

**Terms of Reference for final evaluation of the UN PBF project:
“Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys”**

*Deadline for responding to this Tender: **Sunday 26 May 2019** (CET 23:59)*

Background

This project focuses on empowering Kyrgyzstani youth from different ethnic, gender and social backgrounds in the regions of Osh, Jalal-Abad, Chui and Batken to have a voice heard in local, national and international policy levels and to act as agents of change within their communities to foster understanding about the ‘other’ and bring new insights to gender roles, norms and issues. To reach these objectives and results, the participatory video (PV) methodology is the foundation of the project.

The project is coordinated by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a network of conflict prevention CSOs. The implementing partner is GPPAC’s Regional Secretariat for Central Asia, Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI). The other partners in the project are the Middle East Nonviolence and Democracy (MEND), the member of GPPAC from Palestine (MENA region), and Real-Time, the originator of the participatory video methodology.

The project has two main objectives:

- **Outcome 1:** Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to formulate common messages to decision makers in their local constituencies, on the national level and international level, in order to make their vision of a peaceful future heard in policy making decisions.
- **Outcome 2:** Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.

The following activities have been conducted and are still planned in the project:

- Selection of 16 schools and children (128; 8 in each school).
- Training of trainers in participatory video (PV) methodology by MEND and Real Time.
- Conflict analysis trainings for children and teachers (128 children, 32 teachers).
- Training sessions in PV for 32 teachers and 128 children.
- Baseline survey.
- The professional video equipment has been purchased and donated to schools.
- In all 16 target schools, participants prepared movie ideas and scripts.
- Local implementing staff of FTI underwent a 2-day training session on video editing. All 128 pupil participants and 32 teachers received a similar mini-training.
- The best movie ideas were chosen in each of the groups of participants in an inclusive and democratic way. Altogether, 32 short movies about the major social problems important for youth have been filmed by young participants and shown to the local communities during the feedback sessions.
- Experience exchange meetings between the children from different schools.
- The internal mid-term review of the project was conducted in October 2018. It included visits to schools and informal discussions with teachers, pupils, and staff about the project, its sustainability, and communal impact.
- Two movies have been selected for the feedback sessions on the national level with the high level government officials which are planned for the end of May 2019.
- The international advocacy visit of Kyrgyzstani youth to the Netherlands and to Belgium is planned for June 2019. Altogether, 8 movies out of 32 have been selected to be shown on the international level. 8 children (15 to 17 years of age) involved in creation of these movies will take part in the international advocacy visit.

- The participating children have undergone the training in the media literacy and social media campaigning. The movies are promoted online both nationally and internationally.
- A short publication capturing the experience with the PV methodology and the final movie are planned by the end of the project.

Purposes

The accountability purpose of the evaluation is:

- to assess how relevant the project was, towards the direct stakeholders of the project;*
- to assess the logframe matrix, whether activities contributed to the achievement of results and project goals and what the overall impact of the project was.*

The learning purpose of the evaluation is:

- to harvest the outcomes of the project, in order to use for learning from the project and follow-up*
- to assess which elements of the project were most successful towards conflict prevention, and which critical factors, or criteria can be formulated at the general level, possibly applicable to the whole Central Asian region.*

The evaluation makes recommendations on whether the project should be continued, and what are the potentially most promising directions for continuation or follow-up of the project.

Objectives

The evaluation is a final evaluation, required by the donor (UN PBF) to be executed towards the end of the project. The evaluation is commissioned and coordinated by the project coordinators GPPAC and FTI. It should take place during the last months of the project, May-June 2019, once all main activities have taken place. There will be a national closing event as a final project activity - that is most likely to take place in the end of June 2019 - that should be utilised as one of the field study visits in the final evaluation.

The evaluation and its recommendations will be a useful tool of information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project. The evaluation will inform the UN PBF to what extent the project goals have been achieved, as well as provide directions for future support in the conflict prevention and peacebuilding field in Kyrgyzstan and possibly beyond.

The evaluation's first goal is to document project achievements towards the initial project proposal and the project activities, the occurrence of the expected results and impact and their progress towards sustainability. The other goal of the evaluation is to document the lessons learned from the project, as well as recommendations that can be used by project partners and direct stakeholders for strategic directions for Kyrgyzstan, possibly for Central Asia and/or even beyond.

Subject and focus (scope)

The subject of the evaluation is the project *"Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys"*, financially supported by UN PBF.

The evaluator will review and summarise the available evidence of the quality, accountability and impact of the project activities. The evaluation will consist of both desk and field study and will take place in May - June 2019 and final reporting including commenting is done before the end of the project (31 July 2019). The Kyrgyz school system ends in May. The final event of the Project is

scheduled for the end of June 2019 or beginning of July 2019. The Project ends on 31 July 2019. The evaluation report itself has to be finalised during July 2019.

