institution(s), strategic focus, harmonisation and appropriate delivery modalities? ²
Judgement Criteria	The programme's design - including the quantity and quality of inputs provided and the type of activities planned – is appropriate to the specific political, institutional and managerial contexts within which the capacity objectives were required

¹ Here the OF has been addressed through two specific questions (OF/1 and OF/2). According to the context, it could be addressed with one EQ, using the JCs to treat the specificities of the various features contributing to the OF.

² Here the QCa have been merged into one EQ, but disaggregated in five JCs. Different approaches could be justified by the context.

	<p>The local partners are effectively engaged in the relevant sector reforms and have a leadership position in the planning and management of the programme</p> <p>The programme design and implementation explicitly focus on CD effects and provide means and indicators to ensure their achievement</p> <p>The programme is carried out in a framework of dialogue and coordination led by the beneficiary, including harmonized / joint practices among donors</p> <p>The programme responds to 'peer-to-peer' modalities, to emphasize the learning and CD processes, and to reduce as much as possible the external management of TC (PIU)?</p>
--	---

EQ4: Outputs- staff competences	To what extent did the programme contribute to the production of objectively verifiable changes in staff competences (legal, financial, data processing, management...)? How did external factors affect such changes?
Judgement Criteria	<p>Staff competences toward the strategic objectives of the institution have been increased: new competences have been created and existing competences have been strengthened</p> <p>Specific inputs and activities of the programme have contributed to the determination of such changes in the staff competences</p> <p>Staff competences have been an indirect consequence of the staff involvement in the programme activities</p> <p>Other inputs and external factors have contributed -and have interacted (or not) with the programme- to change staff competences</p>
EQ5: Outputs- procedures and functions	To what extent did the programme contribute to the production of objectively verifiable changes in institutional procedures and functions (policy and financing, stakeholders' involvement, accountability and supervision)? How did external factors affect such changes?
Judgement Criteria	<p>Procedures and functions related to the strategic objectives of the institution have been created/ strengthened in various areas</p> <p>Specific inputs and activities of the programme have contributed to the determination of such changes in the procedures and functions</p> <p>Changes in procedures and functions have been an indirect consequence of the institutional involvement in the programme activities</p> <p>Other inputs and external factors have contributed -and have interacted (or not) with the programme- to change procedures and functions</p>
EQ6: Outputs- organisations	To what extent did the programme contribute to the production of objectively verifiable changes in the organisational and internal functioning (institutional structure, decision process, internal mobility and competition)? How did external factors affect such changes?
Judgement Criteria	<p>The executive structure and the internal management have changed toward increased effectiveness and efficiency, better decision processes and career</p> <p>Specific inputs and activities of the programme have contributed to the determination of such changes in the internal structures and functioning</p> <p>Changes in the internal structures and functioning have been an indirect consequence of the institutional involvement in the programme activities</p> <p>Other inputs and external factors have contributed -and have interacted (or not) with the programme- to change internal structures and functions</p>
EQ7: Outputs-	To what extent did the programme contribute to the production of objectively verifiable

unexpected	changes on individuals, institutions and initiatives, which were not targeted? How did external factors affect such changes?
Judgement Criteria	<p>Any significant and objectively verifiable change occurred, which was not an expected effect of the programme.</p> <p>Specific inputs and activities of the programme have contributed to the determination of such unplanned changes</p> <p>The unexpected changes have been an indirect consequence of the institutional involvement in the programme activities</p> <p>Other inputs and external factors have contributed -and have interacted (or not) with the programme- to the unexpected changes</p>

TABLE 8: STEP 2: STANDARD EQS AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA

EC AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	STATEMENT OF EQS AND JUDGEMENT CRITERIA
EQ8: Initiative	To what extent is the institution more capable to generate the plans (strategic or other levels) that reflect its stated needs, mission and various changing environments and to then mobilize its resources and management to execute them?
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: Plans are generated by the institution, which reflect its vision and the needs of the society it serves as expressed in targeted, clear objectives as well as pragmatic and integrated operational strategies.</p> <p>JC2: The institution has designed and built into its plans and systems the necessary feedback and monitoring mechanisms that will ensure self-renewal (adaptation) in order to achieve objectives</p> <p>JC3: The institution has designed and put into place the knowledge, systems and databases necessary to ensure that resource allocation reflects the strategic directions and operational needs expressed in plans.</p> <p>JC4: Mechanisms and modalities that serve to monitor and control resource allocation have been designed by the institution and then put in place and used.</p>
EQ9: Link to Results	To what extent is the institution more capable to achieve and monitor the “developmental results” stated in national and “departmental” plans in a sustainable manner?
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: The institution has been able to define what it requires to (sustainably) reach targeted service levels within appropriate quality standards.</p> <p>JC2: Strategies and mechanisms to engage non-governmental resources in the achievement of objectives related to the institution’s vision (including those related to coordination and complementarity) have been developed by the institution.</p> <p>JC3: The institution has a record of meeting its performance targets in relation to national developmental results.</p>
EQ10: Networking	To what extent is the institution accountable and able to work in a coordinated and efficient manner as part of a larger network of interested stakeholders?
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: Stakeholders assign legitimacy to the institution through an awareness of, and agreement with, the relationship between the mission, the objectives and the plans.</p> <p>JC2: The institution is the primary source of advice to politicians and decision-makers within (the fields and activities related to) its mandate.</p> <p>JC3: The institution has designed and put into place mechanisms to ensure that the application of the institution’s regulatory and control frameworks takes place in a transparent manner</p> <p>JC4: Managers, employees and key stakeholders are motivated to execute the mission of the institution and achieve its objectives for the sake of the common good.</p>
EQ11: Adaptation	To what extent is the institution in a position to constantly adapt in response to changing external environments and conditions?
Judgement criteria	JC1: The institution has designed and built into its plans and systems the

