



ROM BACKGROUND CONCLUSION SHEET (ONGOING)

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------|--|------|
| ROM ID | | | |
| Project Title | | | |
| Country | | | |
| Project Task Manager | | | |
| Expert(s) | | | |
| ROM field visit dates | start: | | end: |

1. RELEVANCE

The extent to which the objectives of the intervention are still consistent with beneficiaries' needs and partners' and donor's policies.

1.1 Does the intervention presently respond to the needs of the target groups?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

a. Were there any changes in the situation of the target groups and the context which have, or will, influence the relevance of the operation for target groups?

b. Have the activities of other actors such as government and donors changed the needs and priorities of the target groups?

c. From the target groups' perspective, what is the level of priority of the needs the operation is addressing?

| 1.2 Does the operation presently support the policy (or its development) of the partner government and is it in line with existing policy? | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p><i>a. Have there been any changes in Partner government policy which have had, or will have, an impact on the relevance of the operation?</i></p> <p><i>b. Is the operation supporting the development or improvement of a sector policy?</i></p> | | | | |
| 1.3 Is the operation in line with EC development policy and strategies? | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
| <p><i>a. Is the operation in line with the latest EU development cooperation policy?</i></p> <p><i>b. Is it aligned with EU policy for the specific sector in the country/region?</i></p> <p><i>c. Does the operation respect the EU's international commitments such as the Paris Declaration and follow-up?</i></p> <p><i>d. Is the operation embedded in and supporting policy dialogue which the EUD/HQ is engaged in?</i></p> | | | | |
| <p>Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.</p> | Overall conclusion - Relevance | | | |

2. QUALITY OF DESIGN

The internal coherence and validity of the intervention logic, its formalization in a logframe (or other format) and the implementation arrangements.

2.1 Does the present intervention logic still hold true and is it clear and coherent?

A

B

C

D

a. Does a logframe exist and what is its quality?

b. Is the operation's underlying intervention logic coherent, clear and realistic?

c. Is the approach adopted in the design taking sufficiently into account previous experience and state of the art knowledge in similar interventions?

d. Are the resources, capacity and timeframe adequate to achieve the project purpose?

e. Does the intervention logic explicitly mention risks and assumptions and are they specific, up to date and holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?

f. To which degree does the design foresee sufficient flexibility for adaptation to a changing context?

g. Are the indicators SMART?

| 2.2. Do the implementation arrangements take into account the capacity of the partners, and is the design fully supported by them? | | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>a. Are the timescale and activities realistic with regard to the stakeholders' capacities, organizational structure and implementation arrangements?</p> <p>b. Have the relevant stakeholders been actively involved, as a driving force, in the design process?</p> <p>c. Do all relevant stakeholders, especially the target group, understand and agree on the intervention logic?</p> <p>d. Are the roles and responsibilities of all partners clearly defined and understood by all concerned?</p> <p>e. Does the operation foresee adequate capacity development support?</p> | | | | | |
| 2.3 Is the current design sufficiently taking cross-cutting issues into account? | | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
| <p>a. Have the relevant cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, human rights and governance, donor coordination or others) been adequately mainstreamed in the design?</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.</p> | Overall conclusion - Quality of design | | | | |
| | Overall conclusion - Relevance and quality of design | | | | |

3. EFFICIENCY

A measure of how economically (in terms of quality, quantity and time) resources/inputs are converted to outputs.

3.1 How well is the availability and use of inputs and resources managed?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

- a. To what degree are inputs and resources provided/available on time from all parties involved to implement activities?*
- b. To what degree are inputs available at planned costs (or lower)?*
- c. Are staffing arrangements proving adequate?*
- d. Are inputs monitored regularly, and by whom, to encourage cost-effective implementation of activities?*
- e. Are operation resources managed well and in a transparent and accountable manner?*
- f. Is the current budget break-down conducive to the implementation of the operation?*
- g. Are all contractual procedures clearly understood and do they facilitate the implementation of the operation?*