Concerning the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria the following focus and limitations are foreseen:

- **'Relevance'** will not be the focus of the evaluation. The reasoning here is that the Project partners have sufficient information from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring that the project was relevant. Therefore, there is no need to analyse this further in detail. The findings on relevance from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring will be included in the final evaluation report. Additionally, the relevance could be addressed and to some extent assessed further through interviews with relevant stakeholders for the other prioritised evaluation criteria below so it explains why the project remains relevant.
- **'Effectiveness'** The evaluation will assess whether the project objectives have been achieved, and how and to what extent they have contributed to conflict prevention and the empowerment of Kyrgyzstani girls and boys (as further specified in the two project objectives).
- **'Efficiency'** will not be the focus of the evaluation. It will only have to be addressed in a more general manner, by analysing the project's overall results in relation to the overall expenses and main budget lines. One possible angle is to include a reflection on possible spill-over effects, such as links to other projects and programmes of involved stakeholders, and follow-up at the community levels.
- **'Impact'** will be the focus of the evaluation. It will be addressed at the project level, through analysing the project's achievements and comparing these against broader peacebuilding needs and priorities in the country.
- **'Sustainability'** The evaluation will provide information to what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after the project has ended and by whom. The evaluation will provide information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project, the involved national actors, and civil society which approaches prove to be (most) successful, as well as strategic directions for the near future, such as recommendations for follow-up.

Main evaluation questions

In case project partners and UNPBSO agree with the scope of the evaluation, then we will specify the evaluation questions further. Provisionally, the main evaluation questions are formulated as following, under each of the five OECD/DAC criteria :

Relevance: (NB: limited scope)

- To what extent are the project objectives still valid for Kyrgyzstan, the partner organizations and the beneficiaries?
- Did the project remain relevant throughout its duration?
- For UN PBF the following sub-questions should be addressed:
 - o (a) What was the relevance of the proposed "theory of change," and did the assumptions identified during project design hold true?
 - o (b) Was the project relevant in terms of the broader peacebuilding strategy for the country, including, for example: national peacebuilding plans, UN strategic frameworks, and identified peacebuilding gaps?
 - o (c) Was the project more or less relevant for different communities and groups? (For example: was the project more relevant to Kyrgyz boys than to females?)
 - o (d) How did the programme ensure its relevance by including key stakeholders in project design?

Effectiveness: (NB: 4-6 evaluation questions)

- To what extent has the project achieved its expected results (both at the outputs and outcomes levels)? (reference is made to the project document)
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
- In which regions/communities the results were the most effective and which lessons learned can be drawn from that for the future?
- One specific evaluation question addressing the youth and gender objectives (to be developed)

Efficiency: (NB: limited scope)

- Have the budget funds been used efficiently? This can be analysed for the overall project expenses and at the budget 'levels' of 5,000 to 36,000 USD; so for the main budget items as project staff, involved project partners, hired experts, purchase of equipment and the main project events. Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why? More broadly, a reflection should be included to what extent the project provided "value for money?".
- Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why? How effective was the project in terms of enhancing the partners' work?
- Were there any possible spillover effects and/or synergies with other initiatives. Sub-questions can be: (a) were there spillover effects to other projects and programmes of involved stakeholders, and/or follow-up at the community levels? (b) To what extent did the project actively coordinate and leverage potential synergies with other initiatives in the region?

Impact: (NB: 5-7 evaluation questions)

- How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from the project (immediate impact)?
- What exactly has already changed in the lives of girls and boys (immediate impact)? Or: which impact did the project have on the participating children and schools? (NB: include an evaluation question for the children's parents as well? - to be decided still)
- Which positive and/or negative effects/impact in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project?
- Which positive and/or negative effects/impact did the project have on the participating communities?
- Which positive and/or negative effects/impact did the project have on the local and national policies? How were project results connected towards the larger peacebuilding priorities of Kyrgyzstan?

Sustainability: (NB: 5-7 evaluation questions)

- In general, what were the measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the project?
- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the end of the project?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- If applicable, what needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?
- Did the project enhance the support mechanisms of partners?
- Did the project build local capacity in participatory video and more broadly in youth empowerment and conflict prevention?
- To what extent can the project be considered "catalytic," either in galvanizing further financial investments from outside parties, or encouraging subsequent processes after the end of the project?

- What are the lessons learned from this project that can be taken into account for similar projects in Kyrgyzstan, and possibly for similar projects in other Central Asian countries or even outside the Central Asian region?

Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation will begin with an inception phase of reviewing documents provided by GPPAC and FTI (desk study) and a subsequent inception report, including the formulation of the exact evaluation questions and a feasible activity plan and budget to achieve the objectives of the final evaluation. This is followed by a period of research, including field study and the preparation of a draft report. The final report will consider remarks to the draft report.

A combination of primary data collection and secondary data review is expected during the evaluation. Primary data shall be collected through a variety of methods, including field observations, key stakeholder interviews (staff of GPPAC, the implementing partner FTI and the other partners in the project, project participants and the other direct beneficiaries) and focus group discussions. A baseline survey was held among pupils that should be part of the final evaluation analysis. Secondary data shall be collected from statistics and other relevant data at various levels of aggregation.

