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1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Rationale behind establishment of EIGE

The European Institute for Gender Equality (hereinafter, EIGE/the Institute) was established by the 2006 Parliament and Council Regulation 1922/2006.¹ The following aspects justifying EIGE’s establishment were provided in the two main feasibility studies carried out by the European Commission and European Parliament:

- Institutional deficit in the European activity on gender equality, including lack of continuous support structure providing relevant technical expertise;
- Too large focus of gender equality policies on labour market and too little attention given to other policy fields where gender equality is important;
- Uneven implementation of existing Directives on gender equality in labour market across the EU countries;
- Failure of the existing agencies to mainstream gender equality in their domains;
- Need for a mechanism of co-opting stakeholder groups into the decision-making process;
- Need for mobilisation of policy-relevant expertise and competence already available (e.g. developed at the national level) to increase visibility of the European public action in the field and minimise bureaucratic or political bias.

These studies suggested that to address the aspects mentioned above the key functions of Institute should include: collection, interpretation and dissemination of objective, timely, reliable and comparable information and research results/data, especially with a more practical emphasis; promotion, development and fostering of cooperation and networking; development and testing of tools, models and methods for gender mainstreaming; provision of technical assistance and best practices concerning the implementation of these instruments to policy makers; increasing visibility for gender equality through campaigns, seminars and workshops as well as other awareness raising actions, and coordination of research.

1.2. Wider European policy context of EIGE

The Institute’s establishing Regulation was launched in 2006. At the time, the main policy frameworks relevant for EIGE included the Lisbon Strategy (2000-2010), the 2006 European Pact for Gender Equality, and the Roadmap for equality between women and men (2006-2010).

The **Beijing Platform for Action**, launched following the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 and reviewed every 5 years since, is the major EU’s international commitment in the field of gender equality. In 1998, it was decided that the Council of the EU would provide information about the progress of Member States in the twelve critical areas of concern, which include (a) women and poverty; (b) education and training for women; (c) women and health; (d) violence against women; (e) women and armed conflict; (f)

women and the economy; (g) women in power and decision-making; (h) institutional mechanisms for advancement of women; (i) human rights of women; (j) women and the media; (k) women and the environment; (l) the girl child.

The subsequent European strategies and policy documents in the field of gender equality follow up these key areas of concern. Consequently, these areas are the main topics of action for EIGE.

The Lisbon strategy, which was the EU’s action and development plan between 2000 and 2010, aimed to make the European Union the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. It initially foresaw gender equality and gender mainstreaming as an explicit political objective. The strategy also included gender-specific targets, e.g. the employment rate of 60% among women.

However, in 2005 the strategy was reviewed in the light that most of the initial targets were seen to be unachievable by 2010. The new focus of Lisbon strategy included stronger focus on growth and jobs, subsuming social cohesion objectives under these priorities. However, this meant that the gender equality guidelines was removed and the gender mainstreaming approach was weakened in the Lisbon framework. Consequentially, the institutional commitment to gender mainstreaming at the highest level dwindled, and the focus on gender equality issues decreased in national level policy documents as well.2

Despite these unfavourable developments (and at least partly to mitigate them), the Roadmap for equality between women and men (2006-2010) developed by the Commission reaffirmed the dual approach of gender equality based on gender mainstreaming and specific measures, stated in previous EU policy documents in the field (e.g. the Framework Strategy for equality between women and men). It set out six main priority areas for EU action on gender equality, including:

- Equal economic independence;
- Reconciliation of work, private and family life;
- Promoting equal participation of women and men in decision making;
- Eradicating gender-based violence and trafficking;
- Eliminating gender stereotypes in society;
- Promoting gender equality outside the EU.

The Roadmap specifically mentioned the lack of progress in the areas mentioned above, requiring better governance at all levels. It specifically stated that the establishment of EIGE would provide expertise, improve knowledge and heighten visibility of gender equality. EIGE took up most of the areas identified in the Roadmap as its main fields of focus. Additionally, the Roadmap already called for the development of Gender Equality Index (which is currently largely based on the domains identified in this Roadmap), indicators for the Beijing Platform for action and the European network of gender equality institutions.

The **2006 European Pact for Gender Equality** launched by the Council reiterated the points raised by the Roadmap and encouraged action on EU and Member States level on measures to close gender gaps and combat gender stereotypes in the labour market, measures to promote a better work-life balance for all, and measures to reinforce governance through gender mainstreaming and better monitoring. The latter measures specifically called to fully utilise the opportunities presented by establishment of EIGE.

2010 marked a period of changing strategic context in most areas of EU policy, with the new strategy **Europe 2020** replacing the Lisbon strategy. The main target area in terms of gender equality remained the female employment rate, this time set at 75% against the baseline of 63%. On the other hand, the targets related to educational attainment and early school leaving are more challenging among the male population. The focus of Europe 2020 on inclusive growth in general also presumes that the benefits of EU level policy should be felt by women and men alike. Therefore, the monitoring of gender aspects of the Europe 2020 target achievement is a particularly important task for EIGE, which it fulfils by offering data on employment, poverty and education.

The Commission's **Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015** following the previous Roadmap strongly recognised the role of EIGE in the European gender equality policy and set out the key tasks for its functioning:

- A documentation centre for gender mainstreaming;
- Support for development of mainstreaming tools and methods;
- Gender equality index;
- Virtual European Network on Gender Equality.

Additionally, helping the Commission and Member States to report on EU-level indicators under Beijing Platform for Action was set out as the role of EIGE. The thematic fields of EIGE’s work, such as gender-based violence, women and men in decision making, equality in economic independence were also reiterated as the key fields for European policy action.

The new European strategy was also followed up by Council’s **European Pact for Gender Equality 2011-2020**, focusing on gender pay gap and other gaps in employment and social protection, better work-life balance for women and men as well as combat against gender-based violence. Similarly to the pact of the previous period, the full utilisation of EIGE’s capacities in the field was advised.

### 1.3. Activities and functions of the Institute in a complex area and environment

EIGE’s **mission** is to become the European knowledge centre on gender equality issues. This mission is fulfilled through the role and tasks set out in its founding regulation. According to the Regulation, the specific tasks of the Institute include:

- Collection, analysis and dissemination of relevant objective, comparable and reliable information as regards gender equality, including results from research and best practice communicated by Member States, Community institutions, research centres, national equality bodies, non-governmental organisations, social partners, relevant third countries and international organisations, and suggestion of areas for further research;
- Development of methods to improve the objectivity, comparability and reliability of data at European level by establishing criteria that will improve the consistency of information and take into account gender issues when collecting data;

- Development, analysis, evaluation and dissemination of methodological tools in order to support the integration of gender equality into all Community policies and the resulting national policies and to support gender mainstreaming in all Community institutions and bodies;

- Carrying out surveys on the situation in Europe as regards gender equality;

- Setting up and coordination of a European Network on Gender Equality, involving the centres, bodies, organisations and experts dealing with gender equality and gender mainstreaming in order to support and encourage research, optimise the use of available resources and foster the exchange and dissemination of information;

- Organisation of ad hoc meetings of experts to support the Institute’s research work, encourage the exchange of information among researchers and promote the inclusion of a gender perspective in their research;

- In order to raise EU citizens’ awareness of gender equality, organisation, with relevant stakeholders, of conferences, campaigns and meetings at European level, and presentation of the findings and conclusions to the Commission;

- Dissemination of information regarding positive examples of non-stereotypical roles for women and men in every walk of life, presentation of its findings and initiatives designed to publicise and build on such success stories;

- Development of a dialogue and cooperation with non-governmental and equal opportunities organisations, universities and experts, research centres, social partners and related bodies actively seeking to achieve equality at national and European level;

- Setting up of documentation resources accessible to the public;

- Making information on gender mainstreaming available to public and private organisations;

- Provision of information to the Community Institutions on gender equality and gender mainstreaming in the accession and candidate countries.

The Regulation also sets out the overall (long-term) objectives of EIGE: (a) contribution to and strengthening of gender equality including gender mainstreaming in all Community policies and the resulting national policies, (b) the fight against discrimination based on sex, and (c) raising the EU citizens’ awareness of gender equality.

These main aspects are also reflected in EIGE’s vision to make equality between women and men a reality for all Europeans and beyond.

Understanding the intervention logic of EIGE is the key to robust evaluation design and in particular to accurate assessment of its effectiveness and impact. The intervention logic provided below is drawn from EU policy documents, EIGE’s strategic planning documents and annual reports / annual activity reports published during the period to be evaluated. It should be noted that the activities put in the intervention logic are based on the information provided in EIGE’s regulation and not on its actual projects conducted. More information about the exact projects is presented in the section on case study selection.

---

3 The intervention logic is a causal link between the activities undertaken and the expected effects of policy or an organisation.
Figure 1. The intervention logic of EIGE

**Long-term impacts**
- Reduction of gender stereotypes among EU citizens
- Diminishing discrimination based on sex
- Improving equality between women and men

**Immediate impacts**
- Mainstreaming gender equality into policy and practice
- Improved gender equality competence among the stakeholders and the general public
- Increased gender equality aspects included in political agenda at EU and MS level
- New policy decisions made at EU and MS level on gender equality issues
- New or strengthened institutions active in the field of gender equality
- Strengthened organisational capacities of gender equality policy stakeholders

**Results**
- Raised awareness of stakeholders and public in general about gender equality
- Knowledge on gender equality gained by stakeholders
- Application of gained knowledge in the work of stakeholders
- New concepts and ideas introduced into policy discussions
- New research, evidence disseminated to stakeholders
- Strengthened cooperation and expanded network of organisations helping fight discrimination and mainstream gender equality

**Outputs**
- Collected, analysed and disseminated relevant information on gender equality
- Knowledge gaps filled, new knowledge, insights and evidence generated
- Fostered networking and exchange of information on issues of gender equality
- Technical assistance provided to EU and national institutions (monitoring and reporting, policy advice)

**Activities**
- Collecting research results and best practices
- Suggesting areas for further research
- Operation of Resource and Documentation Centre
- Informing public and private organisations on gender mainstreaming
- Collecting and disseminating positive examples of non-stereotypical gender roles
- Carrying out surveys on gender equality situation in Europe
- Gender statistics database and Gender Equality Index
- Identification of benefits of gender equality
- Ensuring comparative data on gender-based violence
- European Network on Gender Equality (online)
- EIGE Experts’ Forum
- Organisation of ad hoc expert meetings
- Organisation of European level conferences, campaigns and meetings
- Developing dialogue and cooperation with other bodies active in gender equality
- Developing methodologies for gender mainstreaming in EU and national policies, institutions and bodies, advising on its application
- Information provided to EU institutions (Commission, Parliament etc.) on gender equality and mainstreaming in Member States, accession and candidate countries;
- Monitoring progress in Beijing Platform for
EIGE functions in a highly sensitive and challenging environment. The following main aspects make the gender equality policy a particularly challenging policy field:

- Lack of reliable data in the most sensitive areas of inequality, such as gender-based violence or double inequalities (e.g. gender inequality in migrant communities), which makes the evidence-based actions extremely difficult;

- Very divergent prevailing gender inequalities in different Member States as evidenced by the findings of Gender Equality Index (e.g. in Italy the issues related to knowledge and power are the most pressing and in Hungary work and health inequalities are prevalent). This means that the needs of support in different Member States are also significantly different;

- Unstable national and European level political support to the issue. The idea of EIGE was first raised in the 1990s in a favourable European political climate. By 2005, however, the strategic focus on gender equality had suffered a negative shift. The economic and financial crisis starting in 2008-2009 further pushed gender equality to the role of "secondary issue" in many countries which were forced to implement austerity measures. In the new Europe 2020 strategy, the gender dimension returned to the strategic level of policy planning, although the support throughout Member States remained uneven. This lack of continuity

- The final target groups of EIGE's activities are very divergent in different cases – certain issues (employment, decision making) affect the total female population, other issues affect only certain groups of females, and some inequalities (life expectancy, educational attainment) affect men;

- Prevailing social, cultural and economic factors, such as traditional household labour division between genders, male-dominated business cultures, lack of female role models and continuing gender stereotypes mean lack of enforcement of gender equality legislation even where it exists. These factors are usually deeply rooted and require decades of work to be properly addressed.

1.4. Organisational structure and management of EIGE

This section presents the current organisational set-up and management structure of EIGE.

At first we present our understanding if the overall organisational structure of EIGE. Subsequently, we give a brief overview of the management and governance bodies of EIGE (the Management Board, the Standing Committee, the Experts' Forum and the Director). Then, the two EIGE units (Administration and Operations) are described. Finally, at the end of this section, the most important functions within the organisation (HR, ICT, Procurement, Finance and Budgeting, etc.) are touched upon.

1.4.1. Organisational structure of EIGE

EIGE's core bodies constitute of a Management Board (the decision-making body), an Experts' Forum (a consultative body) and its Director (executive body) including her staff. Operationally, the work of EIGE is allocated within two Units – the Administration Unit and the Operational Unit.

---

Based on ex ante evaluations and feasibility studies of EIGE, European policy documents, EIGE's mid-term and annual work programmes.
The organisational structure of EIGE has been depicted here below:

**Figure 2: Organisational structure of EIGE**

1.4.2. **The Bodies of EIGE: Management Board, Standing Committee, Experts’ Forum and Director**

**Management Board and Standing Committee**

The Management Board adopts the annual work programme, the medium-term work programme as well as the Institute’s budget. The Board consists of 18 representatives from the Member States and operates on a rotation basis thus guaranteeing total representation combined with operational efficiency. According to the Rules of Procedure for the Management Board of EIGE, the Member States are divided into three groups of nine in the order of the forthcoming Presidencies. To ensure an orderly rotation, the Member States are divided as follows:

- For the first term of office – 2007-2009 – the representatives were drawn from the first two groups of Member States;
- For the second term – 2010-2012 – the representatives were composed of members drawn from the third and first groups;
- For the third term – 2013-2015 – from the second and third groups.

The same principle should be applied for the rotation of the members beyond 2015. In the event of future enlargements, this system would have to be adjusted accordingly.

---

5 For the exact lists of Member States within each of the rotation groups, please see Rules of Procedure for the Management Board of EIGE, available on the webpage: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents](http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents)
Apart from the Member States’ representatives within the Management Board, one member represents the European Commission.

There is an equal number of substitute members and the length of its representatives’ mandate is 3 years. The members need to be appointed in a way to guarantee the highest standards of competence and a broad range of relevant and transdisciplinary expertise in the area of gender quality.

The Management Board elects its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for a term of 3 years by secret ballot from amongst the full members at the first meeting of the Management Board following the appointment of its members. Detailed rules for their appointment are described in Rules of Procedure for the Management Board of EIGE. In the absence of the Chair, his or her duties, in particular chairing of the Management Board meetings, shall be performed by the Vice-Chair (if this is not possible – by a person appointed by the Chair). If the Chair resigns or is unable to serve for any other reason, a new Chair should be appointed for the remainder of the term of office. The same rule applies to the Vice-Chair.

The Chair has the following responsibilities with respect to the Management Board meetings:

- convenes the Board meetings;
- draws up, in consultation with the Director, a provisional agenda for the coming meeting;
- signs approved meeting minutes;
- invites, in consultation with the Director, other persons or agencies to participate in the Board meetings as observer;
- is in charge of decision making within the Board, but himself or herself has only the casting vote;
- initiates in consultation with the Director a written procedure for the Management Board to adopt decisions between the meetings of the Board if necessary for the functioning of EIGE.

The Management Board appoints the Director, the Standing Committee and the Accountant.

The Standing Committee is a sub-group of the Management Board. It prepares the issues for the Agenda for the Management Board and advises the Director of EIGE. The Committee is composed of the Chair of the Management Board, the Vice-Chair and three other members representing Member States and one representative of the European Commission.

Experts' Forum

The Experts' Forum is the Institute’s advisory body. Its principle function is to provide expertise knowledge in the field of gender equality.

It is composed of members from competent bodies specialised in gender equality issues from every Member State of the European Union. Each Member State has both a member and an alternate. Other members are

---

6 *Rules of Procedure for the Management Board of EIGE*, available on the webpage: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents](http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents)

7 According to information provided on the webpage of EIGE: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/management-board](http://eige.europa.eu/content/management-board)
designated by the European Parliament (two), the European Commission (three) and interested parties at the European level, with one representative from:

- an appropriate non-governmental organisation at Community level which has a legitimate interest in contributing to the fight against discrimination on grounds of sex and the promotion of gender equality;
- employers’ organisations at Community level; and
- workers’ organisations at Community level.

Members of the Forum are designated for a period of three years. The Member States and the Commission aim to achieve a balanced representation between men and women in the Experts’ Forum. Members may be replaced by alternates, appointed at the same time. Within the current Experts’ Forum women representatives outnumber the men.

**Director**

The Director is the Institute's legal representative. The Director is responsible, under the supervision of the Management Board, for:

- the implementation of the tasks of EIGE;
- staff-related matters;
- the day-to-day administration;
- the preparation and implementation of the Institute's annual and medium-term programmes of activities;
- the preparation and publishing of the annual report of EIGE;
- the implementation of effective monitoring and evaluation procedures regarding the performance of the Institute.

The current Director has been appointed on 16 April 2009, for a 5 year term. The Director is appointed by the Management Board on the basis of a list of candidates proposed by the Commission after an open competition, following publication in the Official Journal of the European Union and elsewhere of a call for expressions of interest. Before the formal appointment, the candidate selected by the Management Board is asked to make a declaration before competent committee(s) of the European Parliament and answer questions from its/their members. Upon a proposal from the Commission, the term of office of the Director may be extended once for a period of not more than five years.

**1.4.3. Human Resources of EIGE**

The staff of EIGE is allocated between two Units as described in the section above and is composed of 47 persons. The Administration Unit is composed of the Head of Administration and 4 teams supported by the

---

8 According to information provided on the webpage of EIGE: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/experts-forum](http://eige.europa.eu/content/experts-forum)

9 *Internal Rules of EIGE*, available on the webpage: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents](http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents)
Administration Secretariat - approximately 10 people. The Operations Unit is made up of the Head of Operations and 5 teams supported by the Operations Secretariat – approximately 37 people. The teams are supplemented by Seconded National Experts, Trainees (Interns) and Interim staff. The Director’s offices includes 2 persons of support staff, i.e. the Director’s Assistant and the Administrative Agent.

1.4.4. Units of EIGE

The Administration Unit is one of two units at the European Institute for gender Equality (EIGE). Its work is divided into five main areas of activity: Human Resources; Procurement and Finance; Budget and Accounting; ICT and Logistics. The main beneficiaries of the support provided by the administration unit are the management and staff of EIGE.

The work of EIGE’s Operations unit is concentrated in five key areas of activity: Communications; Stakeholders and Networking; Resource and Documentation; Gender Mainstreaming; and Data Collection, Statistics and Indices.

The missions and objectives of the both units are presented in the table below.

**Table 1: Mission, objectives and activities of EIGE units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration Unit</th>
<th>Operations Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of activity</strong></td>
<td>- Human Resources;</td>
<td>- Communications;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Procurement and Finance;</td>
<td>- Stakeholders and Networking;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget and Accounting;</td>
<td>- Resource and Documentation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ICT and Logistics.</td>
<td>- Gender Mainstreaming;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Data Collection, Statistics and Indices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>To ensure smooth and effective functioning of the agency within its administrative areas.</td>
<td>To support the EU institutions (particularly the European Commission) and the Member States in the implementation of gender equality policies and the integration of a gender perspective in relevant policy processes at EU and national levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>- Guarantee the smooth functioning of the agency on a daily basis (overseeing all tasks, from the cleaning of offices to the payment of salaries);</td>
<td>- Support better-informed decision making by providing reliable and comparable data and indicators on gender equality, gender-based violence and information on methods, tools and good practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure that the agency’s needs in terms of budget, contract and procurement processes are administratively sound;</td>
<td>- Contribute to increased awareness among decision-makers and the public of progress and challenges in implementing European gender equality policies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure that the agency’s administrative processes and procedures meet all obligations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Promote the use of best practices in policy development and implementation in all administrative processes and procedures at the agency.
- Carry out the Institute's mission and vision, in close cooperation with the Administration Unit.

Source: The European Institute for Gender Equality's Mission, Vision and Objectives, available at the webpage of EIGE: http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents

While working on the designated disciplines, personnel of EIGE contributes to the formulation of the Annual Work Programme, the Annual Report, the Annual Activity Report and the Mid-term Work Programme. Planning for the annual work programmes takes place 18 months in advance of the specific year. Procedures are in place to support the co-ordination of the work and regular communication takes place via team meetings, team leader's meetings with the Director, Heads of Unit meetings with the Director and bi-monthly staff meetings.

Human Resources Management at EIGE Accounting and budgetting at the Agency are dealt with by the Accounting officer, the Finance and Procurement officer and an Administrative Agent.

These staff members deal with the financial management and authorisation of administrative expenditure, contracts and grants.  

1.4.5. ICT

EIGE also has an ICT & Logistics Agent and Administrative Agent that ensure uninterrupted availability, integrity and optimal performance of the Institute's information and communication technology facilities through the deployment and administration of ICT systems and services.

1.4.6. Communication

EIGE has four staff members who are dedicated to streamline the communication of the Agency: a Senior Communications Officer, an Information & Communications Officer, an Online Communications Officer, and a Networking & Communications Assistant that design, plan and implement the internal and external communication strategy of the Agency, aimed at increasing a general knowledge and interest in gender equality and informing stakeholders and wider audiences about gender equality and the work of the Institute.

1.4.7. Monitoring and Evaluation

EIGE adheres to the principles set out in the Results-Based Management (RBM) methodology, using parameters and indicators to monitor the implementation of its work programmes.

---

10 According to information provided on the webpage of EIGE: http://eige.europa.eu/content
11 According to information provided on the webpage of EIGE: http://eige.europa.eu/content
12 According to information provided on the webpage of EIGE: http://eige.europa.eu/content
The RBM methodology, also known as Management by objectives (MBO), is a process of defining objectives within an organisation to ensure that management and staff agree to the objectives and understand what they need to do in order to achieve these objectives.

To allow for follow-up of the Institute’s work in relation to the work programme, the Director of the Institute reports on current developments and all issues of importance to the Institute during each Management Board meeting.\(^{13}\)

Output indicators have been defined for this purpose (e.g. cooperation agreements with organisations dealing with gender equality; website updated for new technologies; visits to EIGE by external stakeholders, meetings with the European Parliament, regular meetings of the Management Board and the Experts’ Forum held, reports, studies, update of the Gender Equality index, etc.).\(^{14}\)

### 1.5. Stakeholder structure of EIGE

The tender specifications already specify a number of EIGE’s stakeholders at European, national and international level. All these stakeholders interact with EIGE in different ways and there are varied soft and hard ways in which they can influence EIGE’s work.