3.2 How well are the activities implemented?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

- a. To what extent are activities implemented as planned/scheduled? If there are delays, have the reasons been identified and remedial action been taken to get the operation back on track?*
- b. Are funds spent in line with the implementation of activities? If not, why?*
- c. Is there a need to change any of the planned activities? If so, how well have these changes been managed?*
- d. How well are activities monitored? Is monitoring used to take corrective action?*
- e. How well does the operation co-ordinate with other, similar interventions (if any) for synergy and in order to avoid overlaps?*
- f. Is a logframe (or an equivalent tool) actively used as management tool? If not, why?*
- g. Is a work plan/implementation schedule available and actively used by project management?*

3.3 How well are the outputs achieved?

A

B

C

D

a. Are the outputs delivered as planned and in a coherent manner e.g. logical sequence?

b. What is the quality of the outputs? Are they likely to lead to the intended outcomes?

c. Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner?

d. Are the outputs accessible to the target group?

e. Are they correctly reflected through indicators?

3.4. How well are the Partners involved and contributing?

A

B

C

D

- a. Do the inter-institutional structures (e.g. steering committee, monitoring and reporting system, etc.) facilitate efficient implementation?*
- b. Is there good communication between partner government, EU, project management and other stakeholders?*
- c. If necessary, are specific arrangements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding, etc.) in place to promote active stakeholder involvement?*

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.

Overall conclusion - Efficiency

4. EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which the intervention's objectives (on outcome and project purpose level) are, or are expected to be, achieved.

4.1. How well is the operation achieving its expected outcomes?

 A B C D

a. Have the expected outcomes been achieved to date?

b. What is the quality of the outcomes?

c. How do target groups assess their usefulness?

d. Do all target groups (and everybody in the target group) benefit from the operation as expected?

e. Are there any factors which prevent target groups from benefitting?

4.2. As presently implemented, what is the likelihood that the project purpose will be achieved?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

a. To what extent has the project purpose been achieved so far? Is this measurable through the indicators or is there other evidence for this?

b. Given the achievement and quality of outcomes so far, what can be said about the likelihood of achieving the project purpose within the timeline of the operation?

c. To what extent has the operation adapted to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) in order to ensure the achievement of the outcomes and the project purpose?

d. Are there any unexpected, negative effects on the target group which have occurred or are likely to occur due to the operation? Did project management take remedial action against these?

e. Are there any unexpected positive effects on the target group which have occurred or are likely to occur?

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.

Overall conclusion - Effectiveness

5. IMPACT TO DATE

Likelihood of positive and negative, medium to long-term effects of an intervention, both direct and indirect, intended and unintended.

5.1. What are the operation's direct impact prospects (i.e. contribution at the level of overall objective)?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

a. Are there any changes on the level of the Overall Objective which can be observed (through indicators) so far? Can the operation be assessed as having contributed to these changes?

b. Given the progress so far, what direct impacts appear likely by the end of the operation?

c. Are any external factors likely to jeopardize the operation's direct impact?

d. Does the operation contribute to the development or improvement of related policies?

5.2 To what extent does/will the operation have any indirect (positive/negative) impact?

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

a. Is there any unplanned positive impact on the final beneficiaries?

b. Are there any observable or expected spill-over effects? Are there any indications that elements/aspects of the operation will be rolled out to or taken up by other parties?

c. What are the negative consequences, if any, of the operation on the target group and others? Did the operation take timely measures to mitigate negative impact?

d. What are the likely environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic long term effects?

e. Do donor coherence, complementarity and coordination encourage synergies and/or improve the potential impact of the operation?

Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies.

Overall conclusion - Impact to date

6. SUSTAINABILITY TO DATE

Likelihood of the continuation of benefits of an intervention after its completion.

6.1 What is the financial/economic viability of the continuation of benefits after the end of the operation?

 A

 B

 C

 D

a. Is there a viable financial sustainability plan in place and is it being implemented? i.e. if the benefits have to be supported after the operation's end, will funds be available? If so, by whom? By the partner government/project authority? Or is continued donor support required? If so, is it likely to be available?

b. If there are costs for continued access to the benefits, are target groups in a position to assume their share after the completion of the operation?

c. Are there any external factors that might jeopardize the sustainability of benefits, and if so, have appropriate measures been taken to forestall this?

d. Are the target groups and/or relevant authorities/institutions able to afford the maintenance or replacement of the technologies/services/outputs introduced by the operation?

e. Is the financial/economic dimension of the phasing out strategy being adequately addressed and implemented as far as necessary to date?