The guidance for the evaluation is specified in [to be confirmed; possibly the [ADA guidelines](#) could be used]. The OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards are to be applied and compliance needs to be comprehensible in the evaluation. The OECD/DAC document is downloadable here: [\[link\]](#).

The main documents available from the project are mostly in English and Russian languages, some are also in Kyrgyz language. The underlying reports of the main documents, such as events reports, local progress reports and survey results are all in Kyrgyz and/or Russian. Evaluation reports are to be written in English.

The indicative number of working days foreseen is 15. The following indicative division of work days for the respective steps/tasks of the final evaluation are foreseen:

- 0,5 days briefing
- 2 days document review
- 1 day inception report
- 1 day mission preparation
- 5 days research, including 2-4 field trips: Bishkek and probably 2-3 (all?) of the 4 localities of the project (one of these site meetings will be during and around the final closing events of the project expected to be in June-July 2019)
- 3 days report drafting
- 2 days report finalization
- 0,5 days debriefing

Costs for international and local travel, accommodation and per diems, as well as possible translation services have to be covered by the evaluator and should therefore be included in the evaluator's offer. There is a total maximum available budget for the sub-contracted evaluator of 15,000 USD.

Timetable

- Tendering and offers: May

Tenderers provide an offer with an outline of the proposed evaluation methodology (max. 3 pages), CV(s) of expert(s) proposed for the assignment, statement on availability of the proposed expert(s)

during the planned evaluation period, information on fee rate in USD, calculation of number of work days, as well as information on travel costs.

- Briefing in Bishkek:

Half-day meeting with FTI and GPPAC (NB: GPPAC may have to join online): May-June.

- Document review (desk study):

Project proposal, narrative reports, baseline survey, activity reports, training materials, project publications, OECD/DAC Guidelines for Evaluation, Guidance for evaluations.

- Inception report:

The evaluator will produce an inception report which will be shared with GPPAC and FTI before starting the research. The format for the report will be provided by the time of the start of the evaluation.

- Field study:

The evaluator(s) will undertake field missions in June to the most relevant project sites.

- Report drafting:

The evaluator will draft a report in English, which should contain at most 20 pages without annexes. The draft report will be provided within 10 days after the last field study (potentially, at closing event) and before 15 July 2019. Comments will be provided by GPPAC and FTI by 31 July.

- Report finalization:

The evaluator will finalize the report according to the comments received by GPPAC and FTI. The final version should not require any additional editing. The final report has to be ready by 15 August 2019.

- Debriefing in Bishkek or The Hague or an online meeting:

Half-day meeting with GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, possibly other project partners. August/September 2019.

Evaluation team

NB: Usually this type of final evaluation that is rather small in size and scope will be done by 1 evaluator, possibly seconded by a 2nd 'junior' evaluator.

Criteria for the evaluator(s):

- Preferably from Central Asia.
- Experience in development cooperation field, specifically in conflict prevention and peacebuilding field; and/or in community development related to youth and gender.
- Fluency in Russian, Kyrgyz, and English.

Reports

The evaluator will produce three reports (inception report, draft report, final report). The reports will be in English and between 15 and 20 pages in length (excluding annexes). The guidance for the report is here: [link to be provided].

The draft evaluation report and final report need to be structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions. The quality of the reports will be assessed according to the evaluation quality criteria of the OECD/DAC:

- Were the terms of reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear summary?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions?
- Are cross-cutting issues (e.g. poverty, gender, environment) indicated in the report separately?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (the project's logframe)?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings clearly stated in the report, and are they derivable from the latter?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt?
- Is it comprehensible how the evaluator has achieved their findings?
- Are the recommendations and lessons learnt realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Were the most important documents taken into consideration, and is the content of the latter reflected in the report?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

Coordination/Responsibility

The evaluator should work in close cooperation with GPPAC and FTI during the preparatory and implementation phase.

GPPAC will be in charge of the contracting and this Terms of Reference for the final evaluation (Mr Paul Kosterink; Coordinator Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation of GPPAC) and for the initial cooperation regarding the exchange of relevant project documentation and data (Ms Kateryna Gryniuk; UN PBF Project Coordinator of GPPAC). More detailed documentation and data, as well as logistical support will be provided by FTI, by the UN PBF Project Coordinator, Mr Erkin Kochkarov. Logistical support can include assistance in arranging interviews and visits. The UN PBF Project Coordinators of GPPAC and FTI are available for specific information at the content level.

Annexes

- Project proposal, including budget and planning tables.
- Logical Framework.
- Mid-term Review report of the Project.

The annexes will be provided to interested parties upon request.

Responding to this tender (see "Timetable") latest **by Sunday 26 May 2019** (CET 23:59) in an email to: Paul Kosterink <p.kosterink@gppac.net> and Kateryna Gryniuk <k.gryniuk@gppac.net>

NB: This Terms of Reference is based on ADA guidance: <https://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation/>