CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION

MID TERM AND END TERM EVALUATION OF GBWN

Terms of Reference for the (Mid Term and End Term) Evaluation of the Gender Budget Watchdog Network of Western Balkans and Moldova

Date of publication: November 6th, 2020

Deadline for applications: November 13th, 2020

# General information

Since August 2019 the project - Gender budget watchdog network is being implemented by a consortium of CSOs led by Center for Research and policy Making – CRPM Skopje.

## Introduction

The project directly addresses two main problems:

1) insufficient capacity for gender responsive budgeting among CSOs which affects their ability and actions to demand accountability from national and local governments on the gender equality of policy and budgets;

2) lack of network of CSOs and gender advocates who work on the gender perspective in policy and budgets, which has an effect on their empowerment and effectiveness to impact policy and budget change beyond the gender equality and women empowerment agenda (GEWE).

The project is implemented in seven countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro and Serbia, all of which have committed to gender equality objectives by ratifying CEDAW and adopting gender specific national legal frameworks, as well as building national gender machinery to deliver gender equality results. Most of them (except for Montenegro and Moldova) have introduced legal and policy provisions for gender responsive budgeting. The project uses Gender Responsive Budgeting - GRB as a critical tool to ensure that gender equality commitments are translated into real actions, that will eventually render positive results.

1 “Intervention” encompasses all development and humanitarian efforts that may be evaluated under the framework agreement. This includes projects and programmes, policies, strategies, thematic areas, technical assistance, policy advice, approaches and instruments used.
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## Evaluation object: Intervention to be evaluated

The evaluation object is the project implementation of the Gender Budget Watchdog Network.

The project is promoting the following theory of change: through capacity building for using GRB tools in CSO work; networking and mobilization of citizens in advocacy; towards the enhancement of gender equality on the national and local level. The specific objectives of the project are: (i) to strengthen the capacity of CSOs to use GRB tools to evaluate the correspondence of policies and budgets with the needs of men and women; (ii) to develop a network for effective policy advocacy, knowledge and information sharing and strengthened government accountability; (iii) to engage citizens and contribute to policy change leading to gendered reform of public finances.

The main target group of the project is civil society organizations. Equipping CSOs with the necessary knowledge and skillset for GRB can make real changes, transform communities, improve governance and enhance citizens’ trust in governments. In this respect, the project has targeted focus and will work specifically with: 1. Women’s organizations - organizations that work on women’s rights realization and advocacy as well as those that work with women as beneficiaries, although they focus on other vulnerable groups as well (i.e. rural, people with disabilities, poor, and etc.); 2. Think tanks - especially those working on EU accession reforms in education, aging, youth, public administration and etc.; 3. CSOs working on public finance (budget or procurement issues), dealing with public finance, budget and public procurement monitoring.

The project is implemented by Centre for Research and Policy Making – CRPM together with 6 local partners, one in each of the target countries. **AL:** The *Gender Alliance for Development Centre* (GADC) is a voice for Albanian women and a force for change. Our organization works to empower women and to create an equal and just future for low-income girls and women to get out of poverty and exclusion all over Albania. **BiH:** The *Center for Civil Society Promotion* is dedicated to its mission to empower civil society and support their cooperation, networking and development of effective relations with government through civic engagement. **KS**: *Kosovo Women’s Network’s (KWN)* mission is to support, protect and promote the rights and the interests of women and girls through the exchange of experience and information, partnership and networking, research, advocacy, and service. **MNE:** *Women Action* creates space for: Political promotion of women on all decision-making positions; Women’s economic empowerment; Creating equal and well-balanced Gender relations; Strengthening of multi discriminated women. **MD:** The mission of *Keystone Moldova* is to promote and develop opportunities for ensuring the quality of life of individuals living in difficult social situations, including persons with disabilities, children with special education needs, abused children and women, families living in poverty, discriminated groups of population. **SER:** *Gender Knowledge Hub* - GKH is think tank and do thank established with the aim to increase production, dissemination and use of knowledge on gender, gender equality and gender mainstreaming and to contribute to development and implementation of practical solutions that will contribute to gender equality in Serbia.