Based on our experience in previous evaluations of EU decentralised agencies, we have developed an updated structure of EIGE’s as an EU agency’s stakeholders, which is presented in the scheme below.

\(^{13}\) 2014 Work Programme available at the webpage: [http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents](http://eige.europa.eu/content/important-documents)

\(^{14}\) 2014 Work Programme
1.6. Previous evaluations and assessments

Although the forthcoming assignment will be the first ex post evaluation of EIGE, the following studies / evaluations which had the Institute as an object have been already conducted:

- The Feasibility study carried out by the European Commission
- The Feasibility study carried out by the European Parliament
- The Ex- Ante evaluation (2006)
- The Second Ex-Ante evaluation (2011)
- The evaluation of the EU decentralised agencies in 2009

Below we present the main earlier findings on the topics which will be also touched upon in the new evaluation.
Relevance

The feasibility study in 2002 concluded that the Institute should have links to research centres and should collect and disseminate existing research rather than conduct research itself. The Institute should be a technical institution and its main target group should be the policy-makers at European level.

An ex ante evaluation has also been undertaken just before creating the agency and several alternatives were considered, including the options of extending the remit of FRA or EUROFOUND. These options were rejected on the basis that gender equality would remain a peripheral matter in the extended agencies and thus would not be given sufficient political attention.

The second ex ante evaluation estimated that the relevance of the Institute was in fact bigger in 2011 than it was upon the time of the Regulation, due to setbacks in some European countries on gender related legislation, such as abortion legislation. Second ex-ante evaluation also found the agency to be highly relevant among the surveyed stakeholders and this was also evidenced by the policy context review which showed that there were many policy fields which lacked comparable statistical data and it was discussed whether EIGE should be tasked with filling such gaps or whether by doing so they address an immediate problem focused on a relatively small part of the gender equality policy arena where the output is useable for a short period of time.

Coherence and Added Value

The 2005 ex ante evaluation concluded that an independent body in the field of gender equality could more easily ensure the stakeholder involvement needed at European level (through expert networks, national representation on the management Board, etc.) and could more easily establish and maintain formal and informal networks throughout the Community. It was also concluded that the greater independence of agencies enhances the credibility and perceived objectivity of information and can provide a more neutral forum for discussions and exchange of information.

Whereas from the constituent act it could be derived that information dissemination and awareness-raising are the main tasks of the Institute, the discussions and the finances available direct the main task of the Institute towards the provision and development of methods and methodologies, as well as support to the Community institutions in implementing gender equality and gender mainstreaming in their work. The tasks foreseen in the constituent act are much wider than the budget allocated to deliver the results.

Effectiveness

As evidenced by the second ex-ante evaluation of EIGE, the agency was effective in delivering technical assistance to the Community Institutions and authorities of the Member States. The surveyed stakeholders positively evaluated the collection of data and statistics where gaps of such data existed, the development of a Gender Equality Index, the collection of information on gender equality policies and legislation in Member States, and the collection of good practices.

By exercising the technical support function, EIGE produced many outputs, effectiveness and impact of which highly depended on how the stakeholders used the Institute's outputs and how they affected their decisions. In this regard the second ex-ante evaluation found that while EIGE has commissioned a wide range of different research projects, none of the outputs from these assignments were publicly available. On
the other hand, EIGE alone could not affect change, its outputs and outcomes might be widely adopted, though its impact might be marginal and indirect.

Moreover, second ex-ante evaluation concluded there was a need expressed by the stakeholders to further extend to data analysis and research, develop tools and methods in relation to gender mainstreaming, provide tools, methods and training material on how to monitor progress and conduct gender impact assessments, and to provide gender mainstreaming training.

**Efficiency**

The question of efficiency of EIGE was analysed in more detail in the 2009 evaluation of EU decentralised agencies. It found that one of the challenges for the Management Board is how to keep the Member States currently not in the Board involved in the Institute's activities. It was concluded that a good alternative for this is the Experts' Forum, where all Member States are present. However, the Experts' Forum is not clearly defined when it comes to the representation of the Member States. The constituent act states that the Experts' Forum should be composed of members from competent bodies specialised in gender equality issues", but it is not defined what these competent bodies are and on what level the representation should be.

The evaluation also found that the administrative issues of EIGE (inspection of the potential location, signing of Service Level Agreements with the Office for Infrastructure and logistics (OIB), etc.) were split among several units, which made it difficult to achieve an overview of the process.

It was also concluded that staff mobility and a large number of coordinators meant that the institutional memory of the parent DG was split among too many people, which did not foster efficient coordination. This may partly have been caused by the late approval of the Director, but it nevertheless seemed to the evaluator that a more streamlined administrative support structure, giving assistance with respect to setting-up the Institute, would have been needed in order to improve the efficiency of the set-up process. Also, EIGE had one of the highest travel time index and the same for travel cost, whilst its networking function would require a high accessibility.

2. **METHODOLOGY**

2.1. **Our approach**

2.1.1. **Objectives and scope of the evaluation**

The objective of the forthcoming assignment is to provide an external, independent evaluation of the activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of EIGE since the recruitment of its first staff member in April 2009 until the end of 2013. However, given the timeline of the evaluation it is clear that by the time it is finalised approximately 18 months will have passed since the end of the evaluation period. Our experience shows that organisational evaluations have the highest quality and usefulness when they can present conclusions and recommendations updated according to the specific policy context at the time the report is published. For this purpose, the evaluation will also take into account the later developments and define the ways in which the situation has already changed compared to the evaluation period.
EIGE has not so far undergone any ex-post evaluation. Originally, the external evaluation of EIGE’s impacts and synergy effects was foreseen to be commissioned by January 2010. However, this assignment was transformed into a second ex-ante evaluation due to the fact that the Institute became functional later than initially planned. The overarching evaluation of the EU decentralised agencies in 2009 discussed the rationale, coherence and efficiency of EIGE, but also considered that it was too early to estimate its effectiveness in achieving outputs, customer satisfaction, or impacts.

The ex-ante evaluations, like the ones conducted on EIGE so far, focus on formation of the plan or strategy for the implementation of a specific intervention, e.g. how well its design is adjusted to meet the objectives, whether it is coherent with other interventions in the area, how efficient it is and how well this design is following the best practices. This type of evaluations identifies the preconditions for activities to be successful and check if these preconditions will be met under given resources. The relevance questions are also central in this type of evaluation. These features of ex ante evaluations mean that stakeholder interviews, focus groups and expert judgment are usually the main tools used in them.

The forthcoming ex post evaluation, on the other hand, will focus much more on the impacts which can already be measured as a sufficient amount of time has passed since the intervention (establishment of the Institute) has started. Much more information on the efficiency and effectiveness of EIGE can also be reached already. Our approach to this evaluation is to focus much more on the detailed operationalization of evaluation questions, raising of the hypotheses and gathering of much more quantitative and representative data to test them. Strong focus will be put on beneficiaries and stakeholders of the Institute while gathering this data. The surveys, case studies and the wide interview programme will be the main building blocks allowing us to provide strong conclusions and recommendations.

The main objective of the proposed evaluation is to analyse the effectiveness, efficiency (including appropriateness of management structure), added value (impact) as well as coordination and coherence (including synergy effects) of the Institute’s activities. Based on the findings gathered, the conclusions and recommendations will be formulated, including an estimation whether modification or extension of the Institute’s tasks are needed and what financial implications this might cause. The evaluation will provide an assessment of the extent to which the recommendations made by the ex ante evaluations and the feasibility studies have been put into practice. It will also take into account the changes in the operational environment of the Agency since its establishment, the evolution of EU policy concerning gender equality and changes in EU policy instruments affecting EIGE’s activities, which were discussed briefly in the background section.

The proposed evaluation will combine a retrospective and prospective analysis:

- retrospective analysis will concern the effectiveness, efficiency, added value and coordination/coherence of EIGE’s past activities, as well as the qualitative and quantitative aspects of its work for the 2009-2013 period;

- prospective analysis will consider the strengths and weaknesses of EIGE and will provide recommendations for its work and organisation in the future. More specifically, the prospective analysis will be based on new policy developments at the EU level, findings of the retrospective analysis, the opinions of the relevant stakeholders gathered through surveys and interviews, and additional evaluation methods (including SWOT and focus groups).

EIGE’s mid-term work programme for 2013-2015 will be taken as a reference point for recommendations on how its activities could be further developed in the future. The evaluation will encompass the entire scope of
EIGE’s activities according to thematic and functional aspects. An in-depth analysis of results and impacts of EIGE will be conducted in the representative sample of activities/projects selected for the case studies.

2.1.2. Design of evaluation

In order to answer the questions provided in the tender specifications for this assignment, the operational questions and judgement criteria must be defined. The operationalisation of the questions in terms of judgement criteria and preliminary indicators, target groups to be approached, as well as the main data collection and analysis methods to be applied is presented in the following sections of this chapter for each of the main evaluation issues. All evaluation methods concerning data collection and analysis are described in detail in further sections.

The operationalisation of evaluation questions will be refined in the inception phase and agreed with the Steering Committee of the evaluation. During this period, upon the agreement with Steering Committee, the quantitative or qualitative indicators as well as their arger levels/baselines will be further developed from the current judgment criteria.

2.1.3. Main principles of the methodological approach

Taking into consideration the objectives of the evaluation and its questions, we propose a methodology resting on the principles presented below.

First, in order to provide a comprehensive view of the EIGE’s objectives and their implementation, the evaluation will cover both European and national levels. The European level will address the key European level actors, including public actors, NGOs, social partners, and other stakeholders. National level will focus on national public actors, as well as other national key stakeholders. Additionally, we propose to carry out the analysis at the institutional level, by conducting interviews with EIGE staff members as well as the members of its Management Board and Experts’ Forum.

Second, the analysis of the monitoring, evaluation and other data will be based on recognised methods of evaluation. The evaluation will use quantitative indicators wherever possible.

Third, we propose an evidence-based evaluation. The analysis of data will rely on the logic of triangulation. Our answer to each evaluation question will rely on several sources of information, as indicated in the operationalisation tables below. Also, the evaluation will clearly state the extent to which the evaluation findings and conclusions are supported by the evaluation information (weakly supported; moderately supported; strongly supported) and by which information (objectively verifiable data, analytical insights, opinions of the stakeholders etc.). Where opinion is one of the main sources of information, the degree of consensus will be indicated. Overall, all our reasoning shall be made fully transparent and extensively discussed with the Steering Committee to ensure broad agreement and understanding on the process for presenting methods and findings.

Fourth, we propose an approach which has been successfully tested in carrying out other organisational evaluations at EU level, and in particular the evaluations of other EU agencies, e.g. Cedefop (in 2013), ETF (in 2011), European Research Council Executive agency, Research Executive Agency, Executive Agency for Competitiveness and Innovation. These evaluations have been very highly regarded by the Commission and the stakeholders of the agencies, particularly due to their depth of analysis and robustness of evidence.
Fifth, as the premises of PPMI Group and PPMI are based in Vilnius, geographic proximity of the evaluation team and EIGE will allow a particularly strong hands-on approach towards evaluation. There will be no financial constraints to the participation of evaluation team representatives in any meetings or events (e.g. Management Board or Experts' Forum meetings, conferences) organised in EIGE’s premises or elsewhere in Vilnius, which will ensure a more participatory and direct collection of relevant information. The interview programme with EIGE’s staff will be conducted face-to-face and the approach of a field visit measuring the opinions of staff at a single point in time and interviews spread out through the timeline of evaluation for methodology building, data gathering and validation purposes can be used simultaneously. Moreover, this allows a very easy and costless organisation of any required ad hoc meetings of the evaluation team and and EIGE’s representatives.

2.2. Evaluation questions and indicators

In this section, we elaborate the evaluation criteria stated in the tender specifications for this assignment, structuring them by issue. We review the previous findings of ex ante evaluations and feasibility studies (where they exist), discuss our approach to answering the evaluation questions, and provide examples of target groups, methods, variables and indicators that would be used for evaluation purposes. The whole evaluation framework will be further elaborated during the inception phase. We also operationalise the questions, taking into account particularly the experience we have obtained in evaluations of other EU agencies.

2.2.1. Relevance

Relevance is defined as the extent to which the objectives of an intervention are pertinent to needs faced by its target groups. One of the key challenges in assessing relevance relates to identification and measurement of the needs and priorities of key stakeholders and target groups.

Our evaluation approach

Given the findings of the previous EIGE evaluations and feasibility studies, the proposed evaluation will seek to assess the continued relevance of the Institute. In particular it will seek to establish the extent to which EIGE’s activities are relevant to the shifting needs of its beneficiaries. For this purpose, the evaluation team will first of all look into the needs of potential beneficiaries as identified in the documents released prior to the establishment of EIGE and during its first years of functioning. Afterwards, we will list the identified needs in our survey of EIGE’s stakeholders and will request them to estimate to what extent these needs were fulfilled by the Institute. Finally, we will ask an open question in the survey requesting the stakeholders to identify other needs not mentioned in the survey before. The needs mentioned will be further explored in the interviews with the representatives of stakeholders in selected countries.

Additionally, we intend to inquire EIGE’s staff, management bodies as well as the Commission and Parliament about the changing needs of EIGE’s beneficiaries. This information will be used for triangulation purposes only and the information obtained directly from stakeholders will remain the key source for evaluation of relevance.

Main information sources to be used
The evaluation team will look into the following documents for the primary identification of the needs of EIGE’s stakeholders:

- The feasibility studies conducted by the Commission and Parliament;
- The two ex-ante evaluations available;
- The key policy documents, including strategies, roadmaps and pacts in the field of gender equality as mentioned in the background section of the offer;
- EIGE’s establishing regulation, mid-term and annual work programmes, annual reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in tender specifications</th>
<th>Operational question</th>
<th>Target groups addressed</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Related preliminary indicators</th>
<th>Collection methods</th>
<th>Analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do the Institute’s services meet the needs of its stakeholders?</td>
<td>1.1. To what extent does EIGE meet the needs of its key target groups (e.g. policy makers) as defined in the feasibility studies of the Institute?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders, EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of EIGE’s stakeholders across different groups agree with this and if this is confirmed by EIGE’s staff and bodies as well as Commission and Parliament representatives</td>
<td>Share of different groups of stakeholders who agree that EIGE met their needs</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. To what extent did these needs change since their identification, due to developments and changes in EIGE’s political and economic framework?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders, EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>Changes identified by the stakeholders of EIGE and confirmed by EIGE’s staff and bodies as well as Commission and Parliament representatives</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Desk research (review of planning documents of EIGE and other actors), surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis methods, Mixed methods analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.2. Effectiveness

**Effectiveness** is typically defined as the extent to which the outputs are delivered to achieve the set objectives and the intended results. In the current evaluation effectiveness will include the analysis of the level of achievement of intended results and immediate impacts. The analysis will also examine the extent to which EIGE managed to enter and centralise the network of gender equality community.

**Our evaluation approach**

Our approach towards the evaluation of effectiveness relies on our understanding of EIGE’s intervention logic, which links the delivery of activities and outputs to achievement of results and impacts.
According to the intervention logic, direct and concrete products of EIGE - activities and outputs of its work create the next immediate level of effects that are expected to take place if the outputs are successfully delivered and the external conditions are neutral or favourable to EIGE.

In the evaluation of effectiveness we examine to what extent EIGE managed to successfully deliver its products to stakeholders, how far the results were useful and used by the stakeholders and what impact it gave on further policy and institutional developments. Our interpretation of the evaluation questions related to effectiveness, specific evaluation judgement criteria, and evaluation methods to be used are detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in tender specifications</th>
<th>Operational question</th>
<th>Target groups addressed</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Preliminary Indicators</th>
<th>Collection methods</th>
<th>Analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent did EIGE successfully deliver timely and adequate assistance and expertise, initiated activities to collect, record and analyse relevant, objective, reliable and comparable information and data related to gender equality issues in the European Union and its Member States in support to the implementation of the Union policy?</td>
<td>2.1. To what extent were the outcomes of EIGE’s work appropriately communicated to the main stakeholders and partners?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority within different groups of stakeholders are satisfied with EIGE’s communication methods, tools and scope.</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders who are satisfied with different elements of EIGE’s communication</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, case studies, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. To what extent EIGE’s outcomes led to greater awareness of gender equality issues among stakeholders?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if stakeholders report increased awareness about different issues in the area of gender equality</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders reporting increased awareness about specific issues</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. To what extent EIGE’s outcomes generated knowledge and skills among the stakeholders?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if stakeholders report gaining knowledge and skills about different issues in the area of gender equality due to EIGE’s activities</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders reporting gaining knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. To what extent do stakeholders use these outcomes in their work?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders have reported using EIGE’s outcomes in their work</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders that report actual use of EIGE’s outputs in their work; Share and types of EIGE’s outputs that are frequently used</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies.</td>
<td>Mixed method analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. What have been the additional outputs/outcomes that were not foreseen initially in the work programmes?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members</td>
<td>New elements of utility mentioned by different types of stakeholders and/or supported by documentary analysis</td>
<td>Same new elements of utility of EIGE mentioned at least twice by different types of stakeholders</td>
<td>Interviews, case studies, open questions in survey questionnaires.</td>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. To what extent EIGE’s activities and outcomes triggered new data collection activities, further research and dissemination by other actors in European gender equality community?</td>
<td>Research community, public institutions, including competent gender equality authorities and statistical offices</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that EIGE’s activities triggered new data collection activities, further research and dissemination</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders who agree with the statement</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. To what extent EIGE’s activities and outcomes stimulated introduction of new concepts and ideas related to gender equality issues into policy discussions?</td>
<td>Public authorities</td>
<td>To a large extent if public authorities report that EIGE’s activities and outcomes stimulated new policy discussions</td>
<td>Share of respondents who report that EIGE’s activities and outcomes stimulated new policy discussions</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent EIGE managed to develop adequate methods and standards to improve the comparability, objectivity and reliability of data among the Member States?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members responsible for data collection</td>
<td>Yes, if documentary sources and EIGE’s staff members confirm that</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Did EIGE develop theoretical underpinning for data collection in the area of gender equality?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members responsible for data collection</td>
<td>To a large extent, if documentary sources, EIGE’s staff members and relevant stakeholders confirm that EIGE was successful at assessing existing data</td>
<td>Share of respondents who report that EIGE was successful in assessing existing data sources and identifying data gaps</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, surveys</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. To what extent did EIGE manage to assess existing data sources and identify data gaps in the area of gender equality?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members responsible for data collection, research community, public institutions, including competent gender</td>
<td>To a large extent, if documentary sources, EIGE’s staff members and relevant stakeholders confirm that EIGE was successful at assessing existing data</td>
<td>Share of respondents who report that EIGE was successful in assessing existing data sources and identifying data gaps</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, surveys</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. To what extent EIGE was successful in developing methods and tools for collecting additional data?</td>
<td>Research community, public institutions, including competent gender equality authorities and statistical offices</td>
<td>To a large extent if relevant stakeholders say so</td>
<td>Share of respondents who report that EIGE was successful in developing methods and tools for collecting additional data</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. To what extent EIGE was successful in collecting additional data in the area of gender equality?</td>
<td>Research community, public institutions, including competent gender equality authorities and statistical offices</td>
<td>To a large extent if relevant stakeholders say so</td>
<td>Share of respondents who report that EIGE was successful in collecting additional data</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. To what extent EIGE was successful in processing, reporting and disseminating additional data to stakeholders?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority within different groups of stakeholders say so</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders who agree that EIGE was successful in this regard</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. Did this increase access to comparable, objective and reliable data, methods and tools related to gender equality issues?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority within different groups of stakeholders say so</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders who agree that EIGE’s activities in collecting processing and disseminating increased access to comparable, objective and reliable data</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent has EIGE been successful in developing and assisting</td>
<td>4.1. What was the growth rate of EIGE’s EuroGender network?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Large if the network has been growing steadily during</td>
<td>Annual growth rate of EuroGender network</td>
<td>Documentary analysis</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking on gender equality at the European level?</td>
<td>4.2. Has EIGE managed to become the central actor in European gender equality community?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>Yes if EIGE is the most connected actor in European gender equality community</td>
<td>Degree centrality, betweenness centrality, closeness centrality</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Social network analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. To what extent has EIGE helped other stakeholders develop transnational partnerships in the area of gender equality?</td>
<td>All groups of stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority within different groups of stakeholders agree that EIGE helped them in this regard</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders who agree that EIGE helped them in this regard</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3. Efficiency

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness are evaluation criteria that focus on the relationship between the outputs/results and inputs of a public policy intervention. They help to assess how well the inputs were transformed into outputs and whether the unit costs of outputs were reasonable. In organisational evaluations analysis of efficiency also involves the scrutiny of the organisational structure (are the different tasks executed by the right resource in terms of responsibilities and tasks?), performance measurement (are monitoring arrangements efficiently organised?), financial management (is the budget spent in a way that results in an efficient organisation?) and human resources management (is a sound and modern HR management in place?), as well as other management systems and processes (e.g. project management, stakeholder management, etc.) to establish if they help to minimise costs and maximise outputs, results and impacts of an organisation.

Previous findings and conclusions

Several feasibility studies were carried out by the European Union Committee of the UK House of Lords\textsuperscript{15} and the European Parliament\textsuperscript{16} before the set-up of the Agency.

The Parliament study envisaged a light and flexible organisation in terms of human resources, but influential through its structure underpinning its role as a networking body that could operate in an efficient manner. It was concluded that a small Board should run the Institute to ensure that the Institute operates efficiently.

The UK House of Lords study questioned whether it was necessary to set up the Institute or whether the work it was supposed to do could be done more efficiently and economically by an existing agency, or whether the Member States' public bodies and NGOs would be able to carry out the proposed activities as efficiently themselves. The study report claimed to be not in favour of having a large Management Board overseeing a potentially very small Institute and believed it would be essential to develop an efficient, cost-effective structure that is proportionate to the size of the Institute.

The first EIGE’s ex-ante evaluation pointed at the possible cost-savings and efficiency gains Agencies can bring. The second ex-ante evaluation however noted that the remote location of the Agency could prevent EIGE from acting efficiently in carrying out its activities. It also pointed out that there was a need to ensure that mechanisms and activities were put in place to assure a close working relationship between EIGE and its parent DG JUST to ensure that EU funding is delivered efficiently. The issue of the Member State representation in the Management Board was also raised. The evaluation report attempted to make a plan to monitor and measure achievements and progress towards an efficient delivery of the work in the Agency.

