



FCA Evaluation Term of Reference

CRITICAL FRIEND EVALUATOR

OF

THE NETWORK FOR RELIGIOUS AND TRADITIONAL PEACEMAKERS'

SOUTHEAST ASIA: ADVANCING INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION OR BELIEF

1. Background of the evaluation

The Network for Religious and Traditional Peacemakers (Network) is implementing the European Union-funded consortium project "Southeast Asia: Advancing Inter-Religious Dialogue and Freedom of Religion or Belief (FoRB)" (SEA-AIR). The 30-month project began in January 2019 and is being implemented in consortium with Finn Church Aid (FCA), Sathirakoses Nagapradipa Foundation (SNF), World Faiths Development Dialogue (WFDD), Islamic Relief Worldwide (IRW), and World Conference of Religions for Peace (RfP).

The project aims to contribute to an improved consensus and a conducive environment for the protection of FoRB and for peaceful coexistence of groups and individuals with different religious affiliation in Southeast Asia. Specifically, the project aims to enhance local capacities to prevent and combat discrimination on grounds of religion or belief through interfaith understanding and mainstreaming at country and regional level in Myanmar, Bangladesh and other South and Southeast Asian countries. The proposed action—composed of strategic interlinked and inclusive activities in support of FoRB and against discrimination based on the ground of religion—builds on on-going and/or anticipated actions by the Peacemakers Network and other actors within Myanmar, Bangladesh and the broader Southeast and South Asia.

The project's key target groups include religious clergy and traditional actors, women, youth and minority change makers, NGOs and civil society groups, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Secretariat, relevant South and Southeast Asian States, and UN missions/agencies. Final beneficiaries will include women, youth, minority groups and other individuals marginalized or discriminated on the basis of religion, local communities impacted by escalating challenges to FoRB, by related human rights violations and escalating violence in target countries.

2. Rational, purpose and priority objectives of the evaluation

This participatory, impartial and independent evaluation is to be conducted throughout the project by the "critical friend" approach, i.e. an independent external evaluator who will participate in a number of the project meetings and key activities to provide feedback and lessons learned to the Network. He/she will carry out an evaluation looking at the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, coordination, coherence & value added; two reports – midterm and final – will be prepared including recommendations for follow up activities. These reports will be used by all consortium partner organizations as well as the European Union (EU).

The need for and benefit of a critical friend evaluator was reflected upon and outlined during the development of the project proposal. It is viewed as a valuable tool for on-going SEA-AIR project management, to enhance future project implementations, and is expected to inform the Network, EU, and the partners of progress made and lessons learned to date, and towards necessary adjustments required. The evaluation will look at the Network and project partner organizations, and will pay attention to each project activity in lieu of its objectives and context. The critical friend will complement the project's

monitoring & evaluation methodology, which focuses on results-based performance measures, by bringing a holistic and adaptive approach to examining project activities and evaluating results.

The approach of the evaluation should be to benefit the Network and partner organizations in the on-going and future design and implementation of its work. Consequently, the assessment will determine if current activities carried out by the project staff are appropriate in meeting the needs of the consortium organizations and project stakeholders, examine and assess if project outputs and initiatives are achieved at the mid-point and end of the project, and analyze the activities to determine if they are inclusive, participatory, engaging and consultative. Additionally, the assessment will determine to what degree funds were used efficiently in relation to the Description of Action, the coordination of roles and responsibilities in managing activities by project staff, and if the expected and unexpected outcomes were achieved and effective in terms both of needs, relevance, effectiveness and appropriateness. The assessment will determine what, if any, contribution the consortium has made towards contributing to improved mainstream acceptance of FoRB and for peaceful coexistence of groups and individuals with different religious affiliation in South and Southeast Asia, and to what degree those contributions are sustainable.

The evaluation process shall both review the implementation of the consortium in collaboration with project staff as well as engage directly with stakeholders, including the Network partners and the EU, as well as those who have worked with, and/or participated in consortium activities.

The specific objectives of the evaluation will be the following:

Assess the implementation of project activities and initiatives in relation to the inputs, outputs and core deliverables as outlined in the project Description of Action, Timeframe of Action, and Logframe and in light of current context on an on-going basis.

1. Assess the coordination and management of project staff roles and responsibilities;
2. Assess the efficient use of funds by the project staff in relation to the Description of Action;
3. Assess the expected and unexpected outcomes achieved in terms of needs, relevance and appropriateness, and the contribution the consortium has made towards contributing to improved mainstream acceptance of FoRB belief and for peaceful coexistence of groups and individuals with different religious affiliation in South and Southeast Asia.
4. Provide concrete proposals based on evaluation, including recommendations from project partners and perspectives of those outside project staff, to enhance the relevance, outcome and impact of the project's strategy; and
5. Make justified and well-founded recommendations on the possible continuation of the project and the necessary refinements to ensure maximum impact.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The scope of this evaluation covers the entire project timeline, from January 2019 until the end of the project in June 2021. The evaluation process, including a breakdown of phases and corresponding project activities, is detailed in Section 6.

