

# Indicative Operational and Methodological Breakdown of the Activities and Expected Results Envisaged under the Terms of Reference External Evaluation of the Public Administration Reform Strategy (2023–2030) and its Action Plan (2023–2026) of the Republic of North Macedonia

Prepared as an accompanying elaboration to the observations and clarification request submitted regarding the Terms of Reference.

Date: 26.05.2026

Prepared by: Rozalinda Stojova

As an extension of the observations shared in the accompanying message, the overview below provides an indicative breakdown of the expected results and related activities envisaged under the Terms of Reference, together with their practical, methodological, and operational implications. It aims to illustrate what each activity realistically entails in practice, including the estimated level of effort in working days and the types of expertise that would normally be required for a methodologically sound and high-quality implementation of the engagement.

The sections below provide a structured overview of the main evaluation phases and expected results envisaged under the Terms of Reference, together with their practical implications, indicative resource requirements, and estimated level of effort for quality implementation.

## 1. INCEPTION / METHODOLOGY PHASE

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Inception phase / methodological preparation
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparation of the methodology and evaluation matrix/questionnaire;</li> <li>- discussion with the MPA and ReSPA teams;</li> <li>- updated implementation timeline;</li> <li>- confirmation of documents and availability;</li> <li>- preparation of draft report structure and evaluation tools.</li> </ul>
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed review and interpretation of the ToR;</li> <li>- alignment meetings;</li> <li>- preparation of the overall methodological framework;</li> <li>- development of evaluation questions and judgement criteria;</li> <li>- preparation of interview guides, workshop concept, questionnaires, data collection tools, reporting structure, analytical framework, implementation timeline, communication workflow, and internal coordination arrangements among all involved stakeholders.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator and potentially additional thematic experts;</li> <li>- ReSPA coordination staff;</li> <li>- MPA working group members;</li> <li>- institutional focal points;</li> <li>- dedicated administrative and logistical support for scheduling meetings, communication, circulation of documents, note taking, and coordination of comments and approvals.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	4–6 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	This phase is foundational for the credibility and consistency of the entire evaluation process and directly influences the quality of all subsequent activities and outputs.

## 2. DESK RESEARCH / DOCUMENT REVIEW

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Desk research and evidence collection
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collection and analysis of data and information from primary and secondary sources;</li> <li>- review of strategic, monitoring, and institutional documentation.</li> </ul>
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed analytical review of the: PAR Strategy, Action Plan, annual implementation reports, monitoring reports, SIGMA reports, OECD findings, EC Progress Reports, legislation acts, donor analyses, indicators, governance structures, and related reform documentation;</li> <li>- cross-referencing findings across pillars and extracting evidence relevant to DAC/OECD evaluation criteria.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator and/or thematic experts with PAR, governance, HRM, service delivery, digital transformation, and evaluation expertise;</li> <li>- MPA working group;</li> <li>- institutional providers of documents and data;</li> <li>- possible support staff for document collection, organization, and data management.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	6–10 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	The scope and analytical depth of the documentation review substantially influence the quality and evidence base of the evaluation findings and recommendations.

## 3. PREPARATION AND FACILITATION OF FIRST WORKSHOP

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Initial stakeholder consultation / workshop phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	<p>Workshop serving as a starting point for the field phase, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- presentation of the approach,</li> <li>- group work,</li> <li>- discussions per evaluation questions,</li> <li>- and facilitation with up to 30 participants.</li> </ul>
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparation of workshop methodology, agenda, presentations, facilitation materials, participant coordination;</li> <li>- moderation of discussions, capturing findings and conclusions;</li> <li>- synthesis of workshop outputs;</li> <li>- and integration of findings into the evaluation process.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator/facilitator;</li> <li>- possible co-facilitator or rapporteur;</li> <li>- ReSPA and MPA coordination staff;</li> <li>- institutional representatives and stakeholders;</li> <li>- logistical and administrative support for invitations, confirmations, venue/online arrangements, note taking, reporting, and participant coordination.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	3–4 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	The workshop represents one of the key mechanisms for collecting qualitative evidence and validating institutional perspectives early in the evaluation process.

#### 4. INTERVIEWS / STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS / FOCUS GROUPS

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Field research and stakeholder engagement
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews,</li> <li>- consultations,</li> <li>- online questionnaires,</li> <li>- focus groups,</li> <li>- and one-to-one consultations for validation of selected issues and findings.</li> </ul>
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification and prioritization of stakeholders, and their most relevant institutional representatives;</li> <li>- scheduling and conducting interviews;</li> <li>- preparation of interview protocols and questionnaires;</li> <li>- moderating consultations;</li> <li>- documenting and synthesizing findings;</li> <li>- follow-up communication;</li> <li>- and triangulation of perspectives across institutions and reform areas.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator and/or thematic experts;</li> <li>- institutional representatives;</li> <li>- MPA and MDT officials;</li> <li>- potentially civil society and donor representatives;</li> <li>- administrative/logistical support for scheduling, invitations, follow-up communication, note taking, and documentation.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	5–8 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	Availability and participation of relevant institutional representatives are critical for ensuring balanced, credible, and representative findings.

#### 5. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Analytical assessment phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis of quantitative and qualitative data collected during desk and field research stages.</li> </ul>
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment of indicators;</li> <li>- triangulation of evidence;</li> <li>- analysis of implementation progress and institutional performance; DAC/OECD criteria assessment;</li> <li>- identification of systemic gaps and implementation bottlenecks;</li> <li>- comparative analysis across pillars;</li> <li>- and preparation of evidence-based conclusions and recommendations.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator and potentially additional experts with evaluation, governance, PAR, statistics, or analytical expertise;</li> <li>- possible data processing or visualization support.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	5–7 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	This phase represents the core analytical component of the assignment and requires substantial methodological rigor and evidence validation.