\textsuperscript{15} House of Lords – European Union Committee, “Proposed European Institute for Gender Equality – Report with evidence”, 2005

\textsuperscript{16} European Parliament, “Role of a future European gender institute”, June 2004
In the 2009 evaluation of the EU decentralised agencies\(^{17}\), no assessment on the efficiency or cost-effectiveness could be made, as at the point in time the study was executed, the Agency did not yet become operational. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that the limited Management Board (18 Member States represented, and one representative of the Commission) would need to prove its efficiency in the future. A challenge that was noted in this respect is how to keep the Member States that are not represented in the Management Board involved. A possibility in this respect could be via the Experts' Forum that would ensure the excellence and independence of the Institute. However, the representation of Member States in the Expert Forum was not clearly defined (i.e. which competent bodies at Member State level and the level of representation). With respect to the set-up of the agency, some inefficiencies were flagged in the evaluation report, such as loss of knowledge and organisational and administrative issues, calling for a more streamlined administrative support structure at that point in time. Also the high travel time index and travel cost was noted, which could be counterproductive taking into account the Agency's networking function.

In July 2012, the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission endorsed a Common Approach on EU decentralised Agencies, Although legally non-binding, it's purpose was to serve as a political blueprint guiding future horizontal initiatives and reforms of individual EU agencies. In line with the Joint Statement, the Commission has prepared a "roadmap on the follow-up to the Common Approach with concrete timetables for the planned initiatives" which provides some important guidelines on how EU agencies should develop further in the upcoming years. The main objectives of the Common Approach are: more balanced governance (by clarifying the role of the management boards, set-up of the boards, etc.), improved efficiency and accountability (by installing shared services, applying ABB/ABM management tools, developing key performance indicators, etc.) and greater coherence (e.g. harmonised voting rules in management boards across Agencies, etc.).\(^{18}\)

**Our evaluation approach**

Our evaluation approach is based on the following methods:

- The evaluation of the efficiency of the Institute will be based upon the Deloitte *Organisational Diagnostic toolbox, as depicted here below:*


\(^{18}\) European Commission, Roadmap on the follow-up to the Common Approach on EU decentralised agencies
This holistic methodology covers all elements to enable a sound and comprehensive scan of the organisation: organisational structure, governance, processes, technology, reporting & control, knowledge management, change management, internal communications, human capital, culture, and planning & budgeting.

This toolbox comprises an number of specific methodologies out of which elements can be used to facilitate the evaluation:

- HR Maturity Assessment tool™ for evaluating the HR function;
- Integrated Performance Management™ for evaluating the level of performance management in the Institute;
- Business Process Management for evaluating the business process management and improvements in the Institute;
- Communication Management Framework™ for evaluating the communication plans / activities of the Institute;


- The Chief Information Officer - CIO Framework™ for evaluating the IT function;

- Knowledge Management Framework™ for assessing the level of knowledge management within the Institute;

- Span of control analysis for assessing the number of people reporting directly to a supervisor in an organisation;

- Etc.

- **The overall methods of desk research, surveys, interviews and focus groups as described in the relevant sections of the offer.**

- **Cost-effectiveness analysis:** this methodology will be used to compare the relative costs and the outcomes (effects) of the Institute. By comparing the actual annual cost of the Institute over the past years (based on the financial data that is available) with the benefits that it brought (measured or quantified achievement of its objectives – if available), a ratio can be expressed where the denominator is the achieved benefit (not necessarily a monetary value) and the numerator is the cost associated.

Aspects that are important to analyse in the efficiency evaluation are:

- Financial management (incl. progress towards implementing Activity Based Budgeting and Activity Based Management required by the EC Roadmap);

- Quality management;

- HR management and resource allocation;

- Administrative procedures and scope for simplification;

- Internal processes and procedures;

- Adequacy of the (governance) structure and organisation of the Agency;

- Performance measurement system, reporting and evaluating mechanisms;

- Technology support.

In our analysis of the topics mentioned here above, our long-lasting expertise in efficiency projects and evaluations for EU institutions will enable us to benchmark certain aspects of EIGE with other, similar agencies / organisations (where relevant).

**Main information sources to be used**

The main information sources we intend to use for the evaluation of efficiency are:

- The Agency's Annual Work Programmes and Mid-Term Work Programmes;

- The Agency's Financial Statements and Budget documents;
The ex-ante evaluations of the Agency;
Minutes of the Management Board meetings;
Annual activity reports;
Annual reports;
EIGE’s Rules of Procedure;
EIGE’s Mission, Vision and Objectives;
Feasibility studies;
Establishing Regulation;
Internal reports of internal evaluations of the activities/projects of the Institute;
Monitoring reports;
Any other documents that might be important to include.

The main actors to be approached for data collection are:

- EIGE’s staff members;
- Commission parent DG officials;
- External stakeholders;
- Management Board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in tender specifications</th>
<th>Operational question</th>
<th>Target groups addressed</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Preliminary Indicators</th>
<th>Collection methods</th>
<th>Analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent has EIGE established processes and procedures ensuring that it reaches the objectives set out in the Founding Regulation and its first work programmes, taking into account its budget and human resources?</td>
<td>5.1. Do the existing processes and procedures contribute to the achievement of EIGE’s objectives?</td>
<td>Management Board members, Director EIGE’s staff members</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that the existing processes and procedures of EIGE contribute to achieving the objectives of the Institute</td>
<td>Clear indications that stakeholders believe the EIGE processes help achieving the organisation’s objectives</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2. Is there an organisation-wide process model in place with processes documented based upon a standardised methodology</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members</td>
<td>Evidence found that there are business processes defined based upon a standardised methodology</td>
<td>Business processes in place for the most important workflows (e.g. sound HR management procedures and tools in place)</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7. Are there quality management procedures in place and implemented?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members</td>
<td>Evidence found that quality management procedures are in place To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that quality procedures are being implemented continuously</td>
<td>Quality management processes in place</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a reasonable cost in terms of financial and human resources and administrative arrangements in the activities and achievement of the set objectives?</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Procurement Officer Management Board members Director</td>
<td>Evidence found that financial and budgeting processes are in place Evidence found that the Agency is able to spend its budget Evidence found that the Agency moving towards ABB and ABM To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that the principles of sound financial management are being applied</td>
<td>Financial and budgeting processes in place Capacity of the Agency to spend its budget Existence of sound financial management reporting (administrative budget) Progress made towards ABB (costing of EIGE’s activities) and ABM (costing of EIGE’s outputs and results, ensuring that the process for the allocation of resources is consistent with the political priorities and objectives)</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9. Are the financial and human resources that are spent reasonable as compared to the achievement of the objectives of EIGE?</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Procurement Officer Management Board members External stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that there is a positive cost/benefit analysis to be made with regards the Agency</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders that make a positive cost-effectiveness analysis of the Agency Own opinion on whether the costs and benefits are balanced</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods Cost effectiveness analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the structure and organisation of the Institute (i.e. size, organisation, staff composition, composition of management bodies, the ratio of administrative / operational staff, recruitment and training issues, etc.) adequate for the tasks and the actual workload?</td>
<td>6.1. To what extent is the organisation structure easy to understand, clearly documented and communicated to all stakeholders and overall balanced and adequate?</td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members, External stakeholders</td>
<td>The structure and organisation of the Agency is adequate to the work entrusted to it and to the actual workload</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders that is satisfied with the organisation structure</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Is the size of the organisation as a whole and the different units balanced / adequate / fit-for-purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EIGE’s staff members, Management Board members, External stakeholders, Director</td>
<td>The size of the organisation and the units is adequate to the work entrusted to it and to the actual workload</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders that consider the size of the organisation balanced / adequate / fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Is the ratio of administrative vs. operational staff fit-for-purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EIGE’s HoUs, Management Board members, External stakeholders, Director</td>
<td>The ratio of administrative vs. operational staff is fit-for-purpose as compared to other, similar organisations</td>
<td>Ratio administrative vs. operational staff fit-for-purpose as compared to other, similar organisations</td>
<td>Desk research, own opinion, interviews &amp; focus groups (if needed following the calculation of the ratio)</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Is the ‘span of control’ (ratio management functions vs. operational staff) fit-for-purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EIGE’s HoUs, Management Board members, External stakeholders, Director</td>
<td>The chain of responsibility within the Agency is well-defined and there are appropriate management systems and procedures in place. The ‘span of control’ ratio can be considered as fit-for-purpose as compared to other, similar organisations</td>
<td>‘Span of control’ ratio fit-for-purpose as compared to other, similar organisations</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Are the roles and responsibilities of EIGE staff clearly documented and communicated to all stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EIGE’s HR staff, External stakeholders</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that the roles and responsibilities are clearly documented</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities clearly documented and communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Are the composition and working methods of the Standing Committee of the Management Board, the Management Board itself and the Expert Forum fit-for-purpose?</td>
<td>Management Board members External stakeholders Director</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that the composition of the Standing Committee of the Management Board, the Management Board and the Expert Forum is fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>Share of stakeholders that is satisfied with the composition of the Standing Committee of the Management Board, the Management Board and the Expert Forum and consider them as fit-for-purpose</td>
<td>Desk research, surveys, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are the internal mechanisms for monitoring, reporting and evaluating fit-for-purpose?</td>
<td>Management Board members External stakeholders Director</td>
<td>Evidence that strategic and operational objectives are in place</td>
<td>Strategic and operational objectives in place</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1. To what extent are strategic and operational objectives in place?</td>
<td>Manager EIGE’s HoUs</td>
<td>Evidence that KPIs are defined</td>
<td>KPIs defined</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2. Are adequate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) defined and is there a performance measurement system in place to monitor progress in realising the strategic and operational objectives?</td>
<td>Director EIGE’s HoUs</td>
<td>Evidence that KPIs are defined</td>
<td>KPIs defined</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. Are there, based upon KPI measurement, action plans with preventive and corrective measures defined and followed up?</td>
<td>Director EIGE’s HoUs</td>
<td>Evidence that action plans with preventive and corrective measures are defined and are being followed up</td>
<td>Action plans with preventive and corrective measures defined and followed up</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4. Does EIGE evaluate its own projects internally?</td>
<td>Management Board members Director EIGE’s HoUs</td>
<td>Evidence that action plans with preventive and corrective measures are defined and are being followed up</td>
<td>Action plans with preventive and corrective measures defined and followed up</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does EIGE have a strategic workforce planning / HR processes in place?</td>
<td>EIGE’s HR staff Director</td>
<td>Evidence that there is a resource planning / allocation in place</td>
<td>Resource planning / allocation in place</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Preliminary Indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management in place?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of the Administration unit</td>
<td>It proves to be easy to find the right profiles in recruitment processes Positive assessment of the match between staff profiles and job descriptions There is no incidence of excessive overtime being worked</td>
<td>Fit of staff profiles to job descriptions Degree of difficulty to find the right profiles (time spent to recruit specific profiles and number of candidates for each job advertised)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2. Does EIGE have a talent management in place (incl. training strategy, competency model, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EIGE’s HR staff Director Head of the Administration unit</td>
<td>Evidence that the following components of talent management are in place: training strategy, competency model, training plans, individual evaluations, etc.</td>
<td>Talent management in place (incl. training strategy, competency model, complete training plan adapted to each function, implementation of individual evaluation by objectives, periodicity of function interviews with Agency staff and their direct manager, etc.)</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are the necessary IT processes in place?</td>
<td>9.1. Are there IT processes in place to define and deliver IT services in line with the overall IT objectives, needs and priorities?</td>
<td>EIGE’s IT staff Director Head of the Administration unit</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of relevant stakeholders agree that the IT processes that are in place deliver the services in line with the IT objectives, needs and priorities</td>
<td>IT processes in place</td>
<td>Desk research, interviews, focus groups.</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. Added value

**Added value** is defined as the net contribution of the Institute to achieving broader policy goals, e.g. contribution to the achievement of the Treaty objectives.
Our evaluation approach

To evaluate the added value of EIGE compared to other bodies active in gender equality policy at the EU level, we suggest to first look into whether or not the main target groups/stakeholders of the different bodies overlap. This in itself might not necessarily be a disadvantage if the services which are provided to these groups by different actors are different. The desk research efforts will reveal the initial estimation of potential overlaps, and this will be triangulated with the representatives of the bodies inquired. Afterwards, the work programmes of evaluated bodies will be compared to identify the differences and similarities in services provided.

The evaluation of EIGE’s added value to the work of Member States, and in particular to the policy formation and implementation, will be estimated by requesting the major beneficiaries and stakeholders where they can perceive such added value and what concrete elements they can identify. The mixed methods analysis approach (coding the qualitative data and providing estimations of quantitative trends) will be applied. Finally, as the issue of added value is particularly difficult to grasp using the conventional methods of surveys and interviews, the high level focus group on added value of EIGE will be held to confirm and triangulate the findings.

Main information sources to be used

The estimation of EIGE’s added value will be to a large extent based on quantitative and qualitative data to be collected via surveys and interviews. However, the work programmes and other planning documents of agencies and other bodies compared as well as gender equality policy documents at EU and national level will be looked into.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in tender specifications</th>
<th>Operational question</th>
<th>Target groups addressed</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Related preliminary indicators</th>
<th>Collection methods</th>
<th>Analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent are the Institute’s tasks not currently dealt with by the other EU institutions?</td>
<td>10.1. To what extent do the stakeholders of EIGE differ from those of other EU agencies or EU-level institutions active in the field of gender equality, e.g. FRA, Eurofound, EU-OSHA, FRONTEX, CEPOL?</td>
<td>EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>To a large extent if there is an identifiable difference between types of audiences targeted by EIGE and other actors and if this is confirmed by EIGE’s staff and management actors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Desk research (review of planning documents of EIGE and other actors, EIGE’s contact database), surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2. Where the stakeholders and target audiences do overlap, to what extent does EIGE provide unique services compared to other EU level actors?</td>
<td>EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), representatives from key stakeholder groups, European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>Positive if there is no evidence in EIGE’s and other actors’ planning documents or reports of overlapping services provided to those groups and if this is confirmed by</td>
<td>Yes/no indicator</td>
<td>Desk research (review of planning documents of EIGE and other actors), surveys, interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative analysis methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Related preliminary indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent are the Member States able to make use of and add value to their work from EIGE’s activities?</td>
<td>11.1. What is the level of added value of EIGE at the national level in terms of collection and dissemination of gender equality relevant information?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders in Member States, EIGE staff, Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>High if various groups of EIGE’s national level stakeholders are able to clearly identify EIGE’s added value in this regard, specific elements of added value emerge, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff and management actors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2. What is the level of added value of EIGE at the national level in terms of new knowledge, insights and evidence generated?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders in Member States, EIGE staff, Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>High if various groups of EIGE’s national level stakeholders are able to clearly identify EIGE’s added value in this regard, specific elements of added value emerge, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff and management actors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3. What is the level of added value of EIGE at the national level in terms of networking and information exchange?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders in Member States, EIGE staff, Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>High if various groups of EIGE’s national level stakeholders are able to clearly identify EIGE’s added value in this regard, specific elements of added value emerge, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff and management actors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4. What is the level of added value of EIGE at the national level in terms of technical assistance</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders in Member States, EIGE staff, Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>High if various groups of EIGE’s national level stakeholders are able to clearly identify EIGE’s added value in this regard, specific elements of added value emerge, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff and management actors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Related preliminary indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided to national institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this regard, specific elements of added value emerge, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff and management actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5. What other (unplanned) important elements of EIGE’s added value could be identified at the national level?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders in Member States, EIGE staff, Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>Elements identified by EIGE’s national level stakeholders and confirmed by staff and management actors</td>
<td>Frequency of occurrence of coded added value elements</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent do EIGE’s activities contribute to policy implementation at European and national level?</td>
<td>EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), representatives from national level policy implementing actors, European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of policy implementing actors surveyed confirm EIGE has strengthened their institution’s capacity, are able to identify ways in which this was done, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff, bodies, Commission and Parliament</td>
<td>Share of respondents representing organisations involved in policy implementation who agree EIGE strengthened their institution’s capacity</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1. To what extent did EIGE’s activities contribute to strengthening of institutional capacity at European and national level in the field of gender equality?</td>
<td>EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), representatives from national level policy implementing actors, European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of policy implementing actors surveyed confirm EIGE has contributed to mainstreaming of gender equality, are able to identify ways in which this was done, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff, bodies, Commission and Parliament</td>
<td>Share of respondents involved in policy implementation who agree EIGE contributed to gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in tender specifications</td>
<td>Operational question</td>
<td>Target groups addressed</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Related preliminary indicators</td>
<td>Collection methods</td>
<td>Analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3. To what extent did EIGE’s activities contribute to improved gender equality competence of European and national actors responsible for policy implementation?</td>
<td>EIGE staff, EIGE’s bodies (e.g. Management Board and Experts’ Forum), representatives from national level policy implementing actors, European Commission, Parliament</td>
<td>To a large extent if the majority of policy implementing actors surveyed report improved gender equality competence as a result of EIGE’s activities, are able to identify ways in which this was done, and this is confirmed by EIGE staff, bodies, Commission and Parliament</td>
<td>Share of respondents involved in policy implementation who agree EIGE contributed to improving their gender equality competence</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, case studies, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent did EIGE’s activities contribute to policy formation at European and national level?</td>
<td>EIGE stakeholders involved in European and national level agenda setting and decision making</td>
<td>To a large extent if the stakeholders agree this was the case and can provide concrete examples of support to agenda setting and decision making</td>
<td>Proportion of EIGE’s stakeholders involved in policy formation/decision agreeing with the statement to a large or moderate extent; occurrence of examples of EIGE’s support to policy formation/decision making</td>
<td>Surveys, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis, mixed methods analysis (of open answers in the surveys and interview transcripts), qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2. To what extent does the most prominent European and national level gender equality policy documentation reflect EIGE’s outputs?</td>
<td>Persons having been involved in preparation of major gender equality policy documents</td>
<td>To a large extent if the links between EIGE’s outputs and the major gender equality policy documents are evident and this is confirmed by persons having been involved in their development</td>
<td>Frequency of links between EIGE’s outputs and policy documents</td>
<td>Desk research of major European and national gender equality policy documents, interviews, focus groups</td>
<td>Document analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5. Coordination and coherence

**Coherence** refers to the complementarity and non-duplication of EIGE’s activities and goals with EU objectives and work of other actors in the field of gender equality.

**Our evaluation approach**

The evaluation of EIGE’s external coordination and coherence will be evaluated in two different aspects: 1) other actors, mainly other EU decentralised agencies and other public actors active in the field of gender equality at European level, but also international organisations where relevant; 2) EU-level strategic and planning documents and their links with EIGE’s activities.

As the non-duplication and ‘passive’ complementarity with other actors is already foreseen to be evaluated under the section on added value, we presume the evaluation of coherence and complementarity with other actors would in particular look into the proactive efforts taken to ensure sound collaboration and coherence. The evaluation team has particularly strong experience in this regard from the recently finished evaluation of Cedefop, where the coherence and complementarity of this agency with other agencies, e.g. ETF, Eurofound, and EU-OSHA, was looked upon. From our experience, the most important issues related to cooperation between EU agencies are: 1) the existence of specific cooperation activities foreseen, e.g. cooperation agreements, joint work programmes, joint events etc.; 2) the continuity of these activities and the level of engagement of the collaborating staff; 3) synergies and potential synergies identified. As the international organisations function at a different level than EIGE, in this case we suggest to at first identify the main lessons learnt and best practices from their cooperation, and then propose ways forward how such collaboration may be continued in the future.

In terms of looking into the policy coherence, the most important information sources will be the policy documents, e.g. the texts of the relevant EU level strategies, roadmaps, Council conclusions, Parliament resolutions etc. These documents will be compared to key EIGE’s planning documents. EIGE’s staff as well as high level policy officers at the EU level will also be consulted via interviews to provide triangulation for our analysis. We suggest to look at first at the documentation which was in place when EIGE was established and then move on to analyse current documentation in place to offer a more prospective view.

**Main information sources to be used**

The evaluation team intends to look into the following documents to evaluate the coherence and complementarity of EIGE and other actors active in the field of gender equality:

- The founding documentation of the agencies, to clearly identify their mandate and potential overlaps in it;
- Any documents evidencing the collaboration, such as memoranda of understanding, collaboration agreements, joint work programmes, joint event programmes and outputs etc.;
- The Common Approach to the EU decentralised agencies and the follow-up Roadmap;
- Previous evaluation efforts, including in particular the 2009 evaluation of EU decentralised agencies.

The analysis of these documents will be further complemented by the interviews with representatives of EIGE’s staff as well as other organisations involved in cooperation.

For the analysis of policy coherence, the texts of the main EU level policy documents as well as EIGE’s planning and reporting documents will be used as the main sources of information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in tender specifications</th>
<th>Operational question</th>
<th>Target groups addressed</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Related preliminary indicators</th>
<th>Collection methods</th>
<th>Analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent does EIGE make effort to avoid duplication and to make best possible use of existing resources, as well as coordinate with relevant bodies, governmental institutions and agencies active in the field of gender equality at EU, national and international level?</td>
<td>14.1. What are the proactive efforts (cooperation activities, e.g. joint planning, events and reports, exchange of information) put forward by EIGE and other bodies active in the field of gender equality (as established in EIGE Founding Regulation) at EU level to avoid duplication of their work?</td>
<td>Staff members and management actors of EIGE and other bodies active in the field of gender equality</td>
<td>Efforts mentioned in EIGE's documents or in interviews with staff members / management actors and confirmed by representatives of collaborating bodies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Desk research of EIGE's planning and collaboration documents, interviews</td>
<td>Document analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2. What is the continuity and current level of engagement of EIGE and other bodies in these cooperation activities?</td>
<td>Staff members and management actors of EIGE and other bodies active in the field of gender equality</td>
<td>To large extent if the cooperation activities are continued on a yearly basis and if they are seen by the staff members and the management of EIGE and other bodies to be beneficial in avoiding duplication and creating synergies</td>
<td>Proportion of collaboration activities carried out continuously on yearly basis</td>
<td>Desk research of EIGE's planning and collaboration documents, interviews</td>
<td>Document analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3. What are the current synergy effects between the work of EIGE and of the other bodies active at EU level in the field of gender equality?</td>
<td>Staff members and management actors of EIGE and other bodies active in the field of gender equality</td>
<td>Synergy effects reported in EIGE’s collaboration agreements, planning and reporting documents, identified by EIGE staff and confirmed by the documentation or Broader thematic scope, wider reach of target groups, greater analysis depth of joint activities compared to activities carried out separately</td>
<td>Desk research of EIGE's planning and collaboration documents, interviews</td>
<td>Document analysis, qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Document analysis, qualitative analysis</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4. What are the best practices and lessons learnt from EIGE’s cooperation with international bodies, such as the Council of Europe or the UN bodies, to ensure the pooling of resources and effective implementation of tasks?</td>
<td>Staff members of EIGE and the relevant international bodies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent are the objectives and activities of EIGE in line with the EU priorities in the field of gender equality and the work programme of the Commission?</td>
<td>High level officials (European Commission, Parliament) involved in EU level policy planning, EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>To a large extent if document analysis reveals such pertinence and if it is confirmed by officials involved in policy planning as well as EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1. To what extent have EIGE’s objectives and activities been pertinent to the gender equality dimension of Lisbon and EU2020 strategies?</td>
<td>High level officials (European Commission, Parliament) involved in EU level policy planning, EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>To a large extent if document analysis reveals such pertinence and if it is confirmed by officials involved in policy planning as well as EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2. To what extent have EIGE’s objectives and activities been pertinent to the principles of the Roadmap for equality between women and men 2006-2010 and the Strategy for equality between women and men for 2010-2015?</td>
<td>High level officials (European Commission, Parliament) involved in EU level policy planning, EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>To a large extent if document analysis reveals such pertinence and if it is confirmed by officials involved in policy planning as well as EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3. To what extent has EIGE followed up the Council conclusions, Parliament resolutions and other ad hoc policy documentation relevant to its work?</td>
<td>High level officials (European Commission, Parliament) involved in EU level policy planning, EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td>To a large extent if analysis of EIGE’s documents confirms the recommendations and calls of such policy documents have been followed up and if it is confirmed by EIGE Management Board and Experts’ Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Data collection and analysis methods

We propose to employ a number of recognised evaluation methods for the evaluation: desk research, interviews, surveys, case studies, social network analysis as well as focus groups. These methods are described and their selection is justified below.

