

Extra information on the SCS MTRs (including its assessment by MFA)

1. Introduction

The strategic partnership Mid Term Review/Evaluation (MTR) reports are important documents for the Ministry. The MTR reports will contribute to learning within the different strategic partnerships, but also at country and policy level within the Ministry. The MFA aims to take the findings of the MTRs into account for the development of a new policy framework and grant instruments (whereas the end evaluation will be submitted when the new policy should already be endorsed).

As per grant decision the focus of the MTR should be two-fold:

- Programmatic focusing on: Theory of Change, context analysis and risk analysis (including SEAH, fraud and corruption), achievements to date on the output and outcome indicators that are linked to the Strengthening Civil Society and thematic Result Framework basket indicators, crosscutting themes (gender, youth, climate), challenges, lessons learned and good practices, sustainability
- Partnership collaboration focusing on: leading from the south, partnership with the Ministry and the Embassies, lessons learned and good practices

The MTR can be conducted internally or externally.

Based on the MTR findings and results, partnerships are allowed to change the 5-year outcome targets. If applicable, the request for adjustment of targets should be submitted to MFA together with the MTR supported by a rationale based on the MTR.

Purpose of this document

This document aims to provide transparency about the way MTRs are reviewed by the MFA, which will focus on completeness and methodological strength. It also provides a non-mandatory MTR format.

2. Assessment steps and criteria

Assessment steps/criteria – completeness

1. Completeness of the MTR - programmatic focus

Does the MTR contain the following both at overall partnership programme level as well as at relevant implementation level (i.e. country, regional):

- Context analysis
- Risk analysis (including SEAH, fraud & corruption)
- Assessment of TOC – including validation of assumptions
- Assessment of cross-cutting themes
 - o Gender
 - o Youth
 - o Climate
- Assessment of sustainability
- Actual values for the output and outcome indicators linked to the SCS and thematic Result Framework indicators
 - o Quantitative and qualitative information
 - o Outcomes at country/regional level as well aggregated level

- Disaggregated as per the [SCS IATI indicator guidelines](#).
- Discussion of the contribution of the partnerships towards achieved outcomes
- A reflection on progress towards achieving the 5 year targets

NB. Although the grant decision indicates “achievements to date on output and outcome level” **focus of the assessment will be on outcome level as outputs for 2023 will be reported in the annual report 2023.**

2. Completeness of the MTR – partnership focus

Does the MTR contain:

- Assessment of strategic partnership collaboration including at least:
 - Partnership with MFA and Embassies
 - Localisation/ Leading from the South /power balance

3. Completeness of the MTR – lessons learned & recommendations

Does the MTR contain:

- Lessons learned related to
 - programme
 - partnership collaboration
- Recommendations for the remainder of the programme

Assessment steps/criteria – methodological strength

The IOB evaluation quality criteria were shared by letter (December 2020) including the following recommendation:

“To ensure a high quality end evaluation, these evaluation criteria should also advise the design and reporting of the baseline study and midterm review”

To assess the methodological strength of the MTRs MFA will use a selection of the IOB quality criteria, whereas for the final external evaluations all criteria will apply. As mentioned in the introduction the MTR can be done internally or externally and no knock-out criteria will be applied for the MTRs.

4. Methodological strength - Description of programme and MTR objectives

The MTR complies with the following [IOB evaluation quality criteria](#):

Description and background of the intervention

3. Description of the context of the intervention
4. Description of the intervention
5. Validation of the assumptions underpinning the ToC

Objective and delimitation of the evaluation

6. Description of the objective of the evaluation

Evaluation questions

9. Clear set of evaluation questions

5. Methodological strength – methods

The MTR complies with the following [IOB evaluation quality criteria](#):

11. The methods are appropriate to evaluate effectiveness: attribution and / or contribution (if effectiveness is an evaluation criterion/question)

Please note that the following methods are considered less suitable for making claims of effectiveness:

- *Most Significant Change*
- *Success Case method*
- *Outcome Mapping*
- *Outcome Harvesting*
- *Method for Impact Assessment of program and projects*

These methods can be used but not as unique evaluation methods, they can be used as one evaluation method next to methodological strong methods such as contribution analysis, general elimination methodology, process tracing and/or realist evaluation.

13. The indicators or result areas are appropriate to capture the planned results along the different levels in the ToC

14. Justified choice of sample, cases and information sources (e.g. choice of countries, projects, organisations and persons)

Information at the level where programme implementation takes place is recommended, therefore it is recommended to include all countries/regions in the sample.

If your partnership is active in a very large number of countries, MFA invites you to propose an innovative approach to handle the MTR and to discuss this with your focal point during TOR development.

17. Sufficient independent information sources
18. Triangulation of results from different information sources
19. Discussion of bias
21. Discussion of the limitations of the evaluation

6. Methodological strength – Results and conclusions

The MTR complies with the following [IOB evaluation quality criteria](#):

22. Conclusions answer research questions
23. Conclusions follow logically from the research findings

7. Methodological strength – Usefulness and readability of the report

The MTR complies with the following [IOB evaluation quality criteria](#):

25. Recommendations should be useful and practical, given the evaluation objectives and its intended users
26. The report is well readable, consistent, and includes a clear summary with evaluation objectives, evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations

Adjustment of targets

Based on the MTR findings and results, partnership are allowed to change the 5-year outcome targets. In case adjusted targets are submitted, MFA will assess them using the following criteria

- Are adjustment based on MTR findings?
- Are adjustment acceptable?
- Are adjusted targets realistic in light of available budget and country context?

3. Non-mandatory proposed format for MTR

Below a **non-mandatory** format for the MTR partnership reports is proposed. Partners have the liberty to adjust or use a different format.