## 6. DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Draft reporting phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	Preparation of a Draft Evaluation Report addressing evaluation questions, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and annexes.
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structuring and drafting analytical chapters;</li> <li>- preparation of executive summary;</li> <li>- formulation of findings and recommendations;</li> <li>- integration of evidence and stakeholder perspectives;</li> <li>- preparation of annexes, tables, and references;</li> <li>- internal quality review and formatting.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator;</li> <li>- possible thematic contributors or reviewers;</li> <li>- editorial and formatting support if available;</li> <li>- ReSPA and MPA reviewers providing comments and observations.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	4–6 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	The report is expected to serve both as an accountability mechanism and as a strategic input for future PAR planning and implementation.

## 7. DRAFT ACTION PLAN 2027–2030

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Strategic planning and drafting phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	Preparation of a draft Action Plan with steps, deadlines, institutional structure, problem analysis, and identified priorities.
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review and prioritization of findings;</li> <li>- drafting of measures and activities;</li> <li>- defining timelines, responsibilities, indicators, coordination structures, implementation logic, and reform sequencing;</li> <li>- alignment with strategic objectives and institutional capacities.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator and potentially additional strategic planning/PAR experts;</li> <li>- MPA representatives;</li> <li>- institutional stakeholders contributing to prioritization and validation discussions.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	5–8 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	Preparation of a meaningful and operationally realistic Action Plan normally represents a substantial standalone strategic exercise.

## 8. SECOND WORKSHOP / VALIDATION EVENT

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Validation and consultation phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	Two-day workshop focused on validation of findings, recommendations, lessons learned, and discussion of the draft Action Plan.
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparation of workshop agenda and materials;</li> <li>- presentation of findings;</li> <li>- facilitation of discussions;</li> <li>- moderation of validation sessions;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation of comments and recommendations;</li> <li>- synthesis of conclusions;</li> <li>- incorporation of agreed revisions into final outputs.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator/facilitator;</li> <li>- possible rapporteur or co-facilitator;</li> <li>- ReSPA and MPA coordination staff;</li> <li>- institutional stakeholders and participants;</li> <li>- administrative and logistical support for invitations, organization, note taking, reporting, and coordination.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	4–5 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	The validation phase is essential for ensuring institutional ownership, practical usability, and legitimacy of the evaluation findings and proposed Action Plan.

## 9. FINALIZATION AND REVISION OF OUTPUTS

a) Evaluation Phase / Assignment Component	Final reporting and closure phase
b) Scope as Envisaged in the ToR	Finalization of reports and submission of final outputs after comments and validation.
c) Practical and Methodological Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review and integration of comments;</li> <li>- revisions of findings and recommendations;</li> <li>- consistency checks;</li> <li>- final proofreading, formatting, and quality assurance;</li> <li>- preparation of final submission package and supporting documentation.</li> </ul>
d) Required Human and Institutional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead evaluator;</li> <li>- reviewers and commenting institutions;</li> <li>- possible editorial/formatting support;</li> <li>- ReSPA and MPA coordination staff.</li> </ul>
e) Indicative Level of Effort (Working Days)	2–3 working days
f) Additional Considerations / Observations	This phase ensures consistency, accuracy, institutional alignment, and usability of the final outputs before formal approval and submission.

**It should also be noted that an engagement of this scope and operational intensity would realistically require dedicated administrative and logistical support for coordination, scheduling, communication with institutions and participants, preparation and circulation of materials, note taking, workshop organization, and related follow-up activities, while the Terms of Reference currently do not explicitly clarify whether such support is expected to be provided by ReSPA, the beneficiary institutions, or the expert(s) themselves.**

The indicative estimates below should not be interpreted as a strict sequencing of activities, as several phases would realistically need to overlap and interact dynamically throughout the implementation period. In practice, ensuring methodological rigor, stakeholder coordination, quality assurance, and timely delivery would likely require parallel engagement of complementary expertise profiles and operational support capacities.

No.	Evaluation Component	Indicative Working Days
1	Inception / Methodology Phase	4 – 6
2	Desk Research / Document Review	6 – 10
3	First Workshop Preparation and Facilitation	3 – 4
4	Interviews / Stakeholder Consultations	5 – 8
5	Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis	5 – 7
6	Draft Evaluation Report	4 – 6
7	Draft Action Plan 2027–2030	5 – 8
8	Second Workshop / Validation Event	4 – 5
9	Finalization and Revision of Outputs	2 – 3
	<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED LEVEL OF EFFORT (*) (**)</b>	<b>38 – 57 experts' working days</b>

(\*) The overview also illustrates that several activities would realistically need to run partially in parallel and/or involve complementary expertise profiles in order to ensure timely and methodologically robust implementation.

(\*\*) The indicative estimates presented above also do not fully account for potential delays related to institutional coordination, document availability, scheduling of consultations, incorporation of comments from multiple stakeholders, or unforeseen adjustments during implementation, which are common in complex multi-stakeholder evaluation processes.

The above overview is indicative in nature and intended solely to illustrate the approximate level of effort and operational complexity associated with a methodologically sound and high-quality implementation of the engagement as currently envisaged under the Terms of Reference.

Particular operational complexity arises from the fact that the engagement combines, within a single assignment, both an independent DAC/OECD-based evaluation process and the preparation of a new strategic operational framework in the form of a Draft Action Plan 2027–2030.