The principle of triangulation will be applied during the evaluation. It is a method of data verification based on the use of different sources of data on the same finding/indicator. The key strategy of this technique consists of three steps:

- First, all potential sources of information are identified;
- Second, each source of information is exploited in order to obtain evidence to the same question;
- Third, the data from various sources is compared.

Thus, the application of the triangulation principle will help avoiding subjectivity and help to arrive at impartial and accurate conclusions.

2.3.1. Desk research

Desk research as an evaluation method used for data collection and analysis is usually comprised of two interrelated aspects – a review of relevant literature and analysis of statistical and monitoring data.

Literature review

Literature review is essential in mapping the academic and analytical field of ideas and studies that can be related to the context of the external evaluation. It will serve as a source of contextual information, additional evaluation questions, indicators for assessment, and data for comparison with other agencies. The literature review in this evaluation will consist of:

- primary sources of information (documents, empirical studies);
- secondary sources of information (generalisations).

These primary and secondary sources include:

EU-level documents

- Council Regulation (EC) No 1922/2006 of 20 December 2006 on establishing a European Institute for Gender Equality
• Council Directive 2004/113/EC of 13 December 2004 implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services
• Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions - A Roadmap for equality between women and men 2006-2010”, Commission of the European Communities 2006/275
• Council conclusions on the European Pact for Gender Equality for the period 2011-2020
• Council Conclusions of 22 October 1999 on the review of the implementation by the Member States and the European Institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action (11862/99)
• Council Conclusions of 30 November and 1 December 2006 on Review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action – Indicators in respect of Institutional Mechanisms, (14376/06)
• Commission Staff Working Document: ”Report on Progress on Equality between Women and Men in 2012” (9297/13 ADD 1)
• Council Conclusions of 30 September 2009 on the Review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action: "Beijing +15": A Review of Progress (15992/09)
• European Parliament resolution on Beijing +15 — UN Platform for Action for Gender Equality

Previous evaluations and feasibility studies of EIGE

• European Commission Feasibility Study for a European Gender Institute. PLS Ramboll Management, 2002
• Role of a Future European Gender Institute. Study PE358.898. European Parliament, 2004
• Meta-study on decentralised agencies: cross-cutting analysis of evaluation findings. Final report, 2008, Eureval
• Evaluation of the EU decentralised agencies in 2009, Rambøl Management – Euréval-Matrix, December 2009

Studies / Action Plans / Reports:

• Annual activity reports and annual reports 2010, 2011, 2012
• Mid-term work programmes for 2010-2012 and 2013-2015;
• Documents that regulate the use of the ECs and EIGE’s budget (e.g. Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities, Regulation laying down detailed rules for the Financial Regulation);
• Internal documents that regulate internal management, quality control and describe internal processes (annual accounts, statements of revenue and expenditure, agency’s internal rules and procedures);
• Internal audit reports (if available);
• Research reports, policy documents, best practices, case studies and comparative studies and other literature sources related to the evaluation questions;
• Documents available at EIGE’s website http://eige.europa.eu

Analysis of statistical and monitoring data

The evaluation will make use of monitoring data and statistics collected by EIGE itself or available from other available sources. These data sources will most importantly include EIGE’s own performance monitoring data (where available) and its financial data from the annual activity reports. When applicable and relevant, additional statistical data sources of a more general purpose data useful for contextual or supportive analysis will be used (e.g. obtained from the Eurostat database etc.).

We foresee that to make sure that all relevant sources of information are covered and that the updates in the information available are followed the evaluation team will need to keep in touch with the representatives of EIGE in the Steering Committee of this evaluation.

PPMI experience in carrying out desk research

PPMI experts have extensive experience in designing and carrying out detailed desk research programmes involving various types of EU level and national documents, data extracted from established monitoring systems and previous studies on the particular topic. For instance, under the Cedefop external evaluation was comprised of two interrelated aspects – a review of relevant literature and analysis of monitoring data. The main challenges in obtaining relevant documents which were not publically were related to lack of cooperation from national level actors (e.g. national contact points). However the evaluation team managed to overcome such obstacles by close cooperation with the client, which acted as a mediator in such cases. A well performed desk research was a vital step towards successful application of other methods – such as interviews, surveys and case studies.

2.3.2. Interviews and selection of focus countries

Interviews are necessary to give a better in-depth understanding of the performance of EIGE and its value for its different target groups/beneficiaries. Interviews will be used to develop in-depth case studies (along with literature review) and help assess efficiency of governance, as well as to gather information necessary to answer other evaluation questions. The data collected during interviews will show opinions and perceptions of the EU level and national level stakeholders. Pilot interview programme will be implemented in the beginning of evaluation and their results will be used to develop the survey questionnaires. The majority of interviews shall be conducted in parallel with the survey programme. Some additional interviews will be carried out in the end of evaluation to help interpret and contextualise findings of our survey programme and triangulate results of retrospective and prospective analyses. All interviews will be semi-structured, face-to-face or online, adapted to the specific target group of the interview programme. The final focus and number of interviews with different respondent groups will be discussed and established during the kick-off meeting with the evaluation Steering Group.

The initial position of the evaluation team is that in total around 90 interviews would be appropriate for the planned evaluation.
Based on our experience in organisational evaluations, including the evaluations of Cedefop and ETF, a detailed interview programme with the staff of the organisation is beneficial, particularly in understanding the internal processes of the organisation, its human resources policy, commitment of the staff to the internal quality procedures, advantages and drawbacks of the governance structure and other issues. The field visit to the organisation is usually used to perform this interview programme. It allows the evaluation team to gather the perceptions of organisation’s personnel at a given point in time and offers an on the spot opportunity to discuss and compare the insights given by different staff members on the same topics.

However, in this particular case the geographic proximity of the evaluation team and EIGE will allow to combine the field visit and the face to face interviews to be carried out with EIGE staff in the methodological tool piloting phase and the validation of findings phase as well. In total, we foresee that approximately 12-15 interviews would be conducted with EIGE staff, namely:

- The Director of the Institute;
- The Head of Operations;
- The Head of Administration;
- Staff responsible for communication, networking and stakeholder relations;
- Staff responsible for ICT infrastructure;
- Finance and procurement officers;
- Human resource officers;
- Representatives of Staff Committee;
- Staff responsible for each of the activities selected for detailed case study analysis.

The tender specifications mention the need for the interview programme to cover all relevant stakeholder categories. Most of remaining 75 interviews will focus on the EU and national levels and will target the following groups of EIGE stakeholders:

- Interviewees at the EU level:
  - representatives from the European Commission (in particular DG JUST, DG EMPL) - 7-10 interviews;
  - The Management Board of EIGE – 4-6;
  - The Experts’ Forum of EIGE – 6-8;
  - Other decentralised agencies (e.g. FRA, Eurofound, EU-OSHA) – 4-6;
  - Other European level stakeholders that cooperate with EIGE (e.g. the European Parliament (FEMM committee), European Economic and Social Committee, Committee of the Regions, social partners (ETUC, UEAPME, BusinessEurope, specific sectoral partners where relevant), Eurolib, WINE network, European civil society organisations (e.g. EWL and EQUINET) – 10-15.

- Interviewees at the national level:
  - Member state level stakeholders (national governments/ ministries, statistics offices, researchers/ research organisations, social partners, media, national civil society and human rights organisations) – 40-50 interviews.

5-6 interviews are also planned to be conducted with the staff of selected international organisations collaborating with EIGE or active in its field of work. These include Council of Europe, UN Women, OECD, OSCE and ILO. The concrete selection of such organisations to be
approached will be made based on the activity of their collaboration with EIGE, as evidenced by the collected documentary evidence and the interviews with EIGE staff.

The information collected during interviews will form the basis for case studies. Therefore, the 45-50 planned national level interviews are planned to be attributed to each of the 5 selected case studies.

The box below illustrates the experience of the evaluation team in conducting large scale interview programmes for organisational evaluations.

---

**Our experience in carrying out large scale interview programmes**

PPMI experts have extensive experience in designing and carrying out large-scale interview programmes involving respondents at different operational levels (EU, national and sub-national). For instance, under the external evaluation of Cedefop the Contractor carried out more than 90 interviews, covering different types of stakeholders, including Cedefop employees and senior management, Commission staff involved in the field, relevant national, European and international stakeholders with different affiliations (e.g. employer, trade union representatives, national coordination points for European tools). The data collected during interviews is useful in highlighting opinions and perceptions of the EU level and national level stakeholders, as well as Cedefop's own staff. The completed interviews were all semi-structured and adapted to the nature of different groups of interviewees and different relevant policy contexts.

The tender specifications of the evaluation also call for a representative geographic coverage in the interview programme. This is necessary to ensure that the whole spectrum of different national contexts in which EIGE’s activities are taking place are reflected. However, lack of specific country focus might lead to a fragmented national level picture.

Therefore, we propose focusing the interview programme on only a few countries carefully selected to represent the main different characteristics of the whole sample of Member States. This has proven beneficial in our previous work on the evaluation of EU agencies. Conducting approximately 10 interviews in the same country would allow the evaluation team to develop a strong understanding of the stakeholder relations in a certain country, the centrality of the role of EIGE in this framework and the ways in which EIGE’s work is able to produce impact in different types of countries. It is however important to note that in case of particularly interesting findings from the desk research or surveys which we feel need to be verified via interviews, the interviews in other countries could of course be conducted additionally.

All Member States except Croatia (due to its recent EU Membership) are taken into account in the focus country selection procedure. We propose the following strategy for selecting countries for in depth interview programmes:

- To include countries that have divergent scores in EIGE’s developed Gender Equality Index.

The aggregate scores of gender equality index in EU Member States vary from 35.3 to 74.3. We propose to split the approximate interval between the lowest and the highest score into equal
sub-intervals of 10 points and to select at least one country from each sub-interval. We propose selecting two countries from the lowest sub-interval as it holds the most countries and signals the most pressing need for stronger gender equality support.

### Table 2: Countries by sub-interval of GEI score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-interval of GEI score</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Sweden, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>Belgium, Ireland, France, Slovenia, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>Germany, Estonia, Spain, Luxembourg, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **To include countries that have been leading or the least advanced in specific domains of EIGE’s developed Gender Equality Index.**

Further looking into the Gender Equality Index, we suggest to select some countries which are the leaders or the least advanced in certain areas of gender equality measured by the Index. However, the countries which have overall higher than average scores and manage to keep a balance between different areas of gender equality (e.g. France, Germany) could also be considered.

### Table 3: Leaders and the least advanced countries by domain of GEI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of GEI</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Least advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Finland, Denmark, Sweden, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Latvia, Malta, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden, Belgium</td>
<td>Romania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Denmark, United Kingdom, Sweden, Finland</td>
<td>Romania, Portugal, Bulgaria, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Finland</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Greece, Slovakia, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Sweden, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands</td>
<td>Cyprus, Luxembourg, Italy, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ireland, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium</td>
<td>Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Estonia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **To include countries with varying shares of women in their populations.**

Whereas women outnumber men in total population in all EU Member States, the difference in population varies from virtually nonexistent in Luxembourg or Sweden to 14-18% in Baltic States.

### Table 4: EU Member States by gender balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of women per 100 men</th>
<th>Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>118,6</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>117,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>114,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Number of women per 100 men</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>110,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>109,7</td>
<td>105-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>107,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>106,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>106,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>106,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>106,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>105,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>105,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>105,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>105,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>104,2</td>
<td>100-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>103,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>103,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>103,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>103,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>103,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>102,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>102,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>102,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>102,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>101,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>100,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>100,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat

- To include countries from different geographic regions and population size (see table below). This ensures that the evaluation team is able to control for differences in impacts which can be attributed to regional characteristics or the number of actors to be addressed in the country.

Table 5: A breakdown of participating countries by geographic regions and population size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>DK, FI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>IT, ES</td>
<td>EL, PT</td>
<td>MT, CY, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>BG, EE, LT, LV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>UK, FR</td>
<td>BE, NL</td>
<td>IE, LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>AT, CZ, HU</td>
<td>SK, SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this strategy, we suggest selecting five countries each of which would have 9-10 interviews conducted, together with five alternative countries. The table below presents the selection and the characteristics of these countries according to the criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected country</th>
<th>Sub-interval of GEI</th>
<th>Leader/ least advanced in certain GEI domain</th>
<th>Women per 100 men</th>
<th>Region and size</th>
<th>Additional justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Least advanced in terms of money, knowledge and time</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>East, medium</td>
<td>Lowest overall GEI score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Least advanced in terms of knowledge and power</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>South, large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>Least advanced in terms of health</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
<td>East, small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>Leader in terms of work, knowledge, and health</td>
<td>100-105</td>
<td>West, large</td>
<td>Significantly weaker GEI results in terms of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Leader in terms of work, knowledge, time and power</td>
<td>100-105</td>
<td>North, small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Least advanced in terms of health</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>East/Central, large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Least advanced in terms of money</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
<td>East, small</td>
<td>EIGE's host country, effects stemming from proximity could be estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>Higher than average in a number of aspects</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>West, large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>Leader in terms of money and health</td>
<td>100-105</td>
<td>West, medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Leader in terms of work, knowledge, time and power</td>
<td>100-105</td>
<td>North, small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is very important to note that for all countries in the selected sample we have a designated native speaker expert who would assist the evaluation team in collecting the national level data, e.g. conducting interviews with native speaker stakeholders and obtaining as well as analysing...
desk research sources available in national languages. Some of these experts are members of the evaluation core team, while others would be subcontracted in case their countries are selected. At the moment, a specified budget is foreseen for national level expertise but as the final selection of countries is not yet made, the national experts are not included in the list of subcontractors.

2.3.3. Representative sample surveys

The surveys will be carried out in order to gather core data for answering the particular evaluation questions. The key advantages of the surveys is that they cover most evaluation questions and provide quantitative as well as qualitative (open) answers. Surveys will be used as the key source of information to be verified and complemented by other sources. The survey programme will include the following three surveys:

- Online survey of the stakeholders and target audiences of EIGE;
- Online survey of EIGE’s staff;
- Online survey of EIGE’s Management Board and Experts’ Forum

**Online survey of the stakeholders and target audiences of EIGE**

The purpose of the stakeholders and target audiences survey is to collect data to assess the products of EIGE from its clients’ perspective. It will allow collecting information on motivation and experiences of beneficiaries, as well as learning more about personal benefits of using EIGE’s outputs/products. The results of this survey will be compared to the results of the self-assessment survey of EIGE’s staff.

The evaluation team will use the EIGE’s contact database as the basis for forming the list of respondents to whom the survey links will be disseminated.

The database of potential respondents will be compiled using information provided in EIGE’s website (e.g. on members of Eurogender network), annual reports and work programmes, additionally provided by EIGE, online search and supplemented through the interview programme. The survey will be balanced across different groups of respondents from different countries (geographic representation). Wherever possible, the survey questionnaires will be designed to allow the comparison between the opinions of different groups of respondents.

This survey will gather the data from the entire geographic landscape of EIGE activities. The questionnaire will be sent to:

- European Commission’s representatives (in particular DG JUST, DG EMPL, but also other DGs);
- Other decentralised agencies / (e.g. FRA, Eurofound, EU-OSHA, FRONTEX, CEPOL);
Other European level stakeholders that cooperate with EIGE (e.g. the European Parliament (FEMM committee), European Economic and Social Committee, Committee of the Regions, social partners (ETUC, UEAPME, BusinessEurope, specific sectoral partners where relevant), Eurolib, WINE network, European civil society organisations (e.g. EWL and EQUINET), members of the Social Platform;

- Member state level stakeholders (national governments/ ministries, statistics offices, researchers/research organisations, social partners, media, national civil society and human rights organisations);
- International stakeholders, e.g. ILO, Council of Europe, UN and other actors;
- Project level stakeholders, e.g. local authorities, Roma organisations, educational staff, social workers etc. – to be updated as relevant based on the case study selection.

The target groups of EIGE are very broad: they include European Commission, other European institutions, member states, social partners, research community, research institutes and other organisations which contribute to the advancement of knowledge and understanding of gender equality, practitioners’ community and training organisations in the field of gender equality. However, it can be hypothesised that not all of them are using EIGE’s outputs. In order to make them more widely used, more useful and responsive to the needs of target audiences, it is important to reveal the reasons why a part of intended users are not using them. This will help to develop new insights on how to improve the existing outputs/products or to introduce the new ones, taking into account the opinions of respondents.

The question of translating the questionnaire into different languages to ease the accessibility will be discussed during the kick-off meeting.

**Online survey of former and current EIGE’s staff**

The questionnaire of this survey will be adapted to the staff whose duties are directly related to implementation of priorities/main tasks of the Institute and will exclude the administrative staff (IT, financial and human resources management, general support services, procurement). The information from the administrative members of staff will collected using interviews.

This survey will enable to test if the results of the self-assessment of EIGE correspond to the results of the assessment of EIGE’s clients of its outputs. Therefore respondents of this survey will be asked to reply to the same set of questions as respondents of the targets groups’ survey. They will be also asked to answer other questions in order to collect additional information about EIGE’s performance (e.g. organisational assessment).

It is important to note that the survey of EIGE’s staff will be designed in a way which could form basis for continuing EIGE’s staff survey to be conducted annually or at other set periods. These surveys have proven beneficial for other EU decentralised agencies in improving their human
resource management and ensuring stronger staff engagement as well as ownership of the organisation’s objectives, mission and vision.

**Online survey of former and current EIGE’s Management Board and Experts’ Forum members**

Our experience in evaluation of EU decentralised agencies has shown that to answer the evaluation questions concerning management and governance of the EU agencies it is useful to approach the most important bodies of these agencies. We suggest that a survey combining multiple choice and open ended questions would be the most beneficial tool for collecting a representative sample of opinions from the members of EIGE’s Management Board and Experts’ Forum.

Taking into account the timeline of the evaluation period, we also intend to include the former members of the aforementioned EIGE’s bodies.

**General aspects of the overall survey programme:**

- All surveys will have finite samples of respondents to whom the survey links will be sent. The evaluators will use filter questions and collectors so that the response rates of the surveys can be calculated not only for the general population, but also for certain types/groups of intended respondents. This will allow the evaluators to react quickly in case underrepresentation of certain groups of respondents is noticed.

- Questionnaires will be prepared based on literature review and pilot tested via the first interviews (at least 3-4 pilot interviews with potential respondents per survey questionnaire) to ascertain their clarity and functionality and revised based on results and feedback provided by the respondents;

- Evaluator will take into account data which has been already gathered by various data collection tools during previous ex ante evaluations of EIGE. The design of the tools for the previous evaluations will also be analysed where such information will be available. This will enable the evaluators to design a harmonised questionnaire, providing comparisons of the answers to some questions of the previous evaluation efforts;

- The surveys will be web-based and will be disseminated using our in-house survey tool, which features full functionality needed to ensure a user-friendly survey and has been continuously improved to combine research functionality and respondent satisfaction;

- Survey data will be exported to specialised statistical software (SPSS) for the analysis (frequency tables, cross-tabulations, correlation/regression analysis where relevant, etc. – see more detailed description in the section on retrospective analysis);

- Whenever the evaluators will disseminate the survey links to the respondents, a letter of support obtained from EIGE will be used to facilitate the co-operation with...
The respondents and answer their potential questions about the context of the survey and purpose of the proposed evaluation;

- The experience of the evaluation team shows that the activity of respondents in submitting their responses is the highest **when they receive notifications** from the evaluators – either immediately after the invitation to the survey or after the reminders. Therefore, our approach in the surveys will be to set quite short initial deadlines (2-3 weeks) and to send multiple reminders during that period to those respondents who did not open the survey link. The last reminder would be sent immediately before the deadline and would include a suggestion for the respondents to fill the survey later if they did not have an opportunity to do this earlier. The survey deadline will be kept open for a few days after the deadline until there are no new responses or requests to extend the deadline.

- The questionnaire will include **multiple choice, ranking and open questions**. The wide use of open questions is fruitful where the respondent groups targeted are highly knowledgeable about the issue, which is the case in evaluations of EU agencies or EU initiatives. For example, the surveys we conducted in recent evaluations of Cedefop or ECVET initiative resulted in detailed and strong comments provided by the respondents on a variety of questions.

The evaluation team has conducted large scale surveys in the context of organisational evaluations before, as evidenced by the box below.

**PPMI experience in designing and carrying out large scale survey programmes**

PPMI experts have a lot of experience in designing and carrying out large scale surveys. For instance, large scale surveys were conducted in the framework of such evaluations as the Interim Evaluation of the Lifelong Learning Programme (2010), the Interim Evaluation of Erasmus Mundus (2012), External Evaluation of European Training Foundation (2012), the Interim Evaluation of FP7 Marie Curie Actions (2013), the external evaluation of Cedefop (2013), the external evaluation of Europass (2013), the external evaluation of ECVET (2014), etc. PPMI uses advanced on-line survey tool which enables to effectively disseminate survey questionnaires, keep track of the response rates, and control the overall quality of its surveys. PPMI experts are highly skilled in tracking closely, particularly in the early stages of any survey, the number, origin, and quality of responses and undertaking urgent auxiliary actions to ensure a reasonable sample size of responses. Similarly, we possess a profound knowledge of processing and analysing the collected data.

### 2.3.4. Case studies and their selection

**Case study** method is data collection and analysis technique involving the examination of a limited number of specific cases, which the evaluator anticipates will be revealing about the object of analysis as a whole.

The purpose of the case studies for the current evaluation is to explore in depth the impacts of EIGE’s activities implemented over the evaluation period and to contextualize other evaluation findings. For the case studies to be most useful in the context of the current evaluation, the research team proposes the following criteria for the selection of cases:
Main criteria

1) Representativeness of different thematic focal areas of EIGE’s activities.