4. Evaluation questions

In collaboration with project staff, the evaluator will formulate more detailed evaluation questions that reflect project aims and methodology as well as to give recommendations for the Network's future work. As part of the evaluation process, the evaluator shall specify, and amend if necessary, the evaluation questions to fit the overall goal of the evaluation. The evaluation questions will be based on project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, and coordination, coherence & value added.

5. Methodology required & available data

The evaluator shall base observations and recommendations on relevant project documentation (project Description of Action, Timeframe of Action, and Logframe); all meetings and interviews; comparison with projects of a similar nature, where relevant and appropriate; and best practice as it applies to the implementation of projects of this nature. Importantly the evaluator should carry out interviews and consultations with stakeholders to guide assessments, and to focus mostly on collecting qualitative data.

The evaluator shall produce two reports – a mid- and final evaluation – that should cover the following areas:

Executive summary: The task, brief description of the methodology, main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

Introduction: Evaluation purpose, objective, scope and main questions, the methodology used, data collection and analysis including indicators.

Key findings: Overall progress of the implementation of the project; impact, effectiveness, sustainability of results achieved, efficiency, relevance and compatibility; utilization of Network funds in the implementation of planned and unplanned activities; impact (anticipated and spin-off) of the work of the Network during the period under review.

Conclusions: Overall performance, achieved results compared with given evaluation criteria, policy issues, etc.

Recommendations: Key areas of modifications; recommendations for improving policy/implementation and management; recommendations to maximize the impact of the project throughout the remainder of the project cycle; recommendations with regard to the possible extension and future continuation of the Network.

Lessons learned: General conclusions that are likely to have potential for wider application and use.

The Network shall facilitate the evaluation in a participatory manner, including the validation and dissemination of the final conclusions and recommendations.

Annexes: Terms of Reference, stakeholders interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

Quality standards: The evaluation report shall respect the EU evaluation report quality standards, obtainable in the web-site of the EU AidCO Evaluation Unit, and observe the OECD/DAC development evaluation quality criteria, which can be reached in the web-page of the organization (<http://www.oecd.org>). Special attention should be paid to guidance relating to support in fragile, at-risk and crisis affected contexts

6. Evaluation process

The evaluation is to be carried out between June 2020 and June 2021. The development of a detailed proposal and subsequent actions will be carried out under the approval and supervision of the SEA-AIR Project Manager, and in collaboration with project staff. For all activities outlined, the evaluator is not expected to play a role beyond that of evaluator.

Proposed Evaluation Phases:

Phase I (June 2020):

- Appoint one evaluator and provide evaluator with the project Description and Timeframe of Action, Narrative and Financial Reports, and Logframe;

- The appointed evaluator will develop and submit a more detailed proposal based on project documents and initial interviews with the consortium, describing the course of action for carrying out the evaluation.
- Convene a “kick-off” meeting with evaluator via Skype to clarify any queries and discuss the phases the evaluator will take part in;
- Review, assess and analyze relevant project documentation, including project interim report;

Phase II (June/July 2020):

- Conduct interviews (telephone/Skype consultations or via email correspondence with project staff) with (1) relevant representatives of the consortium partners, (2) other stakeholders such as the Interfaith Fellows; and (3) with at least 3 participants in project initiatives such as the Expert Seminar, including religious and traditional actors;

Phase III (August/September 2020):

- Prepare a maximum five (5) page first draft mid-evaluation report covering the areas outlined in section 2 as well as the more detailed evaluation questions developed in collaboration with project staff to be submitted by August 23, 2020.
- Send by email the preliminary report to Project Manager, who will circulate to representatives of the Network and receive comments by September 06, 2020.
- Finalize the report by September 20, 2020 and provide verbal briefings (via telephone/Skype) to the Network to discuss key findings and recommendations within 30 days of submitting the finalized mid-term reports.

Phase IV (May 2020 – June 2021):

- Participate in existing planned activities during the evaluation period (see List of Activities below), which will provide for an opportunity of interacting with project beneficiaries;
- Prepare a maximum ten (10) page first draft final evaluation report covering the areas outlined above to be submitted by May 29, 2021.
- Send by email the preliminary report to Project Manager, who will circulate to representatives of the Network and receive comments by June 12, 2021.
- Finalize the report and provide verbal briefings to the Network and EU representatives to discuss key findings and recommendations by June 25, 2021.

List of Project Activities prior to mid-term report (list subject to change during Phase I):

- The implementation of the project’s communications strategy, specifically the implementation of a new social media platform (March – June 2020).
- Identifying and selecting the consultant to lead the development of learning and advocacy materials (June – July 2020).
- Implementation of small grant-funded Fellowship projects (March – June 2020).
- Small grant support to 20 Interfaith Councils/CBOs (June 2020).

List of Project Activities prior to final report (list subject to change during Phases I and III):

- Development of regional and country-specific policy briefs and corresponding regional forum (April/ June 2021).

Maximum number of working days not expected to exceed 40 days.