Project budget:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Budget (total) | Requested Grant ADC | Contribution in Cash by SIDA |
| 100% | 82.51% | 17.49% |
| 605,759.00 EUR | 499,808.00 EUR | 105,951,00. EUR |

Considering the Covid 19 recommendations for physical distancing the evaluator will be advised to conduct evaluation activities online or with limited face-to-face meetings following safety protocols at least for the first mid-term evaluation, and to adapt the approach if the Covid 19 circumstances disappear for the end term evaluation.

For further information, the intervention proposal/document is attached as Annex B.

## Evaluation rationale

The project design encompasses two evaluations: (i) mid term evaluation to be implemented in November -December 2020 and end term evaluation to be implemented May-June 2022.

# The assignment

## Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to help CRPM and the local partners to assess progress of on-going intervention. As well for GBWN **to learn from what works well and less well**. The evaluation will be used to inform decisions on how project implementation may be adjusted and improved in the following project implementation period.

The main purpose of the final evaluation is to determine the appropriateness of the project design and the proposed Theory of Change, to assess the sustainability of the processes initiated through the intervention and to provide evidences in order **to gain more knowledge and learn for future interventions in this area, as well as serve as an input for CRPM, the local partners, and the donor organizations ADA and SIDA to a decision on whether GBWN shall receive continued funding or not.**

The primary intended users of the evaluation are:

* + - the project management team CRPM and the local project partners

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate in the tender how this will be ensured during the evaluation process. Other stakeholders that should be kept informed about the evaluation include

* + - Austrian Development Agency
		- Swedish International Development Agency

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

## Evaluation scope

The evaluation scope is limited to: (i) the mid-term evaluation covers the activities implemented from August 2019- September 2019; (ii) the final Evaluation covers activities implemented from August 2019-May 2022.

If needed, the scope of the evaluation may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

## Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

The objective/objectives of this evaluation is/are to

* + - The mid-term evaluation has an objective to evaluate the **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency**of GBWN and formulate recommendations on how its management team can improve and adjust implementation.
		- The end-term evaluation has an objective to evaluate the **relevance**, **coherence**, **effectiveness**, **efficiency, impact and sustainability**of GBWN and formulate recommendations as an input to upcoming discussions concerning the preparation of a new phase of the intervention, as well as provide an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.

The evaluation questions are:

### Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?

* + - To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries’, country, and parter/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?
		- To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?

### Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?

* + - How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organisation where it is being implemented?

### Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

* + - To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?
		- Have the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?

### Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

* + - To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?

### Impact: What difference does the intervention make?

* + - To what extent has the project generated, or is expected to generate, significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, high-level effects?

### Sustainability: Will the benefits last?

* + - To what extent will the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue?

Furthermore, based on the description of cross-cutting challenges the evaluator should consider the following evaluation questions

:

* + - Has the intervention contributed to gender equality?
		- Has the intervention been designed and implemented in a conflict sensitive manner?
		- Has the intervention been designed and implemented in accordance with the perspective on environment and climate change, and if so how and with what results, i.e. have risks for the environment been considered and managed?
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## Evaluation approach and methods

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception report.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods.

A *gender responsive* approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used.

The approach to the evaluation should be *utilization-focused*, which means the evaluator should facilitate the *entire evaluation process* with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluators should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

##  Organization of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by CRPM Skopje. The intended user(s) is/are CRPM Skopje, the 6 partner organizations and the donors of the project.

## Evaluation quality

All evaluations of CRPM Skopje shall conform to OECD/DAC’s Quality Standards for Development Evaluation3. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation4 and the OECD/DAC Better Criteria for Better Evaluation5. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation13. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

3 OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

4 Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.*

5 OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

6 OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

7 OECD (1999) *Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies*.

8 Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*.