The focal areas of EIGE’s activity as defined in its main policy planning documents (mid-term and annual work programmes) have not been stable during the evaluation period despite the fact that most of the activities EIGE performed stayed the same. Some of the activities were being transferred from one area to another, some of the areas were renamed and joined. However, it is possible to distinguish main thematic areas of EIGE which remained more or less consistent during the whole period:

- Comparable and reliable data and indicators on gender equality;
- Implementing gender equality and mainstreaming (collecting and processing methods and practices);
- Resource and documentation centre.

Additionally, EIGE’s planning documents mention two additional focal areas. These areas will not be taken into account when selecting the activities for the case studies, as they will be covered in their entirety by separate sections of the report and will have specific data collection and analysis tools attributed to them:

- Awareness raising, networking and communication – will be covered by social network analysis as well as a specific focus group on the topic of EIGE’s communication;
- Institutional setup and bodies of EIGE – will be covered by in depth analysis of the management and governance of EIGE, including a specific focus group.

The preliminary mapping of the remaining EIGE activities by the thematic area is presented in the table below.

Table 6: Projects associated with thematic focal areas of EIGE’s activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal area</th>
<th>Activities associated with focal area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comparable and reliable data and indicators on gender equality | • Collection of data and statistics in areas of Beijing Platform for Action / support to Council Presidencies  
  • Gender-based violence, incl. female genital mutilation  
  • Gender statistics database and Gender equality index |
| Implementing gender equality policy and mainstreaming | • Methods and tools to support gender equality policy implementation  
  • Benefits of gender equality  
  • Practical tools for gender mainstreaming  
  • Gender training  
  • Collection, processing and dissemination of good practices  
  • Addressing gender stereotypes  
  • Men and gender equality |
| Resource and documentation centre              | • Documentation centre / library  
  • Knowledge Centre  
  • European Network on Gender Equality |

489
Women and men inspiring Europe resource pool

Note: entries in bold represent the activities suggested for case study analysis
Source: compiled by the authors.

2) **Representativeness of all types of EIGE activity.** According to the intervention logic reconstructed by the tenderer, EIGE provides the following types of activity on the topic of gender equality:

- Collection, analysis and dissemination of relevant information;
- Producing original knowledge, generating insights and evidence, filling knowledge gaps;
- Fostering networking and exchange of information;
- Technical assistance and policy support provided to EU and national institutions.

The projects mentioned above can all be attributed to at least one of these types of activity. Some of the projects could be attributed to more than one type.

**Table 7: Projects associated with types of EIGE activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Headline activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Collection, analysis and dissemination of information | • Collection of data and statistics in areas of Beijing Platform for Action / support to Council Presidencies  
  • Collection, processing and dissemination of good practices  
  • Addressing gender stereotypes  
  • Documentation centre / library  
  • Knowledge Centre  
  • Women and men inspiring Europe resource pool |
| Original knowledge, insights and evidence      | • Gender-based violence, incl. female genital mutilation  
  • Gender statistics database and Gender equality index  
  • Men and gender equality |
| Networking and exchange of information         | • Gender training  
  • Benefits of gender equality  
  • European Network on Gender Equality |
| Technical assistance and policy support        | • Collection of data and statistics in areas of Beijing Platform for Action / support to Council Presidencies  
  • Methods and tools to support gender equality policy implementation  
  • Benefits of gender equality |

Note: entries in bold represent the activities suggested for case study analysis
Source: compiled by the authors.

We suggest selecting five activities of EIGE for the in-depth case study analysis. This number of cases will ensure that all the main thematic areas and types of activities of the Institute are covered. Our preliminary view is that the following cases should be selected:

- Collection of data and statistics in areas of Beijing Platform for Action / support to Council Presidencies;
- Gender statistics database and Gender equality index;
- Methods and tools to support gender equality policy implementation;
Methodology for carrying out case studies

During the inception period, the evaluation team will develop the case study guidelines, which will be followed closely by the experts conducting the case studies while providing data collection, analysis and reporting. These guidelines will include, in particular, the set of evaluation questions which should be covered by the case study, suggested methods, types of interviewees and general outline for reporting.

The case studies will be largely based on desk research and interviews, but the survey questions will include information relevant for the selected projects, such as the awareness of stakeholders about the project outputs or their perception of project impact.

The findings concerning each of the selected EIGE’s activities will be presented as separate self-standing case study report, structurally integrated as an annex to the main evaluation report. Such reports will include the intervention logic of each project selected, the methods used to gather the information, The links and consistency between the case study reports and the main report will be ensured by the evaluation team by checking for any discrepancies or contradictions.

Our previous experience in conducting case studies in organisational evaluations is described below.

PPMI experience in conducting case studies

PPMI experts have a lot of experience in conducting case studies as parts of the evaluations of EU agencies. For example, in PPMI’s experience with the external evaluation of Cedefop four case studies were selected to explore in depth the impacts of Cedefop's activities implemented over the evaluation period and to contextualize other evaluation findings. All types of cases were selected based on the separate sets of objective step-by-step criteria, including representativeness of thematic areas of Cedefop’s activities, representativeness of all types of Cedefop’ activities, relevance to the medium term priorities of the organization, etc. In the external evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF) four in-depth case studies were undertaken the four regions targeted by different EU external policy instruments and ETF actions. In each country case, one relevant thematic area targeted by one or more projects within the ETF’s broader work was chosen and examined in detail.

2.3.5. Retrospective analysis methods

The Terms of Reference request the evaluation team to support the findings and recommendations presented in the reports by explaining the degree to which they are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. The conclusions and recommendations based on opinion as a main source should have their degree of consensus indicated and the steps taken to test the opinion should be presented.

The selected data collection methods will provide the evaluation team with a significant array of raw data, both quantitative (survey results) and qualitative (interview transcripts). The data obtained will need to be analysed by applying the well-recognised analysis techniques.
Quantitative analysis

PPMI employs a FluidSurveys 4.1. online survey tool for its quantitative research needs, which is one of the most advanced as well as user- and respondent-friendly tools in the market. The tool comprises an internal analysis capacity, meaning that no coding or exporting of data is needed to obtain the first good look at the data prior to more sophisticated statistical analysis. This allows the evaluation team to follow the changing results real-time and react immediately, e.g. by contacting the respondents who have provided particularly interesting or useful insights, or to drafting preliminary conclusions which can further inform the evaluation process.

After the collection of quantitative data is finalised, using the in-built functions of the survey tool the data will be transferred to SPSS format for further more detailed analysis. The concrete analysis methods chosen will depend on the sample size of respondents who answered each of the questions and other characteristics of data. Generally, each of the major statistical analysis methods has its own requirements to be applied. The analysis techniques which the evaluation team will strive to apply include:

- **T-testing**, used to determine if the two sets of data are significantly different from one another.

- One-way analysis of variance (**ANOVA**), a technique comparing means of two or more samples.

- **Correlation calculations**, e.g. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, measuring statistical dependence between two variables or Pearsons chi-squared test, measuring the consistency of certain frequency distribution with a particular theoretical distribution.

- **Cramér's V**, used to measure association between nominal variables.

Although the validity of quantitative data collected is generally high given the sample is sufficiently large and varied, the data collected still reflects an opinion of respondents. This means that even the qualitative data need explicit techniques to identify the **degree of consensus**. PPMI team will apply the following analysis methods to define it for quantitative data:

- Frequency distributions. Typically in quantitative studies if 51% of respondents agree with a statement, it is held that this indicates a consensus. The 67% frequency would indicate a strong consensus. A lower percentage might indicate a consensus only in case there are many options which the respondents could choose.

- Calculating standard deviations. This shows the variation of data in relation to the average or median. Although the average/median results may suggest one conclusion, the analysis of standard deviation might reveal that there is a significant group opposed to the dominant view.

- Measuring the interquartile deviation (**IQD**) - a simpler way of looking into the variation of data. The difference between 25th and 75th percentile is used to measure the deviation, where the IQD close to zero generally shows that there is an absolute consensus. Again, as the number of choices increases, the large
interquartile deviation might be interpreted differently and does not necessarily show low consensus.

The opinions provided by the respondents in surveys will be further tested using the qualitative methods. Generally, only the questions where the degree of consensus is low or unclear will be further explored in the qualitative inquiry.

**Qualitative analysis**

The qualitative data collected by interviews will employ the recognised analysis techniques for such type of material:

- Observer impression – the data is examined and interpreted by forming and impression and reporting it in a structure form.

- Recursive abstraction – the datasets are summarised, then the summaries are further summarised, until the end result is a compact summary of insights which could not have been drawn from a wider set of data.

- Coding – the categorisation of data to facilitate analysis, somewhat quantifying the data and preparing it for software-assisted analysis.

The key characteristic of the qualitative data distinguishing it from quantitative is the focus on questions of how and why instead of what, when and where. This implies usage of smaller samples but better focus, going for in-depth understanding. The qualitative inquiry by definition has less power of generalisability and can only produce propositions instead of firm conclusions. Thus, instead of validity the qualitative researchers seek trustworthiness of information gathered.

The recognised principles to test the opinions gathered by qualitative means and ensure their trustworthiness, which will be employed by the evaluation team in the forthcoming assignment, include\(^1\):

- Member check (informant feedback). After the interview is conducted and the report is drafted (either the report of the specific interview or a project report), the informants are asked to review the summary of the information obtained and to provide feedback in terms of accuracy, credibility, transferability and interpretative validity.

- Interviewer corroboration. The interviewer gathers evidence that supports a proposition already supported by some initial evidence. Corroboration has its roots in John Stuart Mill's methods of induction – finding causation through the method of (single) agreement, method of (single) difference, and method of concomitant variation (where one phenomenon variates whenever another phenomenon is changed).

\(^{19}\) For a more detailed discussion see Lincoln Y and Guba EG (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.
Peer debriefing. The researcher works together with one or several colleagues or experts in the field who hold impartial views of the research effort. The impartial peers review the methodology applied, the transcripts and the report.

Prolonged engagement concerns the researcher spending sufficient time to learn and understand the social setting or phenomenon inquired. This includes development of rapport and trust within the communities analysed.

Negative case analysis. The purposely sought or spontaneously appearing pieces of evidence which differ from researcher’s expectations, assumption, or working theories, which given special analytical attention may revise, broaden or confirm the patterns emerging.

Mixed methods analysis

The mixed method analysis will be treated as complementary, i.e. the results of quantitative methods will be used to enhance our understanding of qualitative results and vice versa. Although no methodological approach will take overall dominance over another approach, their application will be differentiated according the evaluation questions of this evaluation. Although all the evaluation criteria will be evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively, some evaluation questions could draw on the qualitative methodological approach, while other questions will be answered by relying on quantitative evidence.

We will employ an integrated analysis of quantitative and qualitative data by transforming quantitative data for more qualitative analysis or by preparing qualitative data for more quantitative analysis, followed by an appropriate comparison of different data sets. Our approach to mixed method analysis in this evaluation will be based on transforming qualitative data into quantitative data by categorizing and coding open survey answers and interview transcripts and integrating them with quantitative survey data sets. For this purpose we will use NVivo - a qualitative data analysis (QDA) computer software package which is intended to help users organise, aggregate and analyse unstructured as well as scattered data. The software allows to classify, sort and arrange information; examine relationships in the data; and combine analysis with linking, shaping, searching and modelling. Moreover, NVivo handles virtually any data, including Word documents, PDFs, pictures, database tables, spreadsheets, audio/video files, social media data and web pages and enables to integrate qualitative and quantitative data.

PPMI has applied the mixed methods approach in past evaluations, as evidenced by the box below.

PPMI experience in conducting mixed method analysis

PPMI experts have employed mixed method analysis in the external evaluation of ECVET (2014) for extracting factors which hindered the overall implementation of the initiative. As survey respondents were very active in describing their practical experiences in open survey questions, the evaluation team had enough material to categorise and quantify the main obstacles for ECVET implementation. Structured qualitative data analysis and transformation enabled the team not only to define obstacle categories but also rank them in order of importance.

Social network analysis (SNA)
The social network analysis (SNA) will form a part of the analysis of the survey data obtained from the stakeholders. Questions included in the survey will aim to determine the strength of the relation among different groups of stakeholders in the community of gender equality, particularly EuroGender network. This method will also be used to statistically ascertain the centrality of EIGE in the gender equality community.

SNA is a type of analysis that focuses on the relationships and ties between members of organisations in a certain field. It is based on an assumption that through time organisations develop formal and informal connections with other organisations, which play an important role in the success of businesses and overall work performance. Along with the growing interest and increased use of SNA, a consensus has developed on the central principles underlying the network perspective. In addition to the use of relational concepts, we note the following as being important:

- Actors and their actions are viewed as interdependent rather than independent, autonomous units;
- Relational ties (nodes) between actors are channels for transfer or "flow" of resources (either material or nonmaterial);
- Network models conceptualise structure (social, economic, political, and so forth) as lasting patterns of relations among actors;

Network methods focus on dyads (two actors and their ties), triads (three actors and their ties), or larger systems (subgroups or entire networks).

In the EIGE evaluation context, the SNA will be employed to determine the links between different groups of stakeholders that are formed when these actors communicate with each other in regard to gender equality issues. In particular, the centrality of EIGE in European gender equality community will be measured employing the SNA. The aim of this analysis is to conclude whether EIGE is the centre of knowledge and resources in the area of gender equality and connects other stakeholders better than any other actor in the field.

The findings of SNA are expected to provide general insights on what is the structure of the European gender equality community network, the areas where a cooperation of different actors could be strengthened and promoted further and how far is EIGE considered to be the most important source of expertise and knowledge in the context of European gender equality issues.

The box below provides an example of our experience in conducting this type of analysis in an organisational setting.

---

PPMI experience in the application of social network analysis.

---

PPMI has extensive experience in using modern social network analysis software (UCINet, NodeXL and R system for statistical computation and graphics) that facilitates complex quantitative and qualitative analysis of social networks by numerically and visually describing their features and patterns of interactions. The method of social network analysis was successfully applied and provided substantial results during the external evaluation of Cedefop, carried out by PPMI. The social network analysis (SNA) based on responses by Cedefop’s beneficiaries about their most important contacts helped to define Cedefop’s role and centrality in vocational education and training network and provide insight into whether it adds value above that provided by other organisations in the field. The analysis also helped to depict the pattern of communication among different groups of Cedefop’s stakeholders in the area of VET. In the external evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF) the network analysis was used to quantify the placement of ETF in its stakeholder network and to ascertain how tightly bound the network was, how influential actors were to the process and other measurements. Network analysis was used to both strengthen and validate other findings in the evaluation and to provide insight into the nature of relations between the ETF and its beneficiaries.

2.3.6. Focus groups and additional prospective analysis methods

Since the evaluation aims at undertaking a prospective analysis, it will employ a few additional methods of policy analysis. In addition to the above discussed methods, for the purposes of prospective analysis the following tools will be used:

- **Analysis of public interventions** will be carried out in order to update/adjust the existing intervention logic of EIGE. The result of this effort will be a revised intervention logic of the Institute.

- **Focus groups** will be convened to discuss the key evaluation conclusions and the draft recommendations prepared by the evaluators. The discussion will be chaired by senior members of evaluation team. The results of the focus group discussions will be used to prepare final conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. The final list and composition of the focus groups will be proposed in the inception evaluation report and finalised taking into account the feedback of the Client;

- **SWOT analysis** will be based on: a) synthetic comparison of the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute; b) analysis of external factors that pose risks to the successful implementation and impact of the work of EIGE.

The methods of prospective analysis will be closely interrelated with evaluation methods presented and discussed above. Prospective analysis will draw on the main evaluation findings on “what works / does not work” and “why it does not work” obtained through careful triangulation of data sources and methods. The design of all research tools will take into account the needs of prospective analysis. For instance, survey and interview questionnaires will contain questions on the strengths and weaknesses of the EIGE activities, implementation structure, and networking issues. Moreover, this analysis will also employ suggestions made by key stakeholders, the European Commission and representatives of Member States while responding to survey or interview questions.

**Focus groups**

Focus group discussion as a form of group interview is a convenient way to gather data from several people simultaneously. Moreover, instead of answering questions one after another, participants are encouraged to exchange ideas, ask questions themselves and comment each
others’ points of view and certain experiences. Focus groups are particularly relevant for tackling issues that require deeper qualitative insights which could not be gathered by using other methods, including single one-to-one interviews. Focus group environment encourages participants to explore more sensitive topics and produce more elaborated accounts. For the external evaluation of EIGE we intend to organise four focus group discussions related to organisational set-up, particularly governance and management; communication and impacts on policy:

- **Organisational set-up.** In the context of organisational evaluation, governance and management are often among the topics that involve not only reports, documents and performance indicators but also undocumented internal structures such as general organisational environment, the perception of organisation’s mission, vision as well as the actual functioning of governing bodies. As the topic is highly complex and involve internal and external actors we suggest organising two separate focus groups; (a) **Internal organisational arrangements**; (b) **Functioning of governance structure, prioritisation of activities, budgeting etc.**

- **Communication.** Another considerable topic for focus group discussion is EIGE’s communication. The Institute has adopted its external communication strategy only in the second half of 2012 and prior to the strategy the main communication tasks were related to making key stakeholders aware of EIGE’s presence and its role and establishing partnerships with media and communication experts. At the end of 2012 EIGE reported successful growth of communication activities both online and in the format of events and conferences. However, there is a need for broader picture in terms of stakeholder feedback and effective take-up of the information disseminated by the Agency as well as the adequacy and usefulness of EIGE’s communication activities. More sensitive and problematic communication areas eligible for group discussion might also be sampled using the data from the survey programme envisaged to be conducted by the evaluation team.

- **Impacts on policy and institutional developments.** According to the intervention logic developed by the team, one strand of immediate impacts deriving from the results of EIGE’s activities is related to policy and institutional developments in the area of gender equality and beyond. The goal of integrating gender equality in all Community policies and strengthening gender dimension in member states is entrenched in the Establishing Regulation of EIGE thus it is important to discuss how far EIGE managed to trigger new developments in this regard. Focus group participants representing EU and national level institutions will discuss EIGE’s impact on new policy discussions regarding gender equality, agenda setting as well as EIGE’s role in encouraging institutional and organisation developments across EU.

More detailed information for the selection of the focus groups is provided in the table below.

**Table 8: Selection of focus groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group theme</th>
<th>Main topics and issues to be discussed</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


| Internal organisational arrangements | • Internal processes and procedures;  
  • Administrative arrangements;  
  • Human resource management, including workload, most burdensome procedures, projects, etc.;  
  • The perception of organisation’s mission, vision, future prospects. | EIGE staff members |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Governance and performance management | • Workings of the institutional set-up;  
  • The role of Management Board and its ability to deliver strategic decisions and guidance;  
  • The role of Experts’ Forum and its ability to provide sufficient expertise and support for EIGE’s activities;  
  • The prioritisation of EIGE’s activities;  
  • Adequacy of internal EIGE’s rules and procedures. | Members of EIGE’s Management Board and its Standing Committee; members of EIGE’s Experts’ Forum |
| Communication | • Usefulness and adequacy of EIGE’s communication activities;  
  • Main obstacles for effective take-up of information disseminated by EIGE;  
  • Future prospects of communication strategy and activities;  
  • Perception of EIGE’s mission and vision;  
  • Other sensitive and problematic communication areas (to be sampled using data from survey programme). | Representatives of key target groups: European Commission, European Parliament (FEMM committee), media, NGOs, social partners, researchers and other relevant stakeholders specialising on gender issues; EIGE staff members responsible for communication activities. |
| Impacts on policy | • EIGE’s role in the context of EU gender mainstreaming strategy;  
  • EIGE’s impact on stimulating new policy discussions in member states;  
  • EIGE’s role in agenda setting;  
  • EIGE’s role in encouraging institutional and organisation developments across EU. | Officials of EU institutions, representatives of public authorities of member states, competent gender equality authorities. |

The box below also presents our previous experience in organisation of focus groups.

**PPMI experience in organising focus groups.**

For the external evaluation of ECVET initiative (2014) PPMI experts have organised a focus group in Brussels to discuss outstanding questions of the evaluation regarding governance and bodies of the initiative. Focus group participants representing different internal and external bodies of ECVET engaged in fruitful discussion and provided practical insights on the overall functioning of ECVET governance structure as well as generated a set of practical recommendations which helped the team to formulate a final list of recommendations for the draft final report.

2.3.7. Advantages and disadvantages of methods chosen

The main strength of the proposed evaluation methodology is a balanced selection of recognised evaluation methods, combining the qualitative (literature review, interview programme, focus groups and social network analysis), quantitative (statistical analysis of data obtained from
survey programme and monitoring information) and mixed methods approaches. The triangulation of data sources and methods will allow our team to obtain a wide range of evaluation data and undertake their holistic analysis to inform an accurate, impartial and objective evaluation judgement.

Moreover, the evaluators will seek to use the strengths of the participative approach to evaluation. We have planned validation focus groups which will be used to validate preliminary findings of our analysis. This will enable us to arrive at a well-balanced interpretation of evaluation facts and will help to make relevant policy recommendations. The input of the stakeholders and experts will be indispensable where the past evidence is found insufficient for justifying fully the future course of policy action, but when the policy decisions have to be formulated to avoid losing the positive momentum or the windows of opportunity.

The evaluation team invested its time in reconstructing and discussing the intervention logic of the Institute, which helped to detail the evaluation judgement criteria and to select the appropriate evaluation methods and relevant sources of data. Due to the high level nature of the Institute it is inevitably detached from the ordinary EU citizens. Therefore the awareness and the opinions of the latter with regard to EIGE's activities cannot be considered a valid source of evidence for this particular evaluation.

The table below summarises main method-specific strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the evaluation team.