Proposed MTR format

1. Introduction
 - Background of the partnership programme
 - Objectives of the MTR
2. Methodology
 - Methodology and approach
 - Challenges, bias and limitations
3. Programmatic focus of the partnership programme (overall) (approx. 25 pages)
 - Relevant changes in context
 - Changes in (appreciation of) risks and mitigating measures (including SEAH, fraud and corruption)
 - Review of TOC
 - Overview table of indicators – quantitative – [see below for suggested format](#)
 - Discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets
 - Cross-cutting themes (gender, youth, climate)
 - Sustainability
4. Partnership collaboration (overall)
 - Ownership by local organizations/Leading from the South/power balance
 - Partnership with the Ministry and the Embassies
5. Information per country/region/international component (approx. 10 pages per country/region etc)
 - 5.1 Country X
 - Relevant changes in context
 - Changes in (appreciation of) risks and mitigating measures
 - Review of TOC at country level
 - Results achieved linked to the SCS and thematic MFA indicators
 - Table of indicators at country level - quantitative and qualitative - [see below for suggested format](#)
 - Discussion of the partnership's contribution towards the results
 - Discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets
 - Cross-cutting themes (gender, youth, climate)
 - Partnership collaboration
 - Sustainability
 - 5.2 Country Y

- Relevant changes in context
 - Changes in (appreciation of) risks and mitigating measures
 - Review of TOC at country level
 - Results achieved linked to the SCS and thematic MFA indicators
 - Table of indicators at country level - quantitative and qualitative - [see below for suggested format](#)
 - Discussion of the partnership's contribution towards the results
 - Discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets
 - Cross-cutting themes (gender, youth, climate)
 - Partnership collaboration
 - Sustainability
- 5.3 Country Z
- ...
- 5.4 Region A
- ...
- 5.5 Region B
- ...
- 5.6 International lobby & advocacy
- ...

In case the MTR uses a sample at least the following information should be provided per country/regional/international component:

Results achieved linked to the SCS and thematic MFA indicators

- *Table of indicators at country level - quantitative and qualitative - [see below for suggested format](#)*
- *Discussion of the partnership's contribution towards the results*
- *Discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets*

6. Lessons learned & good practices

- Programmatic
- Partnership collaboration

7. Conclusions and recommendations

Annexes

- TOR
- Information sources

[Adjustment of targets](#)

The adjustment of 5- year targets can be taken up as a chapter of the MTR or as a separate document. Please provide information about ([see below for suggested format](#)):

- Actual value
- Initial target
- Proposed new target
- Explanation for change

Adjustment of annual targets for indicators to be reported annually can be communicated as part of the annual reports

Reporting on indicators at alliance level for multi-country programs:

Indicators to be reported during baseline, MTR, end evaluation¹

			Country X		Country Y		Country Z		Region A		Alliance level (TOTAL) ²	
			Target 2025	Actual 2023	Target 2025	Actual 2023	Target 2025	Actual 2023	Target 2025	Actual 2023	Target 2025	Actual 2023
Indicator title	IATI code	Disaggregation level 1										
	IATI code	Disaggregation level 2										
	IATI code	Disaggregation level 3										
	IATI code	Etc										
Indicator title	IATI code	Disaggregation level 1										
	IATI code	Disaggregation level 2										
	IATI code	Etc										

Indicators to be reported annually do not need to be displayed in a table, however these should be taken into account in the discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets

¹ See below for frequency of reporting

² Please prevent double counting

Per country/region/international component

Indicators to be reported during baseline, MTR and End evaluation³

Per indicator:

	IATI code	Disaggregation	Baseline 2021	Actual 2023	Target 2025
Quantitative		Level of disaggregation 1			
		Level of disaggregation 2			
		Level of disaggregation 3			
		Etc			
Qualitative					

Reflection on progress towards achieving 5 year target taking into account the indicators to be reported annually and their contribution to achieving the targets.

Reflection on the partnership's contribution towards the achieved results.

Frequency of measuring indicators

For the Strengthening Civil Society Indicators (see [SCS-IATI-indicator-guidelines-PoV-with-the-exception-of-partnerships-focusing-on-WRGE.pdf](#)) the reporting frequency is as follows:

- Baseline, MTR and end evaluation: SCS1 – SCS2 – SCS3 – SCS4 – SCS9
- Annually: SCS5 – SCS6 – SCS7- SCS8

For Women's Rights and Gender Equality (WRGE) indicators (see [SCS-IATI-indicator-guidelines-WRGE-PoV-PoW-WPS-LFS](#)) the reporting frequency is as follows

- Baseline, MTR and end evaluation: all outcome indicators (i.e. WRGE 1.1-1.3, WRGE 2.1-2.3, WRGE 3.1-3.3, WRGE 4.1-4.3)
- Annually: all output indicators (i.e. WRGE 5.1.2 and WRGE 5.2.2)

For SRHR indicators, the reporting frequency is as follows (see also [SCS-IATI-indicator-guidelines-SRHR-updated.pdf](#))

- Baseline, MTR and end evaluation: all outcome indicators (1 up to 4)
- Annually: all output indicators (A up to K)

Results on thematic indicators which are linked to SCS indicators can be reported under the thematic (WRGE/ SRHR) indicators, no need to double report.

³ See below for frequency of reporting

Adjustment of targets

Per country/region/international component for indicators to be reported during baseline, MTR and end evaluation:

			Actual 2023	Initial target 2025	New target 2025	Qualitative description of new target
Indicator title	IATI code	Disaggregation level 1				
	IATI code	Disaggregation level 2				
	IATI code	Disaggregation level 3				
	IATI code	Etc				

Explanation of the change in target :