	<p>necessary feedback and monitoring mechanisms that will ensure self-renewal (adaptation) in order to achieve objectives</p> <p>JC2: The institution has the means (including the knowledge, skills and systems) to ensure that planning reflects the knowledge and experience of the institution, its networks and its stakeholders as well as the shifting trends inherent to its environments.</p> <p>JC3: The institution has developed systems and means to identify where it needs to innovate or promote innovation (transformational innovation in support of strategies and objectives)</p> <p>JC4: The institution has put into place the systems and means to assess the extent to which its management and task/responsibility structure reflects its needs for resiliency, diversity (capital and process advantage-seeking through integration and learning³), openness (complexity and network management) and systems/policy coherency.</p> <p>JC5: Policies are analysed and assessed on a timely basis and adjustments are made, based on knowledge management mechanisms including feedback, assessment, and evaluation.</p> <p>JC6: The institution has designed and put into place mechanisms to ensure that positions are filled on a merit basis</p>
EQ12: Coherence	To what extent has the institution succeeded in putting in place policy and management frameworks that build upon one another and provide evidence of a clear chain of results from the strategic to the operational levels?
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: The institution has developed plans and operating principles that are comprehensive and evidence-based, and where conclusions/recommendations flow from explicit chains of reasoning.</p> <p>JC2: The institution has determined the nature and composition of a comprehensive set of all framework documents required for the execution of its mission, including laws, regulations, directives and interpretations, and has put in place mechanisms to ensure their application.</p> <p>JC3: The institution has developed accountability frameworks (including those related to collective action) and is consistently monitoring against them.</p> <p>JC4: The institution has analysed alternatives and implemented a decision concerning the most appropriate hierarchical structure and decentralisation strategy consistent with the institution's mission and objectives.</p> <p>JC5: The institution has designed and put into place a comprehensive set of control frameworks and ensures compliance.</p> <p>JC6: Policies are analysed and assessed on a timely basis and adjustments are made, based on knowledge management mechanisms including feedback, assessment and evaluation.</p> <p>JC7: The institution has put into place mechanisms to ensure that human resource management strategies, policies and systems reflect ongoing and future strategic and operational needs and are executed in a transparent, equitable and unbiased manner.</p>
EQ13: Unexpected	How have non-planned capabilities (that have been developed as a result of

³ One of the 5Cs proposed by ECDPM, based on the management principles outlined in Konrad, A.M. et al, "Human Resource Management Practices For Achieving Diversity Advantage: Determinants And Outcomes Of The Configuration Of Diversity Management Structures", ASAC conference paper, 2006

outcomes dealing with capabilities	Capacity Development efforts in the institution) improved or reduced the overall capacity of the institution to execute its vision and achieve its objectives?
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: Ownership of the programme on the part of the partner country was a factor in bringing about the CD outcomes.</p> <p>JC2: The institution has developed the mechanisms to identify and assess the influence (effects) of un-planned CD to its institutional capacity</p> <p>JC3: The institution has the means in place to quickly build upon positive non-planned effects and mitigate the influence of non-useful effects</p>
EQs 14 to 17: Causality links	To what extent the institutional capacity outputs and/or other factors related to the OF have contributed to each of the above mentioned capacity outcomes (initiative, results, networking and adaptation).
Judgement criteria	<p>JC1: Evidence (examples, stories, etc.) clearly indicates that the advances mentioned in terms of Initiative [then, Results, Networking and Adaptation] have a significant causal correlation with the consolidation and mainstreaming of specific capacity outputs.</p> <p>JC2: Evidence (examples, stories, etc.) clearly indicates that the advances mentioned in terms of institutional Initiative [then, Results, Networking and Adaptation] have a significant causal correlation with other factors related to the Opportunity Framework.</p> <p>JC3: Evidence (examples, stories, etc.) clearly indicates that the advances mentioned in terms of institutional Initiative [then, Results, Networking and Adaptation] have a significant causal correlation with the interaction between specific capacity outputs and other factors related to the Opportunity Framework.</p>