Table 9: Strengths and weaknesses of the main evaluation methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Desk research</td>
<td>• It provides objective results, since it is based on official documents and statistical data;</td>
<td>• Interpretation of the findings of desk research requires additional methods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is holistic and detailed: available sources cover the whole intervention as well as its</td>
<td>• Official documents do not necessarily reflect the perceptions of decision makers and target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual components.</td>
<td>groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation of the findings of desk research requires additional methods;</td>
<td>• As the situation is rapidly changing, some of the information may prove to be outdated,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Official documents do not necessarily reflect the perceptions of decision makers and target</td>
<td>and checking it with the respondents and interviewees will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups;</td>
<td>• Since the interviewees are known by name and position, they may refrain from critical/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The situation is rapidly changing, some of the information may prove to be outdated, and</td>
<td>inconvenient statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>checking it with the respondents and interviewees will be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interviews</td>
<td>• Interviews provide detailed and comparable information. Unlike in surveys, the interviewer</td>
<td>• Interviews capture standpoints of the individual interviewees and do not necessarily provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can explain or clarify the issue in detail, minimising the chances of misinterpretation;</td>
<td>‘hard’ data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews are an excellent methodological tool for capturing subjective assessments and opinions</td>
<td>• Since the interviewees are known by name and position, they may refrain from critical/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of different stakeholders.</td>
<td>inconvenient statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surveys</td>
<td>• Good method to collect quantitative data about a large population (such as the stakeholders of EIGE);</td>
<td>• Surveys measure perceptions of the individual and organisational beneficiaries and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statistical analysis of the survey data is possible due to its quantitative nature;</td>
<td>participants at a particular point of time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows comparisons across previously available results.</td>
<td>• May be perceived as an administrative burden by the respondents participating in the survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social network analysis</td>
<td>• Allows an innovative and comprehensive way to look into the governance and implementation</td>
<td>The analysis may prove to be difficult if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures, which can assist to identify patterns and recommend the structural modifications;</td>
<td>• Most of the connections identified are one-way, which creates a risk to not receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates identifying the process leaders, knowledge brokers, and other significant roles</td>
<td>comprehensive data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>played by different actors;</td>
<td>• In the case of links between individuals (as opposed to organisations), the links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The analysis may prove to be difficult if:</td>
<td>between the actors analysed may be not very strong and permanent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.8. Approach to ensuring data protection

This section states measures to be employed in order to comply with the legislative basis under which the personal information will be processed for the purposes of the evaluation. The data which regards to be protected will include, in particular:

- the lists of the targeted respondent groups;
- filled survey questionnaires;
- transcripts and records of interviews conducted via telephone, e-mail or eye-to-eye.

To ensure the compliance with the Regulation (EC) N° 45/2001 and the Directive 1995/46/EC we will collect only the data necessary to conduct this specific task and will not use it outside the evaluation and will not transfer it to other individuals of entities and the data will be processed only after the data subject has unambiguously given his consent to do so. We will also implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to the risks represented by the processing and the nature of the personal data to be protected. Specifically, all the personal data will be kept in two safeguarded servers (1 TB capacity) with mirror backup system to prevent any unauthorised disclosure or access, accidental or unlawful destruction or accidental loss, or alteration, and to prevent all other unlawful forms of processing. The server facilities are looked after by IT professionals to avoid malfunctioning of the hardware and keep the data on server safe from viruses and other malicious software which could compromise the security of data.

The data which permits identification of data subjects will be kept for no longer than is necessary to process the collected information (within the effective period of the Contract). In order to ensure the highest level of personal data protection, if necessary, the evaluator will circulate the specific inquiries to the target groups indirectly via the Institute and other bodies which have a right to access wider groups of individuals for the purposes of the evaluation. In the reports only impersonal data will be used which will be presented in a way to illustrate general trends, and the identification will be limited to the aggregated levels (respondent categorisation by age, sex, nationality, areas of activities, institutional dependence, etc.).
2.4. Proposed outline of the reports

The forthcoming evaluation will produce four main reports during its lifetime: the inception, interim, draft final and final report. Each of the reports will include a structure which will follow the main evaluation topics – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, added value, coordination and coherence.

However, each subsequent report will add elements to the sections which were not in place in the previous report. The final report itself is foreseen to be limited to 30 pages of text, which is a very challenging task to implement given the large scope of the evaluation framework and the foreseen abundance of data to be collected. Therefore, we foresee that a number of annexes would be necessary to solve the trade-off between readability of the reports to the general public and the provision of more in-depth data to those who see it necessary.

The table below presents this approach in more detail.

**Table 10: Proposed structural elements of the reports**
The evaluation team will seek to maximise the readability and impact of all the forthcoming evaluation reports. All the information will be presented in a clear, structured way. To maximise the readability and impact of the reports, the team will use simple yet explicit graphic and visual elements according to the type and volume of data presented.

In the table below we present indicative visual elements we intend to use for each data collection and analysis method proposed in this offer.

**Table 11: Visual elements to be included in the reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection/analysis method</th>
<th>Presentation in the main body of the report</th>
<th>Presentation in the annexes of the report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk research</td>
<td>Desk research will be a continuous process providing contextual knowledge and complementing other sources of information. Due to purely qualitative nature of the literature review which is the first aspect of desk research, the findings will be presented in a clear, structured text. Some illustrative primary and secondary sources of information will be listed in alphabetic order and presented as annexes to all four evaluation reports.</td>
<td>If applicable, explicit and detailed data tables of monitoring data will be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
citations and most important findings of the desk research might be presented in text boxes integrated in the main body of the text. Analysis of statistical and monitoring data will also result in text which might be illustrated with relevant short data tables and graphs. However, data tables and graphs of monitoring data will only be used in the main body if they particularly improve the readability and reduce the amount of plain text needed.

Interviews  
Data gathered during the interview programme will be qualitative and presented as clean text. Illustrative quotations highlighting the main topic of the results will be presented in text boxes integrated in the main body of the text.

Interview guidelines and indicative questionnaires will be presented as annexes to the interim report.

Surveys  
Interim report: Selected data tables and graphs will be processed, formatted and presented in the main body of the text to maximise the readability and visual impact. Visual elements will be used to provide the full, explicit and user-friendly summary of gathered data in line with primary descriptive statistics.

Draft final and final report: after processing survey data, more advanced visual elements will be used to present and support findings of the analyses. Depending on the evaluation question and type of survey data to be presented, graphs and pictures will be used to the findings described in the text.

Types of charts will depend on data type and the purpose of the visual element:

- **Column charts** will be used to compare values across several categories;
- **Bar charts** will be used to compare values across several categories when the data labels are long or when the chart shows duration/differences of opinion;
- **Line charts** will be used to show trends over time or among different groups of respondents;
- **Pie charts** will be used to depict the proportion of the whole population of respondents (e.g. demographic data; males/females, etc.)
- **Radar charts** will be used when the categories will be not directly comparable;
- **Combined charts** will be used to represent different types of information in one chart and will be an equivalent of cross tabulation, e.g. opinion of respondents (primary scale) and number of outputs (secondary scale).

Survey questionnaires and respondent guidelines will be exported from the online survey tool and presented as annexes to the interim report in MS Word format.

Aggregated survey data will be presented in MS Excel format, containing data tables and graphs where applicable. Aggregated data will be primarily processed and easy to read.

Case studies  
All case study reports will be structured in a uniform way and presented as annexes to the draft final report. The reports will be based on the data gathered during interview and survey programmes and desk research and will contain relevant visual elements as outlined above.

Quantitative analysis  
Quantitative analysis will be employed to analyse the data gathered during the survey programme. The outputs of the analysis will
be used for analytical purposes and to draw certain conclusions which will be presented as plain text.

| Qualitative analysis | Qualitative analysis will be used as an independent method to analyse qualitative data as well as to interpret and contextualise quantitative data. The results will be presented in plain text, however, some illustrative citations and most important findings from the open survey questions and other qualitative information sources might be presented in text boxes integrated in the main body of the text. | n/a |
| Mixed method analysis | The data generated through mixed method analysis will be used to interpret and contextualise quantitative data and will be presented as plain text. Coding tables of open survey answers and interviews will be presented as data tables in the annexes to the draft final report. | n/a |
| Social network analysis | The results of the social network analysis will be presented as the social network net-graph which will be explicitly explained in the main body of the text. However, due to the complexity of the social network graphics, it might also be presented as an annex to the draft final and final reports. | n/a |
| Focus groups | The results of the focus group discussions will be processed and presented as plain text, to contextualise and explain other findings. Similarly to interviews, some interesting quotes might be presented in text boxes. Aggregated and depersonalised summaries of focus group might be included as annexes to the interim report. | n/a |
| Analysis of public interventions | Revised intervention logic figure will be presented and explained in the text of draft final and final reports. | n/a |
| SWOT analysis | n/a | Standard SWOT table will be presented in the annexes of draft final and final reports. |

3. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

This chapter outlines the most important management aspects that will be used to ensure the highest client satisfaction possible.

3.1. Overall work plan

In this section we present the work plan that is in accordance with requirements set in Terms of Reference. It will be further reviewed during the inception period and presented in the revised version as a part of the draft Inception Report. We would like to summarise our approach to the work plan of this assignment into some of the key principles which we follow closely:

- *jump-starting the assignment* (the quality and flexibility of our team, the knowledge possessed by its members, and the preparatory work done while preparing the current offer allows us to start first activities with the minimum delay);

- whenever possible and feasible – *implementing sub-tasks in parallel* (again enabled by the quality and flexibility of the proposed team);

- *allowing for time buffers* necessary to revise and improve the deliverables if so requested by the Client. This is a particularly important risk management tool,
allowing provision of a high quality output based on sufficient amount of qualitative
and quantitative data despite possible risks related to holiday periods, delays in
gathering the information etc.

The overall organisational framework of the foreseen assignment is provided in figure below.
Figure 4. Organisation of the assignment.

**PHASE**

**Inception**
- Fine-tuning of the evaluation framework:
  - Assessment of data availability, operationalisation of evaluation questions, updating the work plan.
  - Refinement of the proposed methodology according to the discussion with the Steering committee.
  - Review of operationalisation proposed in the offer.
  - Development (review) of judgement criteria, variables and indicators.

**Structured and data collection**
- Elaboration of data collection tools:
  - Interview guidelines, survey questionnaires, lists of respondents and interviewees, identified case studies.
  - Detailed and revised methodology and work plan, updated accordingly to secondary and primary data available.
  - Refined version of intervention logic presented in the offer.
  - Operationalised evaluation questions, developed (reviewed) judgement criteria, qualitative and quantitative indicators.

**Data analysis**
- Retrospective analysis:
  - Quantitative analysis
  - Qualitative analysis
  - Mixed methods analysis
  - Social network analysis
  - Case studies
- Prospective analysis:
  - Analysis of public interventions
  - SWOT analysis

**Final reporting**
- Complementing of evaluation results, validation of findings;
  - Formulation of practical conclusions and recommendations;
  - Elaborated data collection tools:
    - Interview guidelines, survey questionnaires, lists of respondents and interviewees, identified case studies.
    - Summary of initial findings and gathered data; assessment of the data.

**OUTPUTS**

- Detailed and revised methodology and work plan, updated accordingly to secondary and primary data available.
- Refined version of intervention logic presented in the offer.
- Operationalised evaluation questions, developed (reviewed) judgement criteria, qualitative and quantitative indicators.

**DELIVERABLES/MEETINGS**

- Inception meeting
  - 3 weeks after the signature of the specific contract
- Inception report
  - 4 weeks after the signature of the specific contract
- Interim report
  - 20 weeks after the signature of the specific contract
- Interim meeting
  - 2 weeks after the submission of the Interim report
- Draft final report
  - 35 weeks after the signature of the specific contract
- Final meeting
  - 5 weeks after the submission of the Draft Final report
- Final report and Summary report
  - 45 weeks after the signature of the specific contract assignment
The project is likely to last for 11 calendar months.

As shown in the figure above, it is proposed to implement the project in four main phases, closely connected to the deliverables and meetings foreseen in the Terms of Reference. Each project phase is divided into a number of tasks and sub-tasks outlined below.

**PHASE 1: Inception (4 weeks)**

This phase focuses on the finalisation and fine-tuning of the evaluation framework. During the inception phase the team will develop the final methodology and intervention logic as well as evaluation questions, judgement criteria, indicators, data collection tools and analysis methods.

During the inception period one project meeting with the Steering Committee will be organised in Vilnius. The purpose of the meeting will be to achieve full common understanding of the assignment, to discuss and develop the methods to be applied, and to foresee the possible risks and the way they could be managed. The meeting will present the team and discuss the principles of the evaluation approach with the Committee. Any issues that are unclear regarding the methodology, operationalisation of the evaluation questions, intervention logic, research tools, and the overall work plan and management of the evaluation will be duly discussed and agreed on.

**Task 1.1. Fine-tuning of the evaluation framework**

The methodological preparation will start right after the signature of the contract. It will particularly involve further development of proposed methods and tools, which will be discussed and agreed on with the Steering Committee. The evaluation team will prepare the final list of the evaluation questions, including judgement criteria, qualitative and quantitative indicators, target groups to addressed, collection tools and analysis methods to be validated by the Steering Committee. We will also identify and review existing sources of information and request for additional information from key experts, stakeholders and the Client if applicable. Based on this review, we will further examine the quality and appropriateness of the data that will be used for the evaluation. In the methodology section we will also revisit the intervention logic model according to the comments of the Steering Committee.

**Task 1.2. Integration and delivery of the Inception Report**

The results of the elaborated evaluation framework will be synthesised and integrated into the Inception Report. The report will be prepared in accordance with specific content requirements outlined in Terms of Reference.

**PHASE 1 deliverables**

The Inception Report submitted within four weeks of the signature of the specific contract will include:

- Final description detailing how the evaluation methodology is going to be implemented (deliverable 1);
- A refined evaluation methodology with operationalised evaluation questions, developed qualitative and quantitative indicators and judgement criteria, indicators, data collection and analysis tools and methods proposed for each of the evaluation questions (deliverable 2);
- The refined intervention logic based on evaluation’s analytical model presented in the Methodology part (**deliverable 3**);
- An updated detailed work plan and implementation timetable (**deliverable 4**).

Phase 1 will be finalised after the delivery of the Inception Report.

**PHASE 2: Structuring and data collection (18 weeks)**

During the data collection phase the evaluation team will elaborate the data collection tools and concentrate on the implementation of interview and survey programmes, organisation of focus group discussions and desk research activities (literature review and monitoring/statistical data collection). Data collection activities will be regularly reported to the Steering Committee. Phase 2 will be finalised after the 3rd meeting with the project Steering Committee, during which contents of the Interim Report and its annexes will be discussed.

**Task 2.1. Execution of desk research**

We will conduct continuous desk research throughout the second phase. This task is divided into three stages. *First*, a comprehensive desk research will be carried out and all relevant sources of information (besides sources already identified in this offer) will be identified. The desk research will include official documents and legal acts; previously conducted studies; evaluation methodologies; and available monitoring and statistical data. *Second*, the existing sources will be reviewed on the basis of the framework for analysis and the evaluation methodology agreed during the inception phase. *Third*, the list of all the existing sources of information as well as a thorough review of these will be prepared. Findings of desk research activities will be used widely for both analysis and preparation of methodological documents necessary for further evaluation tasks. The interim results of the desk research will inform the preparation of the pilot interview programme, the questionnaires for the survey programme and the focus group discussions.

**Task 2.2. Elaboration of data collection tools**

At this phase we will prepare methodological guidelines and documents for data collection and analysis tasks of the project, which include: questionnaires of the surveys and identified lists of respondents; interview guidelines and list of interviewees; guidelines for the focus group discussions and lists of participants. The evaluation team will also present the final selection of case studies. These methodological documents will be submitted with the Interim Report (as annexes). The methodological guidelines and documents will be updated and improved after the pilot interviews.

**Task 2.2. deliverables**

The main **deliverables** of the task 2.2. will be as follows:

- Preliminary methodological guidelines and documents – questionnaires for the surveys and focus groups, interview guidelines, lists of respondents and interviewees, identified case studies (**deliverable 5**).
Task 2.3. Execution of interview programme

This task will be divided into different phases according to the purpose of interviews and types of interviewees:

- A pilot interview programme will be implemented, involving selected EU level and national level actors and stakeholders. After the pilot interview programme, necessary adjustments to the interview questioning routes will be made.
- Approx. 15 interviews will be conducted with EIGE’s staff members during the field visit.
- Some of the EU and national level interviews will be implemented prior to the beginning of the survey programme. Such arrangements should produce initial insights even before the launch of the survey programme, resulting into a fine-tuned survey questionnaire.
- The majority of EU and national level interviews shall be conducted in parallel with the survey programme. 45-50 of the planned national interviews will be attributed to the selected case studies.
- Additional interviews will be carried out after the survey programme has been concluded. These ‘late’ interviews will be used to contextualise findings of our survey programme and triangulate results of retrospective and prospective analyses.

In total, around 90 interviews shall be conducted – approximately 15 with EIGE’s staff members; 35-45 interviews with representatives of EIGE, policy makers and stakeholders at the EU level, and 45-50 interviews at the national level, 5-6 interviews with staff of selected international organisations.

Task 2.3. deliverables

The main deliverables of this task would be as follows:

- Pilot interview programme (deliverable 6);
- Adjusted interview and survey questioning routes (deliverable 7);
- Contextualised findings to be used in the data analysis phase (deliverable 8).

Task 2.4. Execution of survey programme

The task of the survey programme will be divided into three parallel surveys:

- Online survey of the stakeholders and target audiences of EIGE;
- Online survey of EIGE’s staff;
- Online survey of EIGE’s Management Board and Experts’ Forum

All surveys will be carried out in two phases. In the first phase, the questionnaire of each survey will be designed and tested through pilot exercise with a selected small group of respondents from the sample. To avoid and reduce unnecessary burden to respondents, all questions will be based on evaluation questions and material, which will be gathered during initial interviews and desk research. In the second phase, the questionnaire will be disseminated via e-mail using the online survey tool or, due to data protection matters by EIGE itself and the respondents shall be supported should they encounter any further problems in filling out the survey.

Detailed results of the survey programme will be summarised and presented in annexes to the Interim and Final Reports.
Task 2.4. deliverables

The main deliverables of this task will be:

- Description of the survey programme, summing-up of its main findings and assessment of gathered data reliability (deliverable 9).

Task 2.5. Organisation of focus groups

The evaluation team will organise four focus groups to discuss EIGE’s organisational set-up, particularly governance and management, communication and impacts on policy and institutional developments.

The results of the discussions will be summarized and will support further data analysis processes.

Task 2.5. deliverables

- The summarised findings of the focus groups discussions (deliverable 10).

Task 2.6. Integration and delivery of the interim report

The Interim Report will be prepared on the basis of results of structuring and data collection phase. It will present the prepared data collection tools and the preliminary descriptive results of data collection activities.

A separate part of the report will be dedicated to assess the quality and reliability of data gathered via interviews, surveys, focus groups and desk research. Besides, the report will include an overview of the status of the evaluation, a description of problems encountered and solutions found, a conclusion whether any changes to the work plan are required.

As annexes to the report, the questionnaires of interviews, surveys and focus groups will be delivered.

Task 2.5. deliverables

- The Interim Report and its annexes (deliverable 11).

PHASE 3: Data analysis (18 weeks)

During the third phase of the project we will use a wide range of data analysis methods and tools to process the data collected during the structuring and data collection phase.

Task 3.1. Retrospective analysis

The analysis will have both qualitative and quantitative aspects.

Sub-task 3.1.1. Quantitative analysis

- Quantitative analysis will be based on evidence gathered through the web-based surveys and the collection of monitoring and other statistical data. This analysis will be implemented as a three-step process.
- First, the evaluators will enter the collected statistical data into the analysis software and analyse the descriptive statistics.
Second, the evaluators will carry out the statistical analysis that will allow making broader statements about the relationship between data according to category of respondents, etc.

Third, the evaluators will integrate the results of this sub-task with findings of a broad analysis presented in the Draft Final Report.

Sub-task 3.1.2. Qualitative analysis

The qualitative analysis will also be implemented as a three-step process:

- First, the evaluators will thoroughly examine all the information gathered during data collection phase, i.e. monitoring and statistical data, as well as the results of the interview and survey programmes and focus groups.
- Second, the evaluators will check if findings based on analysis of information from various sources do not conflict and lead to similar conclusions. Particular attention will be paid towards the analysis of factors determining them.
- Third, the evaluators will integrate these findings into a broad analysis presented in the Draft Final Report.

Sub-task 3.1.3. Mixed methods analysis

The evaluators will enter quantitative and qualitative data from surveys and interviews into mixed method data analysis software; quantify the qualitative data from open survey questions and interviews and integrate them with quantitative data. The mixed methods analysis will give deeper insights into the statistical trends of qualitative data and will help to describe factors determining them.

Sub-task 3.1.4. Social network analysis (SNA)

The social network analysis (SNA) will form a part of the analysis of the survey data obtained. Some of the questions included in the surveys will aim to determine EIGE’s links with various other types of actors, as well as centrality of EIGE in the European gender equality community. The findings shall complement to the insights on where the cooperation works properly and where it should be enhanced.

Sub-task 3.1.5. Case studies

Using the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the survey and interview programmes, five of the EIGE’s projects (their preliminary selection is presented in the methodology part of the offer) will be analysed in more detail through the case studies. This analysis will be based not only on general information – the specific interviews will be carried out with key stakeholders of each of the selected projects to obtain more particular information. By focusing more on a few selected projects, the evaluation team will be able to provide an analysis, which is not only wide (as certain questions will be answered throughout many EIGE’s projects), but also deep. Such an approach may be able to reveal some additional trends and issues which could then be used in the further qualitative and quantitative analysis.
Task 3.2. Prospective analysis:
3.2.1. Analysis of public interventions
3.2.2. SWOT analysis

In order to carry out a prospective analysis, the evaluation team will carry out the detailed analysis of interventions (the preliminary understanding of the intervention logic is already presented with the current offer). Its findings will determine the main market or government failures. Secondly, the team will carry out the SWOT analysis, findings of which will determine external contextual factors (risks) that may have a negative impact on further work of EIGE. Finally the findings of analysis of interventions, future policy options and risks shall be synthesized and used as a basis for the prospective analysis and subsequent recommendations.

Task 3.3. Integration and delivery of the Draft Final report and Summary report

On the basis of analysis carried out during the data analysis phase, the draft Final Report will be prepared and presented. This report will cover the specific objectives outlined in the Terms of Reference and will provide elaborated draft conclusions and recommendations. The evaluators will apply the principle of data triangulation in the preparation of the main body of the draft Final Report. Draft Final Report will be prepared in accordance with specific formatting and content requirements provided the Steering Committee.

Phase 3 deliverables

- Draft final report (deliverable 12) will include:
  - Draft conclusions and recommendations;
  - Data sets and results tables (presented as annexes to the report).

PHASE 4: Final reporting (4 weeks)

During the fourth phase of the project based on final comments/suggestions from the Steering Committee, we will prepare a Final Report carrying a set of practical recommendations.

Task 4.1. Formulating final conclusions and recommendations

Our approach to the evaluation is based on mutual consultation with the Client. According to the comments and suggestions from the Steering Committee and other comments to the Draft Final report we will formulate the final list of recommendations deriving from the conclusions of the evaluation.

Task 4.2. Integration and delivery of the Final report and (Task 4.3.) Summary report

The Final Report will be prepared on the basis of the quality assessment of the Draft Final Report and comments/suggestions from the Steering Committee. The report will allow to achieve all specific objectives outlined in the Terms of Reference. It will not exceed 30 pages, information and analysis will be tailored to be readily understood by non-academic readers.

The Summary report (executive summary) will be prepared on the basis of the Final report and will contain the summary of the main findings and recommendations. The report will be presented in a clear, reader friendly way, including graphic elements.
Both reports and other project deliverables will be prepared in line with EIGE’s guidelines on formatting, abbreviations, referencing, etc. The final versions of the reports will be professionally edited and proofread by a native English speaker.