6.1 Evaluation Management

The Network will assist the evaluator in organizing meetings with relevant stakeholders and will provide the evaluator with the necessary project documentation. The Network will facilitate the evaluation in a participatory manner and recommends interviews with the consortium members, key partners and religious and traditional peacemakers. The evaluator is expected to arrange her/his own travel arrangements.

Final output is expected in report format, which must adhere to the EU's evaluation instructions. The reports should be submitted in English language. Additional outputs include a PowerPoint presentation on key findings and a final report to be circulated in stakeholder meetings.

7. Timetable

Deliverable	Duration
Detailed Proposal	June 2020
Project Stakeholder Meetings	June/July 2020
Draft Midterm Report	23 August 2020
Finalize Midterm Report and Verbal Briefings	06 September/20 September 2020
Project Stakeholder Meeting and Activities	April/May 2021
Draft Final Report	29 May 2021
Finalize Final Report and Verbal Briefings	25 June 2021
TOTAL DURATION	7-8 months

Maximum number of working days not expected to exceed 40 days.

8. Deliverables & Payments

Deliverables	Payment %
Upon approval of detailed proposal	20%
Upon approval of draft midterm report	40%
Upon approval of finalized final report	40%

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION

9. Skills and qualifications required

An evaluator will be appointed by Network. The evaluator should be independent and neutral entity to the process and to Network partners. The following expertise shall be required by the evaluator for the successful conduct of the evaluation:

- Experience (4 or more years) with and knowledge of project conceptualization, planning, implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation;
- Significant expertise (minimum 5 years) in areas of mediation and mediation support, peacemaking, peace and security, conflict, religion, comparative politics, and/or international relations;
- Experience in the evaluation of at least 1 consortium project, preferably as sole evaluator or team leader;
- Experience working on at least one peacebuilding project that included religious and traditional actors as project stakeholders;
- At least one previous instance undertaking the role of Critical Friend Evaluator and demonstrated ability to produce professional reports;
- Bachelor's degree required;
- Working knowledge of English.

These are minimum requirements and evidence must be included in the proposal documentation, for example in CV. If no evidence of fulfilling the minimum requirements is found in the documentation, the bidder will be disqualified.

10. Budget

Budget proposals must include all costs, including any transportation, insurance & taxes, including VAT. The maximum budget amount, including VAT, should be no greater than €16,000.

11. Bids assessment

All applications (comprised of technical proposal including budget and CV) will be scored on a 0 to 100, with a minimum score of 40 needed for consideration:

Qualitative award criteria	
Methodology for structuring, data collection & analysis as outlined in the Technical Proposal	15 points
Organization of tasks and timetable as outlined in the Technical Proposal	15 points
Rationale of the Evaluator's value added to SEA-AIR project	15 points
Financial proposal as outlined in the Technical Proposal	30 points
Candidates who demonstrate the following relevant experience BEYOND the minimum award criteria (detailed further in section 9 above) will be scored as follows (Maximum 5 points per criteria):	
At least four years' experience in the project management lifecycle (within a peacebuilding context preferred)	1 point per extra year of experience beyond 4 years
At least five years' experience in areas of mediation and mediation support, peacemaking, peace and security, conflict, religion, comparative politics, and international relations	1 point per extra year of experience beyond 5 years
One previous experience in Critical Friend Evaluator role	1 point per experience beyond 1 previous instance
Experience in peacebuilding that included religious and traditional actors as stakeholders	1 point for every peacebuilding project beyond 1
Educational experience beyond Bachelor's degree	3 points for Master's degree in relevant field, 2 points for PhD

12. Terms of contract

- The Consultant is responsible for payment of all social costs, other employment related costs and for all other liabilities of a statutory nature.
- The consultant will have to abide by FCA CoC, Child Safeguarding policy and any other relevant policies.
- The consultant will provide a debriefing session (in Bangkok or via Skype) to present the main findings and recommendations after both the midterm and final reports.
- Copyright for the report will remain with FCA.

13. Submission process

Interested parties should email Project Manager Philip Gassert (Philip.gassert@kua.fi) to request the Technical and Financial Proposal form. **Application deadline is 06 June.** The application package will include the following materials:

- 1-3 page CV
- 1 page cover letter
- 1 work sample of previous evaluation
- 3 professional references
- Technical and financial proposal (maximum 8 pages)

Late, incomplete or partial bids will be rejected.

FCA reserves the right to accept or reject any bid, and to annul the bidding process and reject all bids at any time prior to contract award, without thereby incurring any liability to Bidders.

At the time the contract is awarded, FCA reserves the right to increase or decrease the quantity of Goods, Works or Services originally specified in the tender notice, provided this does not exceed the percentage(s) specified in the tender notice, and without any change in the unit prices. If no percentage was determined in the tender notice, the percentage to be taken into consideration by default is 10%.

Tenderer's bid should remain valid for a delay of at least 90 and up to 120 days (according to the estimated amount of the contract). Should a tenderer retract his bid before the delay is up, he shall run the risk of not being considered in a future tender.

FCA has zero tolerance concerning aid diversion and illegal actions and may screen consultants against international lists to ensure due diligence and compliance with Anti-money laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism requirements.

Annexes

- Assessment grid (upon request)