6.2. What is the level of ownership of the operation by the target group and relevant stakeholders?

 A

 B

 C

 D

a. Is an exit strategy integrated in the design and has the implementation been managed accordingly?

b. Is there any evidence of further commitment of the relevant stakeholders?

c. Is operation implementation demand-driven or is there simply passive buy-in from target groups?

d. Do the target groups plan to continue assuming their role in ensuring continued outputs and outcomes? If so, are they likely to materialize?

e. To what extent have they been actively involved in the implementation and steering process?

f. How far is the operation embedded in the local structures of the target group (possibly different from institutional structures)?

| 6.3. To what degree does the policy environment support the operation? | | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p><i>a. Is the national, local, sector and budgetary policy environment an enabling factor for the continuation of benefits? What specific support is being provided?</i></p> <p><i>b. Do changes in policies and priorities affect the potential sustainability of the benefits? If applicable, has the operation adapted to ensure long-term support?</i></p> <p><i>c. If relevant, is any public and private sector policy support likely to continue after the operation has ended?</i></p> | | | | | |
| 6.4. To what extent does the operation contribute to partners' capacity development? | | <input type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C | <input type="radio"/> D |
| <p><i>a. Does the operation contribute to the development of partner's individual and organizational capacities for sustainable delivery of outputs and outcomes?</i></p> <p><i>b. How far is the operation embedded in institutional structures that are likely to function beyond the life of the operation?</i></p> <p><i>c. Will an adequate level of qualified human and institutional resources be available in the future in order to continue delivering the operation's stream of benefits?</i></p> | | | | | |
| Note: a = very good; b = good; c = problems; d = serious deficiencies. | Overall conclusion - Sustainability to date | | | | |

7. HORIZONTAL ISSUES

7.1 Quality Systems, Monitoring and Evaluation

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>a) Were the QSG comments taken into consideration and included in the final design and applied during implementation?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <i>b) Are the issues identified by ROM regarding design the same as those addressed in the QSG checklist?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <i>c) Have previous evaluations or reviews (such as ROM, reviews by the EU operational manager) led to changes in the operation?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <i>d) Is the available monitoring and reporting information on the operation's progress comprehensive and reliable in order to ensure the possibility to evaluate results and learn lessons?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable:

7.2 Review of Technical Cooperation/Capacity Development Quality Criteria

Adaptation to the context and existing capacity

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>a) Are there critical constraints in the context which are likely to prevent the CD support from achieving its objectives?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <i>b) Is the CD support adequate vis-à-vis the present capacity of the local partner?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

Demand driven TC/CD and ownership

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>c) Do local partners effectively lead in the planning of CD support beyond formal endorsement?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <i>d) Do local partners provide the inputs (human or physical) that would be required to enable the CD support to be effective?</i> | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Result oriented TC/CD | | | |
| e) Are the outputs or outcomes of the CD support clearly specified and still relevant (or adjusted to changes of context)? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| f) Are they regularly monitored and/or assessed (e.g. through a joint performance dialogue or an annual reporting)? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| Harmonisation of TC/CD | | | |
| g) Is the CD support taking into account CD interventions from other donors in the same sector? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| h) Is there a donor coordination mechanism led by local partners and encompassing CD support? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| Project Implementation Arrangement | | | |
| i) Is CD support embedded in the broad institutional context of the local partners and have unnecessary parallel mechanisms been avoided? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| j) Do contracted experts, project managers and NGO staff take instructions from the partner and not the EC? (while some form of reporting to the EC can still take place) | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable: | | | |
| | | | |
| 7.3. EC Visibility | | | |
| Does the operation contribute to promoting EC visibility (e.g. does it comply with the EC Guidelines)? | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| Please comment on any of the questions / aspects above, qualitative data is very valuable: | | | |
| | | | |

8. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

8.1. Have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the operation's strategy?

Yes
 No
 N/A

If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of gender mainstreaming:

- a. Has the operation been planned on the basis of a gender-differentiated beneficiaries' analysis?*
- b. To what extent will / could the gender sensitive approach lead to an improved impact of the operation?*
- c. What is the likeliness of increased gender equality beyond the operation's end?*
- d. According to the OECD Gender Policy Marker how would you classify this operation?*

8.2. Is the operation respecting environmental needs?

Yes
 No
 N/A

If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of mainstreaming environmental aspects:

- a. Have environmental constraints and opportunities been considered adequately in the operation's design?*
- b. Are good environmental practices followed during implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc.)? Does the operation respect traditional, successful environmental practices?*
- c. What capacities exist (within the operation, among partners and the operation's context) to deal with critical risks that could affect the operation's effectiveness such as climate risks or risks of natural disasters (in the case of operations in sensitive geographical areas / natural disasters hotspots)?*
- d. Has environmental damage been caused or likely to be caused by the operation? What kind of environmental impact mitigation measures have been taken?*
- d. Is the achievement of project results and objectives likely to generate increased pressure on fragile ecosystems (natural forests, wetlands, coral reefs, mangroves) and scarce natural resources (e.g. surface and groundwater, timber, soil)?*

8.3. Has (good) governance been mainstreamed in the operation?

Yes No N/A

If so, how? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. Please consider the following aspects of governance:

a. Does it take into consideration the differential impact of poverty on disadvantaged groups?

b. Is the operation designed in such a way that it takes into account potential conflict?

c. Is regular, transparent, financial reporting built into the operation? Are its results widely circulated and understandable?

d. Are there effective anti-corruption monitoring tools in place?

8.4 Does the operation actively contribute to the promotion of Human Rights?

Yes No N/A

If so, how? If not, why not? If n/a, explain.

a. Has there been an analysis of “winners and losers” regarding possible “discrimination” of target groups by the operation?

b. Will the operation help to ensure respect for any relevant human rights and not cause them to be reduced in any way?

c. Do any interested parties and observers raise HR concerns?

OVERVIEW OF SUB-CRITERIA GRADES

| <i>Sub-criteria</i> | <i>Grade</i> |
|--|--------------|
| <i>1.1 Relevance for target groups</i> | |
| <i>1.2 Relevance for partner</i> | |
| <i>1.3 Relevance for EU</i> | |
| <i>2.1 Intervention logic</i> | |
| <i>2.2 Partners and Design</i> | |
| <i>2.3 Cross-cutting issues</i> | |
| <i>3.1 Inputs</i> | |
| <i>3.2 Activities</i> | |
| <i>3.3 Outputs</i> | |
| <i>3.4 Partners and Implementation</i> | |
| <i>4.1 Outcomes</i> | |
| <i>4.2 Project Purpose</i> | |
| <i>5.1 Direct impact</i> | |
| <i>5.2 Indirect impact</i> | |
| <i>6.1 Financial sustainability</i> | |
| <i>6.2 Ownership</i> | |
| <i>6.3 Policy support</i> | |
| <i>6.4 Capacity Development</i> | |
| <i>7.1 a) QSG comments</i> | |
| <i>7.1 b) QSG and ROM on design</i> | |
| <i>7.1 c) Evaluations and reviews</i> | |
| <i>7.1 d) Progress information</i> | |
| <i>7.2 a) TC/CD - constraints</i> | |
| <i>7.2 b) TC/CD - capacity</i> | |
| <i>7.2 c) TC/CD - partner lead</i> | |
| <i>7.2 d) TC/CD - partner input</i> | |
| <i>7.2 e) TC/CD - specified results</i> | |
| <i>7.2 f) TC/CD - monitoring</i> | |
| <i>7.2 g) TC/CD - other donors' intervention</i> | |
| <i>7.2 h) TC/CD - donor coordination</i> | |
| <i>7.2 i) TC/CD - embedded</i> | |
| <i>7.2 j) TC/CD - staff instructions</i> | |
| <i>7.3 EC visibility</i> | |
| <i>8.1 Gender</i> | |
| <i>8.2 Environment</i> | |
| <i>8.3 Good Governance</i> | |
| <i>8.4 Human rights</i> | |