**Phase 4 deliverables**

- Final report and its annexes (*deliverable 13*);
- Summary report (*deliverable 14*).

### 3.2. Timetable

The work plan described above should be implemented during the 11 months foreseen for the implementation of the assignment. The table below presents the evaluation team’s understanding on how the different activities should be distributed during this period.

As it is already mentioned in previous chapter, the project implementation will be divided into four main phases: the *inception phase*; *structuring and data collection*; *data analysis and final reporting phase*. These phases vary in terms of duration depending on tasks and sub-tasks they involve.

Detailed schedule of tasks is provided in the table below.
Figure 5. Detailed schedule of tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>WEEKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inception phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Fine-tuning of the evaluation framework</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Integration and delivery of the Inception Report</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structuring and data collection phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Execution of desk research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Elaboration of data collection tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Execution of interview programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Execution of survey programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Organisation of focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Integration and delivery of the Interim report</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data analysis phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Retrospective analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. Quantitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2. Qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3. Mixed method analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4. Social network analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5. Writing case study reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Prospective analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. Analysis of public interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2. SWOT analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Integration and delivery of the Draft final report</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Final reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Formulating final conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Integration and delivery of the Final report</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Delivery of the Summary report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Work organisation

3.3.1. General work organisation approach

The evaluation team's view is that the essential elements of any project's success include:

- An effective project management, direction and control structure, uniting various involved parties for achievement of project’s common aims;
- Setting up a valid day-to-day management approach, which could allow a strong quality monitoring of the work and risk management;
- Establishment of an effective communication strategy.

There are three main levels of project management: directing, managing and delivering. The directing level bodies are responsible for the overall direction and management of the project within the constraints that are set at the beginning of the project. The Steering Committee of the evaluation is considered to be involved in its overall direction. Managing level bodies are responsible for the day-to-day management of the project within the constraints set out by the directing bodies and mutually agreed upon during the first meeting. The prime responsibility of the managers is to ensure that the project produces the required products in accordance with the time, cost, quality, scope, risk and other performance goals. The delivering level is responsible for the completion of the delegated specific assignments within the project.

Management of the forthcoming evaluation will be heavily based on the key strengths of our team:

- Established and successfully applied project management practices;
- A track record of successfully accomplished projects for the European Union institutions and agencies;
- A wide first-hand experience in carrying out complex evaluation assignments, including organisational evaluations, at the local, national and EU levels;
- Well-established structures, an assembled team with physical resources already in place, and client-oriented processes adapted specifically for this assignment.

The communication strategy in the context of forthcoming assignment is essential in two main aspects. First, as communication with the groups of survey respondents and interviewees brings the most risks to the overall evaluation framework (e.g. due to holiday periods or low interest of the groups approached), it is vital to set up concrete steps and techniques to be taken to ensure a strong engagement of these actors. Second, the evaluators need to both closely follow the guidance of the assignment’s Steering Committee and its separate members and keep them constantly informed about ongoing developments, which calls for a clearly set approach towards mutual exchange of information between evaluation team and Steering Committee.

The following sub-sections will explain the management structure, daily management approach as well as the communication strategy of the project in more detail.
3.3.2. Team and experts

This section presents the structure of the proposed evaluation team and a description of roles and responsibilities of each member of the team.

A combination of technical capabilities and expertise will be required to successfully carry out this assignment:

- Qualifications, knowledge and ability of senior experts to perform tasks outlined in the methodology part of this offer;
- Professional experience in areas covered by this evaluation;
- Experience in application of quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods;
- Experience in management of large and complex international projects at the EU level;
- Demonstrated capacity for data collection and analysis;
- Excellent linguistic ability to communicate and report on the findings in high quality English as well as capacity to carry out interviews and surveys.

The proposed team of experts has all the required professional, technical, linguistic and other capabilities to carry out the project to the highest standard expected. The team is composed of highly qualified PPMI Consortium researchers and external experts with relevant experience. The figure below presents the structure of the proposed research team.

**Figure 6. The proposed team structure**

The project will be managed by the **Project Director** – Mr Rimantas Dumčius - who has extensive experience of contract management, in particular a number of large evaluation projects commissioned by the European Commission, and in depth knowledge in the fields of social affairs and education policies. Mr Dumčius will be responsible for delivering monthly updates on the progress and other relevant aspects of the work on the assignment. He will also function as the Senior Expert in the forthcoming assignment. He is highly experienced in the application of...
various evaluation methods has been a project leader in European Commission (DG EAC) project ‘External Evaluation of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) as well as in the external evaluation of ECVET. He has also led numerous projects commissioned by Lithuanian state authorities.

The team will be led by a Methodological Leader Dr Andrew McCoshan who has long-term experience in designing, leading and executing complex trans-national and multi-cultural projects, evaluation and consulting. He has extensive experience in group direction, facilitation/mediation and teamwork.

The project will highly benefit from inputs of our Senior and Junior experts. Ms Hilde Van De Velde, Dr Egidijus Barcevičius, Dr Bianca Buligescu and Mr Tim De Meyer will act as Senior Evaluators. Mrs Laura Jurkuvėnienė, Ms Aleksandra Malecka, Ms Irma Budginaitė and Mr Donatas Pocius will act as junior experts.

The key Evaluation Team will be supported by the pool of national experts with relevant linguistic skills and expertise on evaluations at European level and gender equality issues (see more detailed information in the table below).

The project team will also be supported by highly qualified independent peer reviewers specialised on evaluation and gender equality issues who will assure the overall quality of the assignment deliverables.

The administrative support team will ensure proper, standard quality-based information flows between expert teams with limited administrative burden to the Client.

Proof-reading of all final deliverables will be carried out by a native English-speaker professional editor.

Table below lists in detail all key members of the evaluation team and peer reviewers, including their field of expertise and role in this project. More detailed information about each member of the proposed evaluation team (except those of the administrative support staff) is provided in the CVs. The table below also lists selected national experts, including their field of expertise.

Table 12. Members of the evaluation team and national experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, position</th>
<th>Fields of expertise</th>
<th>Role in the team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Project director:** | Mr Rimantas Dumčius has extensive experience of contract management, in particular a number of large evaluation projects commissioned by the European Commission, and in depth knowledge in the fields of social affairs, education policies and equal opportunities. He is highly experienced in the application of various evaluation methods and recently led European Commission (DG EAC) projects: „Evaluation of the performance of the Director of the European Training Foundation (ETF) and the ETF’s duties and requirements in the coming years”, „External Evaluation of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop)”; currently he is a project director in European Commission (DG EAC) project “Study on the effective use of early childhood education services in the European Union.” | ▪ Client day-to-day contact;  
▪ Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework;  
▪ Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools;  
▪ Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports;  
▪ Execution of interview programme;  
▪ Organisation of focus groups;  
▪ Prospective analysis;  
▪ Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group. |
| Rimantas Dumčius     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                  |
| Methodological leader: Dr Andrew McCoshan | Management of the team of experts, allocation of tasks, monitoring of the work plan implementation;  
| | Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework;  
| | Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools;  
| | Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports;  
| | Execution of interview programme  
| | Contribution to quantitative and qualitative analyses;  
| | Contribution to mixed-method analysis.  
| | Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group. |

| Dr Egidijus Barcevičius | Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework;  
| | Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools;  
| | Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports;  
| | Contribution to quantitative and qualitative analyses;  
| | Contribution to writing case study reports.  
| | Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group. |

| Methodological leader: Dr Andrew McCoshan |  
| Andrew is an expert in evaluation and from 2006-2011 was director of the framework contract for evaluation services which the Ecorys Group held with DG EAC, and which undertook more than €6 million of work. He has conducted many evaluations with a major organizational/agency component. He is currently rapporteur for the expert evaluation panel for the Interim Evaluation of the Joint Baltic Sea Research and Development Programme (BONUS), a role he was invited to perform by DG Research. Andrew specializes in education and training, and has over 20 years' experience as a researcher and consultant working at local and national levels in the UK and with EU bodies. He has a particular interest in the social aspects of education and training which encompasses gender. Recent work includes acting as Senior Expert on the DG Employment PROGRESS project 'New Skills for Green Jobs: a case for a more gender inclusive labour market'. Andrew is currently a member of the UK Education and Employers Taskforce Research Group and an Associate of the UK Higher Education Academy. He has also been an Associate Fellow at the University of Warwick Centre for Education and Industry, and a Visiting Research Fellow with the UK Commission for Employment and Skills. He was educated at Cambridge and the London School of Economics.  
| |  
| Dr Egidijus Barcevičius, PhD Social Sciences, is Director for Research and Policy Advice at the PPMI. He has more than 12 years of experience in conducting studies and evaluations of various public policy initiatives and providing policy advice to decision makers. Egidijus was involved (as a researcher or team leader) in carrying out policy analysis and evaluation in the fields of employment, labour migration, social protection, public administration, inclusion, equal opportunities, both at the EU-level and in Lithuania. Egidijus has significant experience in conducting evaluations based on comparative cross-country research as well as statistical research and analysis. Recently he has been involved as project leader and researcher in studies such as “New Forms of Employment in Europe” (for European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions), “Analysis and follow-up of mutual learning in the context of Peer Review in the Social Protection and Social Inclusion Programme” (for DG EMPL), “Assessment of the effectiveness and the impact of the Social...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Bianca Buligescu</td>
<td>Bianca is a senior public policy consultant with three years of professional experience in carrying out European public policy projects. Her expertise is in applied labour economics, gender, innovation and social policy. Bianca’s expertise relates in particular to impact assessments and projects involving cross-country analysis on gender, labour economics and innovation in the European Union. Bianca published and presented articles on applied labour economics with a focus on maternal leave policy in Oxford Economics Papers, and occupational gender pay gap. In 2009 she conducted an empirical study on gender pay gaps in Europe for EUROSTAT that was published as a methodological working paper. Bianca currently works as a senior consultant for VVA Europe in London, a consultancy company specialized in analysing the impact of public policies. Bianca has an interdisciplinary educational profile covering three disciplines: political science, sociology and economics with a focus on impact assessment of public policies. Bianca holds a joint bachelor’s degree in Political Science and Sociology from the National School of Political and Administrative Studies in Bucharest, Romania, as well as a cum laude MSc degree in Social Policy Analysis from Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium. She also is about to graduate with a PhD in European Social Protection Policies from the University of Maastricht with a focus on applied labour economics to investigate the impact of public policies in European Union member states.</td>
<td>Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework; Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools; Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports; Execution of interview programme; Contribution to quantitative and qualitative analyses; Contribution to writing case study reports; Contribution to SWOT analysis; Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim De Meyer</td>
<td>Tim De Meyer is a Senior Manager within Deloitte Consulting. Tim is highly experienced in consultancy for the public sector and has worked for more than 13 years for European, federal, regional and local public sector authorities. Tim has specific expertise in the fields of efficiency improvement, business process reengineering, workload assessments, organisation design and the development of performance indicators. Tim has worked on several efficiency projects (e.g. for EC DG CONNECT, EFSA, EUREKA, EC DG REGIO) and has managed the evaluation of the two research executive agencies REA and ERCEA. Tim is an expert in administrative simplification, as he has led a large number of assignments for European and national authorities on simplifying their administrative burden.</td>
<td>Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework; Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools; Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports; Execution of interview programme; Contribution to quantitative and qualitative analyses; Contribution to writing case study reports; Contribution to SWOT analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilde Van De Velde</td>
<td>Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilde is a Director within Deloitte Consulting. Hilde is leading a team of consultants that is dedicated to delivering to EU institutions services within the field of organisation design, process excellence, performance management, strategic planning, HR services and administrative simplification. Efficiency improvement in a public sector context and for EU Institutions and Agencies in particular is Hilde’s focus area. She has led and is leading large-scale efficiency programmes for several Commission DG’s (BUDG, REGIO, CNECT, TAXUD) as well as for EU Agencies (Eurojust, EFSA, Frontex, Eurofound). Over the last years Hilde has lead and delivered multiple projects for the European Institutions and the EU agencies in the area of performance management. For the European Commission, Hilde was project director for the eCohesion project run by DG REGIO and for similar administrative simplification studies at DG RTD, DG AGRI and DG TAXUD. She has led Better Regulation programmes in Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Romania and Hungary. As part of these programmes, she has developed several recommendations in the area of eGovernment. Hilde is Dutch-speaking, works proficiently in English and French, and is an independent user in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior experts</td>
<td>Contribution to the elaboration of the evaluation framework;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Budginaitė</td>
<td>Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Irma Budginaitė works at PPMI since 2010. As a researcher at PPMI, she specialises in social, education policies and migration. Irma graduated from the Vilnius university with a diploma in Political science and she has a Master's Degree in Political Sociology (Sciences Po Paris) as well as a Master’s Degree in Sociology and Social Anthropology (Central European University, Hungary). Irma has been involved in a number of studies and evaluations, contracted by the European Commission, International Organisation for Migration, Eurofound, Lithuanian Research Council, and national ministries. She is experienced in carrying out case studies, applying in-depth and semi-structured interviews, statistical analysis, and carrying out computer assisted qualitative data analysis. Irma took part in several evaluations and studies covering such thematic areas as social inclusion and employment. For example, she contributed to the study on the mutual learning in the context of peer review in the Social Protection and Social Inclusion Programme (2011/2012), the assessment of the effectiveness and the impact of the Social OMC (2010), and currently takes part in the</td>
<td>Contribution to analysis of public interventions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in meetings with the project Steering Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role/Details</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Gudaite</td>
<td>Evaluation of the human resource development and social cohesion in Lithuania and assessment of the prospects for 2014-2010. In the latter, she contributes to the assessment of the measures related to human resource development in public and private sector, life-work balance, gender equality and equal opportunities. Irma is also experienced in working on early childhood education and school policies. She is currently involved in two large-scale research projects commissioned by the DG Education and Culture: “Study of the impact of Comenius Regio” and “Study on effective use of early childhood education and care in preventing early school leaving”. In the area of migration, Irma has professional experience in working on both return migration and immigration policies. She is currently involved in the research on the integration of return migrants into the labour market and society in Lithuania and on the integration of their children in the Lithuanian education system (Lithuanian Research Council, 2013-2015). She also has professional experience in the area of equal opportunities gained at the Unit of Equal Opportunities and Equity (DG Education and Culture, European Commission) and the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsmen (Lithuania). Irma is fluent in English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Jurkuvienė</td>
<td>Ms Laura Jurkuvienė is a senior researcher at PPMI. Laura specialises in evaluation of EU Structural Funds. Her key areas of expertise are performance management and education. Researcher participated in a number of projects related to education, e.g. “External evaluation of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training” (European Commission, Directorate – General for Education and Culture), “The analysis of results of implementation of activities in the area of education and science financed by ESF” (Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Lithuania), and “Integrated analysis of governance of research and higher education” (Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre). Laura holds a MA degree in Public Administration from the Vilnius University. She is fluent in English.</td>
<td>▪ Execution of desk research; ▪ Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools; ▪ Execution of survey programme; ▪ Organisation of focus groups; ▪ Contribution to quantitative and social network analyses; ▪ Contribution to writing case study reports; ▪ Contribution to the preparation and delivery of reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksandra Malecka</td>
<td>Aleksandra Malecka joined Deloitte in February 2012 as consultant in the Public Sector Policy service line to provide support for the European Institutions. She has several years of experience in the public sector, in the field of EU Cohesion Policy, both at the European level working for the European Commission (EC), as well as at the national level being a specialist in the Polish Ministry of</td>
<td>▪ Execution of desk research; ▪ Contribution to elaboration of data collection tools; ▪ Execution of interview programme; ▪ Organisation of focus groups;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Development. Having been involved in the implementation of the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programmes, she gained relevant experience and knowledge in programme/project management: project assessment, reporting and monitoring at programme level, and particular in carrying out evaluations. As a member of the evaluation board Aleksandra was preparing and managing evaluation processes of programmes within the Community Initiative INTERREG III, European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) and Neighbourhood Programmes.

For the first years within the firm Aleksandra focused on the implementation of e-government solutions within the EU Cohesion Policy, by providing advice to Directorate General for Regional & Urban Policy in the framework of the e-Cohesion project. Recently she has been involved in different short-term projects such as evaluation studies for the European Commission and EU agencies.

Donatas Pocius

Mr Donatas Pocius holds a MA degree in Sociology from Vilnius University. He works at PPMI since 2007. During all these years he was constantly involved in conduction of complex international comparative studies, especially in the fields of vocational education and training, adult learning, education financing and other related fields. Currently, Donatas was involved in External Evaluation of Cedefop (2012-2013), Project on financing training in Europe (2010 - 2012) and in the External evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF), a European Union Agency. He was working as a researcher in study on VET financing mechanisms in selected EU Member States (2008-2009), as well as in a study for EC DG EAC about the ongoing reforms in adult learning (2009). During all of the assignments mentioned above, Donatas has developed strong research and analysis skills, such as the application of different interview techniques, development and administration of surveys, moderation of focus groups, as well as quantitative and qualitative (including statistical) analysis of the information gathered. The mother tongue of Donatas is Lithuanian, he is fluent in English, and has a working knowledge of Russian, Italian and French.

Donatas Pocius

Mr Donatas Pocius holds a MA degree in Sociology from Vilnius University. He works at PPMI since 2007. During all these years he was constantly involved in conduction of complex international comparative studies, especially in the fields of vocational education and training, adult learning, education financing and other related fields. Currently, Donatas was involved in External Evaluation of Cedefop (2012-2013), Project on financing training in Europe (2010 - 2012) and in the External evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF), a European Union Agency. He was working as a researcher in study on VET financing mechanisms in selected EU Member States (2008-2009), as well as in a study for EC DG EAC about the ongoing reforms in adult learning (2009). During all of the assignments mentioned above, Donatas has developed strong research and analysis skills, such as the application of different interview techniques, development and administration of surveys, moderation of focus groups, as well as quantitative and qualitative (including statistical) analysis of the information gathered. The mother tongue of Donatas is Lithuanian, he is fluent in English, and has a working knowledge of Russian, Italian and French.

Quality assurance experts/peer reviewers

Luc Chalsege

Luc Chalsège, Senior Director at Deloitte Consulting, has more than 20 years professional experience. Luc’s competencies are mainly linked to strategy development, policy and evaluation of public policies, optimisation of organisation and processes, scorecards and public management in general.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background and Experience</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Managed numerous policy and evaluation studies for the European Commission. Has relevant experience with managing large-scale EU projects. He is the Service Line Leader for the “Public Sector Policy” services within Deloitte Consulting and collaborates to the development of the policy and evaluation practice within the firm. Luc has among other projects managed several projects for DG CONNECT, DG RTD, DG EMPL, DG AGRI, DG COMM, DG ENERGY, DG TRADE, DG JUST, FPI. Before Deloitte, he worked as key account and brand manager for a multinational active in the fast moving consumer goods industry and afterwards for a SME active in the field of communication (public and private sectors). He created then his own consulting SME, offering services and solutions to strategy, policy design, organisation and communication challenges for SMEs and Public Sector stakeholders. Luc speaks French, English, Dutch and has a basic knowledge of Italian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu Laas</td>
<td>Anu Laas has more than 20 years of professional experience as senior expert in gender issues and in labour market, public employment services, education/training and public administration projects in business promotion and rural development. She has more than 20 years of proven working experience in the field of labour market and employment services, job creation and promotion of female entrepreneurship as well as extensive experience in employment and social issues and gendered society concept, collecting and analysing gender disaggregated data (national social surveys, analysing European Social Survey (ESS) data. Anu Laas worked on a range of assignments where she gained sound experience in development, implementation and monitoring of gender equality issues on national and international level. Her main field of specialization is national and international law from gender perspective. Anu Laas is experienced in different research methods and data analysis, in different areas of gender research (including violence against women, critical studies on men; female entrepreneurship), also, she is fully familiar with European Strategies, Programmes and Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer review and quality assurance of all project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Evanthis Kalpazidou Schmidt</td>
<td>Evanthis Kalpazidou Schmidt is an Associate Professor and Research Director at Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy at the Department of Political Science and Government, Aarhus University. Since 2003 she is a member of the European RTD Evaluation Network and National representative, appointed by the Danish Ministry of Science and the European Commission. In 2014 Evanthis Kalpazidou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer review and quality assurance of all project deliverables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schmidt became a member of Expert Group, Ex-post Evaluation of International Cooperation Activities of the FP7 Capacities Programme. She also is a member of various Scientific Societies and Associations (European Platform of Women Scientists, European Evaluation Society, American Evaluation Association, European Higher Education Society – Linking Research, Policy and Practice (EAIR), Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER), Euroscience). Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt is an expert of social dialogue, competitiveness and gender equity issues. She has more than 10 years of experience as an expert in evaluation projects and programmes which cover gender management, gender equality in science, carrier development programmes for women.