9 OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

10 OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*.

11 OECD (2012) *Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results*.

12 Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*.
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## Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out from November 16th until December 31st, 2020. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews need to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase. The travel and meetings are organized by the evaluators by themselves.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Participants** | **Deadlines** |
| 1. Start-up meeting/s Skopje Zoom/Skype/MS Teams | CRPM Skopje Project management team | 16th November, 2020 |
| 2.Inception report  | Evaluators | 1st December, 2020 |
| 3.Desk review | Evaluators | 16 November – 1 December, 2020 |
| 4.Data gathering | Evaluators | 1 December – 12 December, 2020 |
| 5.Draft mid-term evaluation report  | Evaluators, CRPM Project management team | 16th December 2020 |
| 6.Comments to mid term evaluation report | CRPM Skopje | 20th December, 2020 |
| 7.Final mid term evaluation report | Evaluators | 31st December 2020 |
| 8. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting) | EvaluatorsCRPM Skopje6 local project partners | 15th January 2021 |
| 9.Start up meeting end term evaluation  | CRPM Skopje Project management team | 15 May 2022 |
| 10.Inception report | Evaluators | 1st June, 2022 |
| 11.Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance | Evaluators | 15 May -16 June 2022 |
| 12.Draft end-term evaluation report  | Evaluators, CRPM Project management team | 16th June 2022 |
| 13.Comments to end term evaluation report | CRPM Skopje | 21st June 2022 |
| 14.Final end term evaluation report | Evaluators | 1st July, 2022 |
| 15. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting) | EvaluatorsCRPM Skopje6 local project partners | 15th July 2022 |

13 OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*.

**The inception report** will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by CRPM before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology (including how a utilization-focused and gender responsive approach will be ensured), a stakeholder mapping, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

**The final report** shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure). The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages. The evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect a gender analysis/an analysis of identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, directed to relevant stakeholders and categorized as a short-term, medium-term and long-term. The report should be no more than 35 pages excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report). The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation14.

## Evaluation team qualification

The evaluation team leader shall have documented skills and experience from conducting evaluations and leading evaluation teams, including communication and facilitation skills. The team leader should have English language skills.

The evaluation team shall include the following competencies:

* Knowledge of legislation, programme and public policies on gender, budgeting and women’s empowerment, and women’s rights in general in Westerns Balkans and Moldova
* Ability to pragmatically apply in-depth knowledge and experience of issues and practices in the fields of gender equality,
* Strong skills and experience in presenting evidence and ideas for policy and programme.
* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
* Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
* Strong communications skills (written and oral)
* Demonstrated experience in gender and development related research
* Leadership and skills to work with autonomy and initiative

**Ethical Code of Conduct**

* Independence: Consultant shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and that the study findings and recommendations are independently presented.
* Cultural Sensitivity/Valuing diversity: Demonstrating an appreciation of the multicultural nature of the organization and the diversity of its staff. Demonstrating an international outlook, appreciating differences in values and learning from cultural diversity.
* Impartiality: Consultant shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the key players in the field.
* Conflict of Interest: Consultant are required to disclose in writing any experience, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise.
* Honesty and Integrity: Consultant shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the study costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the study.
* Competence: Consultant shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in study, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.
* Accountability: Consultant are accountable for the completion of the agreed deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost-effective manner.

**Required Skills and Experience**

***Education:***

Post-Graduate degree (Masters) in development studies, gender studies, economics, social science, peace and security studies, rural development or other related fields

***Experience:***

A strong record (minimum 5 years) in designing and leading evaluations including gender-responsive evaluations;

Experience in evaluating projects and programs implemented by civil society

Experience with remote/virtual methods and data collection and stakeholder’s engagement

Sound understanding of social and cultural reality of Western Balkans and Moldova, in particular traditional norms affecting gender equality;

Sound understanding of the functioning of government structures and public finance systems, as well as civil society in Western Balkans and Moldova;

Knowledge of the national gender machinery, women’s organizations, policies and legislation on GEWE;

Excellent analytical skills and prior experience of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis;

Experience with remote research and in emergency contexts is a strong asset

A CV for each team member shall be included in the call-off response. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team if appropriate.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

14 Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

## **Financial and human resources**

The foreseen duration of the assignment is the following:

20 consulting days for mid-term evaluation

30 consulting days for end-term evaluation

The tenderers must provide financial proposal separate to the approach and team offer they submit.

The contact person at CRPM is:

CRPM’s Finance Manager Kristijan Aleksovski aleksoski@crpm.org.mk. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant documentation will be provided by: Marija Risteska, GBWN Regional director risteska@crpm.org.mk

Contact details to intended users (your organisation, cooperation partners, other donors etc.) will be provided by Zlatko Simonovski Program manager simonovski@crpm.org.mk

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics: book interviews, prepare visits if applicable including adapting to Covid 19 circumstances.

# Annexes

## Annex A: List of documents to be provided to selected tenderer.

## Annex B Project document and Project budget