

Name of the team: Kaukasios

Criteria	1. reviewer		2. reviewer		3. reviewer	
	Points	Comments	Points	Comments	Points	Comments
Understanding the requirements: understanding the project and the evaluation needs of the contracting authority 0 - 5 b.	2	It is not clear from the tenderer's proposal that the tender assignment (ie submission of the tender) was understood. There is no introduction of the team, project risks, etc. On the contrary, recommendations and managerial summaries are given in the introductions.	4.5	Excellent description of the project and context There is no description of the purpose of the evaluation Uses and cites external sources	5	The introduction includes the background information about the project with understanding of its goals and expectation of the client. The additional information about the project topic are an appropriate and suitable supplement the proposal
Intervention logic: comprehensibility, completeness and suitability of processing intervention 0 - 15 b.	7	The processed intervention logic does not contain all the activities that will be implemented by the project. Within the design, I lack a clear description of the internal logic of the project.	7	Contains LFM with a description of intentions, results, outputs and activities, including indicators, method of verification, risks and assumptions. Assumptions even at the level of intentions where they do not logically belong. Indicator verification sources include data collection tools. The internal logic (if-and-then) is not always clear - what leads to it.	9	The Logic model covers all expected categories but relations between them are not clear. Assumptions and Situation are not included.

				(For example, outputs good farming practices, good wastewater management, good health have increased awareness on wastewater management, educated individuals. Description of intervention logic is missing. Gender mainstreaming is lacking.	
Evaluation matrix: formulation of appropriate and comprehensible evaluation questions and suitable and practical result indicators 0 - 25 b.	7	The proposal contains a slightly confusing matrix with the design of indicators and identification of potential risks. I would welcome a better elaboration of evaluation questions.	10	The offer does not contain an evaluation matrix, only evaluation questions that relate to relevance and effectiveness. Methods of data collection are listed in LFM - sources of verification of indicators, they are not assigned to questions.	15
Evaluation design and methods: appropriate elaboration (and justification) of evaluation design and approach to data collection and analysis, quality of proposed data collection tools,	10	Unfortunately, the applicant did not describe the chosen evaluation design. The proposal shows an effort to ensure triangulation.	12	The offer contains two detailed tools for data collection - a questionnaire for trainees and a questionnaire for farmers. The questionnaires contain scales for evaluating the answers. The nature of the evaluation design is defined (goal-based approach) and describes how the project achieves the set goals. The offer also contains recommendations for achieving goals and sustainability of results.	15
					No description of evaluation matrix. The evaluation questions are formulated but indicators are not related to the questions.
					The evaluation methodology is based on a goal-based approach. The indicators and methods of data collection are related to outcomes, outputs and impact. The table which can be consider as a part of the future questionnaire includes the questions about the quality of training. Followed questions seems as a verification of the user satisfaction. The

incl. sample questions 0 - 25 b.				<p>Lack of a consistent description of the approach, discussion of the proposed methods of data collection with respect to their sources.</p> <p>Missing description of data analysis strategy.</p> <p>Missing triangulation - validation of data (as well as verification of the reliability of data collection tools).</p> <p>The approach to evaluation is not clear from the description.</p>	evaluation design as whole is not clear.	
<p>Risks and methods of mitigation: appropriate assessment of methodological risks and ways to eliminate them 0 - 10 b.</p>	6	The offer partially contains a description of the risks of the project and the selected methods.	2	<p>The shortcomings of the proposed approach (taking into account unplanned or negative results) are not discussed.</p> <p>The risks and limitations of the proposed data collection methods are also not discussed.</p> <p>The recommendations contain elements of the restrictions of the proposed approach</p>	5	The risk is described in context of expected results, impacts and outcomes, but no mitigation is proposed.
<p>Innovation: innovative ideas or detailed practical processing proposals 0 - 5 b.</p>	2	In addition to the basic requirements, the introduction provides additional information and examples of solutions in other parts of the world, it is clear that the applicant conducted an extensive search of the topic.	4	The offer includes a detailed analysis of the problem, including a search of secondary sources.	3	No innovative part. The questions of the future questioners can be consider as practical proposal.

<p>Standards: demonstrated understanding of selected Formal standards for conducting evaluations and their adequate application in the offer 0 - 5 b.</p>	0	<p>Due to the lack of a team introduction and their roles or experience, the offer was not found.</p>	0	<p>The purpose of evaluation is not mentioned anywhere, and it is not always clear from the text whether it is a formulation or an evaluation. Understanding of formal standards of evaluation is not proven, they were not applied in the offer.</p>	0	<p>No formal evaluation standards and process of their application is mention in the proposal. The part of Sustainability is more about the project sustainability.</p>
<p>Offer: quality of the offer (written speech and format) 0 - 10 b.</p>	4	<p>The offer is confusing, it contains an executive summary and recommendations, which is not relevant in the offers.</p>	5		6	<p>The proposal is elaborated in English. It is developed in standard format. The structure is an appropriate, conclusion is missing. The proposal would be improved if the tables are named.</p>
TOTAL	38		44.5		58	