### National experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romania – Bianca Buligescu</th>
<th>Member of Core Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy - Monica Pesce</td>
<td>Monica Pesce is an Associate Partner at VVA and she has deep expertise in supporting both private companies and public administrations in strategic planning and strategy implementation. Specifically for the European Commission – DG ENTR and of the European GNSS Agency she has a deep knowledge of the GNSS and transport sector. She worked on a range of assignments including activities such as business planning, strategic planning, geo-management and sales management as well as scenario modelling and analysis. Monica’s key projects in the GNSS field include, among the others: Evaluation of the possibility to extend EGNOS in Ukraine; Market monitoring and forecasting and public benefits monetary evaluation of the European satellite system (Galileo/EGNOS), Go-to-market strategy for EGNOS commercial services (EDAS), and Market Monitoring and Forecasting Process review, update and integration of Galileo Commercial Services. Monica is also the President of the Board of Professional Women’s Association of Milan, an international association, part of a European association of 19 networks. Monica holds an MSc in Economics from University of Genova, her mother tongue is Italian and she speaks English fluently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia – Anu Laas</td>
<td>Member of Core Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom – Louise Ackers</td>
<td>Professor Louise Ackers holds a Chair in Social Policy and Directs the ‘Knowledge and Place’ Research Group at the University of Salford, UK. Her research focuses on research careers with particular attention to the progression of women in science careers. This has included studies on the participation of women in the European Commission’s Marie Curie Fellowship Scheme (Ackers, 2011), a study for DG research on the mobility of women in science careers addressing the barriers to mobility facing women and the impact of these on career progression and work, again for the European Commission on the relative successes of women in securing grant funding. In addition to these specifically gender-focused studies, all of her work on science and science careers and mobility has paid attention to gender dynamics and outcomes. Professor Ackers coordinates an FP7 programme on the careers, impacts and mobility of researchers in the humanities and social science (POCARIM). This is a large study spanning 13 Member States and will mainstream gender issues in all of its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark – Evanthia Schmidt</td>
<td>Member of Core Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative selection of national experts

<p>| Poland - Aleksandra Malecka | Member of Core Team |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania – Egidijus Barcevičius</td>
<td>Member of Core Team</td>
<td>Virginie Besrest is a senior expert in public policies evaluation and strategy. She is the manager of Quadrant Conseil, a partner company of Eureval, consultancy company specialised in public policy evaluation for which she worked during 10 years. She conducts evaluations and strategic / prospective studies for European or national administrations and regional or local public authorities. She also provides training services. Previously she gathered a triple professional experience: in regional public authority (international cooperation, Picardy), in industry (Export, Agrofood) and in opinion survey / consulting (opinion survey and strategic studies, TNS Sofres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Hilde Van De Velde</td>
<td>Member of Core Team</td>
<td>Liisa Horelli, PhD in environmental psychology, is Adjunct Professor (docent) at the Department of Real Estate, Planning and Geoinformatics, Aalto University, Finland. She conducts research on participatory e-planning. Her latest interdisciplinary research programme is called “The Participatory Local Community as an issue of time politics and planning”. Currently, Dr. Horelli is Visiting professor at the Politecnico di Milano, Designing for Smart (and Wise) Cities. She has carried out action research and published several articles on participatory urban and regional planning, especially from the perspective of health promotion and the enhancement of human and gender-sensitive environments. Dr. Horelli is also studying gendering the self-organisation around Smart Cities and its consequences for urban planning, community development and local co-governance. She consults in gender and environmental issues from the perspective of diversity and psychosocial inclusion. Her latest projects and publications deal with time planning, the co-creation of services and gendering Smart Cities. Since the 1990s Liisa Horelli has conducted several evaluations on EU-funded programmes and projects from the gender perspective. In 1992-1996 Dr. Horelli consulted on evaluation strategies The National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health in Finland (NAWH), which has been involved with various EU DG XIII Tide-projects. Dr. Horelli has participated as an expert in several selections of EU proposals (TIDE selection, February 1996, the ERDF Article 10, New sources of employment, March 1996, and Terra programme on European Spatial Planning, September 1996; Recite II in 1997; Ecos-Ouverture in 1998 and 1999). At the UN, HABITAT II Human Settlement conference in Istanbul, in1996, she organised two global teleconferences, one with the representatives of UNDP, and another one with NGOs from Asia, Africa, South-America, North America and Europe. The event, called “Listen to local voices”, provided opportunities for local women to have an on-line dialogue with their representatives at the conference. In 1997-1998 Liisa Horelli co-ordinated EuroFEM - Gender and Human Settlements network project belonging to the EU 4th Action Programme on Equal Opportunities between Women and Men. An international conference was arranged in Hämeenlinna, Finland, in 1998. In 1998-2003 Dr. Horelli worked as an Academy Research Fellow, conducting research on an interdisciplinary research programme called &quot;Children and Young People as developers of Human-friendly Environments&quot;. Since 2004 she has conducted research on time planning and community informatics- assisted development funded by the European Social Funds, TEKES and the Finnish Academy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3. Resource allocation

Human resources

The table below lists in detail all members of the core team indicating the number of man-days per expert and per assignment.

In general, the allocation of man-days and distribution of human resources presented in a table below reflects evaluator's aim to ensure the best quality service. As a result, in every phase of the evaluation a well-balanced amount of man-days between senior and junior experts is pursued.
Table 13: Allocation of Human Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Category of the expert</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>National experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</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>Director</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>Methodological leader</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>Senior experts</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>Junior experts</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>Peer reviewers</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>National experts</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>Pool of national experts</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>1.</td>
<td>Inception phase</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>1.1.</td>
<td>Fine-tuning of the evaluation framework</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>Inception meeting</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>1.2.</td>
<td>Integration and delivery of the Inception Report</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>2.</td>
<td>Structuring and data collection phase</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>2.1.</td>
<td>Execution of desk research</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>2.2.</td>
<td>Elaboration of data collection tools</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>2.3.</td>
<td>Execution of interview programme</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>2.4.</td>
<td>Execution of survey programme</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>2.5.</td>
<td>Organisation of focus groups</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>2.6.</td>
<td>Integration and delivery of the Interim report</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>Interim meeting</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>3.</td>
<td>Data analysis phase</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>3.1.</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis</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>3.1.1.</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>National experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</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>Director</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>Methodological leader</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>Senior experts</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>Junior experts</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>Peer reviewers</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>National experts</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>Pool of national experts</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>National experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</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>Director</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>Methodological leader</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>Senior experts</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>Junior experts</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>Peer reviewers</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>National experts</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>Pool of national experts</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>

**Man-days per expert category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Man-days per expert category</th>
<th>Rimantas Dumčius</th>
<th>Andrew McCoshan</th>
<th>Hilde Van De Velde</th>
<th>Egidijus Barcevičius</th>
<th>Bianca Bălăgescu</th>
<th>Tim De Meyer</th>
<th>Laura Jurčiūnienė</th>
<th>Aleksandra Maliecka</th>
<th>Irma Budginaitė</th>
<th>Donatas Pocius</th>
<th>Evanthia Kalpazidou</th>
<th>Schmidt, Luc Chalsege, Anu Laas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</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>Director</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>Methodological leader</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>Senior experts</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>Junior experts</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>Peer reviewers</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>National experts</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>Pool of national experts</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>

**Man-days per individual expert**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Man-days per individual expert</th>
<th>Rimantas Dumčius</th>
<th>Andrew McCoshan</th>
<th>Hilde Van De Velde</th>
<th>Egidijus Barcevičius</th>
<th>Bianca Bălăgescu</th>
<th>Tim De Meyer</th>
<th>Laura Jurčiūnienė</th>
<th>Aleksandra Maliecka</th>
<th>Irma Budginaitė</th>
<th>Donatas Pocius</th>
<th>Evanthia Kalpazidou</th>
<th>Schmidt, Luc Chalsege, Anu Laas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</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>Director</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>Methodological leader</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>Senior experts</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>Junior experts</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>Peer reviewers</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>National experts</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>Pool of national experts</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>

**Inception phase**

1.1. Fine-tuning of the evaluation framework
- Inception meeting

1.2. Integration and delivery of the Inception Report

2. Structuring and data collection phase

2.1. Execution of desk research
2.2. Elaboration of data collection tools
2.3. Execution of interview programme
2.4. Execution of survey programme
2.5. Organisation of focus groups
2.6. Integration and delivery of the Interim report
- Interim meeting

3. Data analysis phase

3.1. Retrospective analysis
3.1.1. Quantitative analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Man-days per expert category</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Man-days per individual expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.</td>
<td>Mixed method analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4.</td>
<td>Social network analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5.</td>
<td>Writing case study reports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>Prospective analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.</td>
<td>Analysis of public interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.</td>
<td>SWOT analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.</td>
<td>Integration and delivery of the Draft final report</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Final reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td>Formulating final conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.</td>
<td>Integration and delivery of the Final report</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>Delivery of the Summary report</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total days: 327</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical resources

The physical resources at PPMI available for execution of the contract are the following:

- Office space (about 350 sq. m.) with meeting rooms, archives and working space available;
- A computer network for 35 users with the latest versions of software (Windows 7, MS Office 2013, IBM SPSS statistics, etc.) and well-proven internally developed tools (e.g. Fluidsurveys 4.1, web-based survey tool, web-based survey on assessment of PPMI services);
- 2 servers with approx. 500 GB storage capacity, mirror backup system and due internet connections which allows to safely store and easily access all necessary information;
- Report editing and communication facilities including 5 printers, 1 scanner, 1 fax machine/scanner, 2 copiers, 2 multi-media projectors, internet and web-mail system and other office-automation facilities that are interlinked among themselves by computer network providing sufficient capacities to execute different types of project activities;
- Multilingual personnel;
- ‘Ad hoc’ administrative and audit services;
- Travel services.

We will also ensure an appropriate management and backstopping system, quality control system, secretariat and any other support staff (editors, proof readers, etc.) that are considered necessary for the successful implementation of this assignment.
3.3.4. General quality assurance approach

PPMI Group’s quality approach has been certified as compliant with the ISO 9001:2008 quality management standard. Based on key quality management principles the assignment will be organised to ensure the highest client satisfaction. Quality will be planned, designed and built into the project’s management and deliverables in order to prevent any potential mistakes. The quality approach will be based on continuous improvement of all outputs and responsible management of human and physical resources.

Our approach to quality consists of particularly three stages: quality planning, quality control and quality assurance. Quality planning concerns defining the project deliverables with the respective quality criteria, methods to ensure quality and responsibilities of those involved. Quality control is focused on the operational techniques to fulfil the quality requirements and eliminate causes of unsatisfactory performance.

The quality of the assignment will be ensured by all members of the research team in general and Project Coordinator as well as Peer review panel in particular.

3.3.5. Procedures to ensure client satisfaction

To ensure the highest quality and client satisfaction we provide the basis for an agreement on overall quality expectations on project deliverables and acceptance criteria on which the final product will be judged.

PPMI Group has developed a set of acceptance criteria/quality indicators making a built-in quality control system which helps to improve the quality of the deliverables, notice common mistakes and take preventive actions and stay aware of the project situation.

To ensure the highest quality and client satisfaction the project team will strive to ensure that:

- the proposed methodology is further tailored and fine-tuned to comply with specific requests of the Client during implementation (esp. inception) process of the evaluation. In particular, the assignment will be carried out so as to provide the most robust and complete results possible, supported by solid evidence and rigorous analysis;

- the activities are appropriately organised and resourced, i.e. tasks and responsibilities are clearly distributed according to the experts’ specialisation and relevant professional and academic experience. If needed, organisation of assessment activities will be further developed after first meeting with the project Steering Committee;

- the assessment process is carried out in a very transparent way, i.e. apart from the meetings with the Steering Committee, the team will pursue open and constant communication with the Client outlined in more detail in the communication strategy sub-section;

- the proposed conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation are clear and communicated in such a way that they can be readily understood by a non-specialised reader;

- based on our deep and well academically and practically balanced understanding, all key deliverables are consistent with professional standards and deal with all evaluation
questions specified in Terms of Reference and their subsequent operationalisation, addressing the proper focus and scope.

Furthermore, we ensure that with the help of professional proof-reader all reports will have the same layout, style and format and will follow a common structure in order to ease legibility and intelligibility of the results.

3.3.6. Setting up and monitoring quality

The table below presents the measures of setting up the highest quality of the forthcoming assignment. Our approach is based on constant monitoring and mutual communication with the Client and among team members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>The understanding of the Terms of Reference of the assignment for a rapid and sound implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper selection of service providers</td>
<td>We have composed a well-balanced team in a way which enables the strengths to be fully exploited. However, if the standard quality is not met, the evaluator is ready at any time to propose the alternative for the underperforming experts. The evaluator’s database of service providers allows for the identification of alternative candidates for each expert position of this evaluation. Accuracy, uniformity and transparency in identifying, selecting and contracting the most appropriate experts, will remain a must. If there is a need to change expert, the evaluator will endeavour to appoint the ones with whom it has established a level of trust, understanding and familiarity in working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound implementation</td>
<td>A timely mobilisation of experts in accordance with the Terms of Reference and Client’s requirements, a briefing of selected experts about contents of the specific assignment. An ongoing monitoring and quality control of assignment execution and performance of the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant backstopping</td>
<td>Provision of a flexible and efficient backstopping service by regularly maintaining contacts with the Client experts involved and. This will guarantee the quality of services performed during the execution of the assignment and permit to timely intervene, taking corrective actions if and when it is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective reporting</td>
<td>The quality of reports will be examined by the Team Coordinator and Peer Review Panel. The quality of reports will be strictly and primarily based on the reporting requirements set by the Client, i.e. a timely preparation of reports with appropriate content, language and standard formatting. Prior to the submission to the Client, reports will be reviewed and edited by the professional proofreader to ensure that their quality is up to the standards required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective decentralisation</td>
<td>We completely understand that ensuring consistent and high quality inputs from different experts is critically important for this contract. To this end the role of a project Coordinator will be crucial. The Coordinator will be responsible for a full briefing of all experts at the outset of their...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
work and further provision of instructions during the whole evaluation process. Our internal management system will ensure that all experts are able to make the required inputs strictly according to the work plan foreseen.

| Continuous and adequate coordination | The project Coordinator will continuously and adequately coordinate the activities and distribution of assignments. A full-team briefing at the beginning of the execution of a contract will be arranged to ensure complete and uniform understanding amongst team members of the context and the purpose of work, their responsibilities and deliverables to be provided. To ensure consistency and high quality within the central and homogenous structures, templates, guidelines and other instruction material for the application of evaluation methods will be prepared. |

We will apply two types of quality methods during the implementation of the assignment:

- **In-process methods** by which quality can be built into the deliverables as they are developed (e.g. team meetings, consultations with the Client). The quality inspections will be carried out during the development of the deliverables as well as upon completion.

- **Appraisal methods** by which the finished deliverables will be assessed for completeness and fitness for purpose (report presentations to the Client, reviews of the Quality Assurance expert).

### 3.3.7. Prevention of delays

Our team will ensure effective compliance with internal as well as external deadlines, e.g. in terms of dealing with specific Client’s requests, the submission of written materials, the implementation of assignment tasks, the submission of reports, invoices and other relevant documentation etc. A well-elaborated work plan accompanied with an effective project management will guarantee a timely submission of all key deliverables of the contract.

In case of unexpected major problems, the Project Coordinator will communicate with the Client regarding effective and timely solutions for removing obstacles for sound implementation of the contract. During the implementation of the assignment, the maintenance of regular contacts with the Client and a regular coordination of the experts involved will be based on clear information and constant progress updates. Weekly updates submitted to the Client will review the status and progress of each ongoing task envisaged in the work plan of the evaluation. Monthly updates will be submitted to the Client on the first working day of each month of the assignment. The brief reports will include an updated time table indicating the percentage of tasks completed, any problems encountered by the team regarding the sound implementation of the assignment and additional support needed from the Client if applicable. Constant reporting system will help the evaluation team to keep in touch with the Client and prevent any substantial inaccuracies that might occur.
On the daily basis, the evaluation will be administered by PPMI Group. All administration activities within this assignment will follow practical rather than procedural logic. The main administrative aim is to ensure proper, standard-quality-based information flows between expert teams.

3.3.8. Communication strategy

To control the overall quality of the assignment we have established a two-way communication strategy which in the context of forthcoming assignment is essential in two main aspects. First, as communication with the groups of survey respondents and interviewees brings the most risks to the overall evaluation framework (e.g. due to holiday periods or low interest of the groups approached), it is vital to set up concrete steps and techniques to be taken to ensure a strong engagement of these actors. Second, the evaluators need to both closely follow the guidance of the assignment’s Steering Committee and its separate members and keep them constantly informed about ongoing developments, which calls for a clearly set approach towards mutual exchange of information between evaluation team and Steering Committee.

Communication with EIGE

The communication with EIGE will be conducted via phone, email, video-conference (if needed) and face-to-face meetings. Due to PPMI group's location in Vilnius face-to-face meetings between the Client and the evaluation team members could be organised whenever necessary in order to ensure the highest level of effectiveness in mutual communication.

Regular communication activities with the Client will ensure the smooth execution of the contract and will serve as an early warning system if the contractor would encounter any problems related to the assignment. Regular communication activities will include:

- 3 (4) project meetings with the Steering Committee in Vilnius: Inception meeting, Interim meeting, Final meeting and, if applicable, a presentation at EIGES Management Board of November 2014.
- Monthly progress updates provided by the project Manager on the first day of each month throughout the contract period.
- Weekly progress reports documenting overall progress of the project provided by the project Coordinator.

Additional communication activities would include support from the Client in obtaining additional documents and/or mailing lists of survey respondents and interviewees as well as disseminating the surveys if mailing lists are not accessible to the evaluation team.

If the client expresses any complaint regarding the work undertaken during this evaluation, it is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to respond in the first instance. If the issue cannot be resolved virtually, the Project Coordinator, may meet with the Client representatives to discuss and resolve any outstanding issues.

All the communication from the Steering Committee of the Contracting authority will be answered within three working days.

Communication with survey respondents
Our general approach to communication with survey respondents include 2 options which depend on the availability of contact details and type of dissemination:

| Contact details of potential survey respondents are publicly available/ the contracting authority provides the evaluation team with contact database. | Contact details of potential survey respondents are not publicly available/ due to data protection issues it is impossible to obtain contact details from the contracting authority. |
| Surveys disseminated by the evaluation team via the in-house survey tool. | Surveys disseminated by the contracting authority via in-house emailing system or other emailing tool. |
| In-house survey tool enables the evaluation team to: | If the surveys are disseminated by the contracting authority via the general invitation link, there is no possibility to track status of each invitation and send differentiated reminders. The evaluation team will ask the contracting authority to periodically send reminders to all the contacts in the survey mailing list. |
| ▪ Send an individual invitation to every respondent; | Different approach to survey dissemination will not affect the overall quality and consistency of data gathered. |
| ▪ Anonymously track status of the invitations (number of respondents who have viewed the survey; number of respondents who have completed the survey) and calculate the precise survey response rate; | |
| ▪ Periodically send differentiated reminders only for respondents who have not viewed the survey and for those who have viewed but have not completed the survey. | |
| Common principles of communication with survey respondents: | |
| ▪ Respondents receive a short and easy to read invitation letter containing a link to the survey, information about the purpose of the survey and short guidelines how to fill it in. | |
| ▪ Surveys are formatted in a user-friendly way and are accessible from a variety of electronic devices: personal computers, laptops, tablet computers, smart phones. | |
| ▪ Respondents are provided with a survey-specific email address and are encouraged to send any questions and comments regarding the survey or the overall evaluation. The evaluation team shall answer the inquiries ASAP or within three working days at the latest. | |
| ▪ Survey respondents receive periodical reminders which encourage participation of individuals who have not read/forgotten previous invitations. Frequency of the reminders depend on respondent activity which is monitored daily by the evaluation team member responsible for administering the survey. Usually the reminders are sent in the middle of the survey programme, after public holiday periods and two-three days prior to the survey deadline. If the activity of the respondents remain low, additional reminders or extension of survey period in line with project deadlines might be considered. | |

**Communication with interviewees**

The evaluation team will contact each selected interviewee by sending a personal invitation to participate in an interview outlining:

- A short background of the evaluation;
- The names of the contracting authority and the contractor;
- The sources which were used to identify the potential interviewee;
- The purpose and indicative theme of the interview.

The invitation shall also contain an electronic copy of an official supporting letter from the contracting authority. If additional contact details are publically available, the evaluation team
may follow up the invitation email by phone call to provide the interviewee with more details and reduce time costs.

If the contacted person agrees to be interviewed, the evaluation team shall provide all the relevant details regarding the interview: short guidelines, indicative questions and any other relevant matters. The interviews are to be conducted via telephone, internet telephony or face to face on the date mutually agreed by the evaluation team and the interviewee. Upon request, interviewees shall be provided with a summary transcript of the interview.

3.3.9. Peer review panel

The overall oversight of quality in this assignment will be conducted by Peer review panel on basis of consultations with the Project Coordinator.

To provide an objective perspective the members of the peer review panel will not be engaged in everyday workings of the assignment. The members will help the Project Coordinator and the expert team to ensure the highest quality of data collected, the appropriateness of methodology and tools proposed. They will engage in all phases of the assignment from the inception to the final report to ensure that the overall design and execution of the project is in line with the Client expectations and formal requirements. The role of the peer review panel will be essentially to help the evaluation team ensure that:

- The problem/issue being addressed and evaluated is well formulated and contextualised, previous related studies but also policy decisions are duly taken into account;
- The evaluation approach is well designed and well executed; most essential is the appropriateness of methodology and tools to the evaluation task posed and the data available;
- The data is valid and reliable; when the data are obtained from outside sources, its validity and reliability must be double-checked, and if there are any reservations, these must be reflected appropriately in formulation of findings and conclusions;
- The conclusions follow logically from the findings and are explained thoroughly, in a transparent manner;
- The recommendations are useful and practical; evaluations should enable policy actions and organisations to improve but not to avoid difficulties that may exist;
- The conclusions and recommendations are relevant to the Client and other stakeholders;
- The overall presentation is accurate, easy to read, informative, e.g., there is a good use of graphics, maps and pictures as required.
3.3.10. Risk management

Our risk management strategy encompasses continuous identification, assessment, and prioritisation of risks, so that they could be followed by coordinated and effective application of measures to minimise, monitor, and control the probability and/or impact of these unfortunate events.

In order to manage the risks which might occur during the implementation of this project, we will use risk management log frame. The table below outlines the main risks and the risk management measures proposed by the evaluation team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk management measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies in information collection</td>
<td>Standardised structures, templates, guidelines and other instruction material; a decentralised field work oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect and/or limited information</td>
<td>Triangulation of methods; an initial identification of information sources and key interview and survey respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete/unreliable monitoring information</td>
<td>Contacts with relevant authorities, compensation of the shortages with nationally available data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited time</td>
<td>Time buffers foreseen for each task; multi-tasking and mobilisation of internal resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven understanding of the quality requirements</td>
<td>A briefing of all teams at the outset of the project and in later stages; a decentralised field work oversight; central and uniform instructions to all experts, including provision of standardised structures, templates, guidelines and other instruction material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic barriers in analysing documents, conducting interviews</td>
<td>Using international network of experts with relevant linguistic skills. Selected national experts will support the core evaluation team in conducting interviews in the four selected countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from stakeholders do not cover all relevant aspects in all countries/ institutions at the same level of generality</td>
<td>Triangulation with other methods, such as desk research or interviews, contacts with relevant structures. The evaluation team will closely cooperate with the Client to receive constant support if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low response rate of survey respondents</td>
<td>Early planning: survey questionnaires are carefully planned and designed in parallel with other evaluation tools prior to the beginning of the survey programme. Piloting: survey questionnaires and guidelines are piloted with selected sample of respondents prior to dissemination. Broad respondent base: the final lists of potential respondents are drawn up after detailed review of publicly available sources and in close cooperation with the Client which might provide the evaluation team with additional contacts from its database. Clear responding instructions: respondents are provided with short, user-friendly instructions on how to fill in and save survey responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key interviewees unavailable or unwilling to be interviewed</td>
<td><strong>Periodic reminders</strong>: online survey tool enables to track response status and send targeted reminders only for respondents who have not submitted their responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early planning: list of potential and alternative interviewees will be drawn up and agreed upon prior to the interview programme. Early contacting: interviewees will be contacted at least two weeks prior to the interview programme to set up the suitable date and time. Clear and attractive instructions/background documents for the interviewees: interviewees will be provided with clear guidelines and any additional information considered necessary for the interview. A supporting letter from the Client encouraging interviewees to cooperate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key experts unavailable or unable to carry out the assignments on time and corresponding to the requirements</td>
<td>Broad network of experts providing measures to immediately find a proper replacement for each position in the structure of the core team and the team of national experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>