Terms of
Reference for End-of-Project Evaluation

'Empower – Engage – Build Ownership'
Project *no. 2017/393-981,*

Implemented by:

Table of Contents

i. Acknowledgments

This document represents the Terms of Reference (ToR) for End-of-Project Evaluation compiled by Balkan Green Foundation (BGF) and Institute for Development Policy (INDEP).

ii. Affirmation

"Except as acknowledged by the references in this paper to other authors and publications, the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) described herein consists of our own work, to evaluate our project to find out the impact on CSOs and communities due to project implementation."
Primary quantitative and qualitative data collected throughout the evaluation process remains the property of the CSOs described in this report and must be used only with BGF and INDEP consent.

iii. Glossary

CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
BGF	Balkan Green Foundation
INDEP	Institute for Development Policy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
ToR	Terms of Reference

iv. Introduction

Background Information on BGF

BGF is a regional organization that promotes inclusive and equitable progress within the Western Balkans on the sustainable development domain. BGF places a strong focus on advocating for solutions that promote development policies, which are in line with the world's latest developments, global challenges and national agendas for EU integration. Local and regional initiatives are undertaken on an ongoing basis to further convey BGF's commitment towards regional sustainability, ensuring the strengthening and advancement of vital policies affecting key sectors, such as energy, environment, and economy.

BGF has been successfully positioned as a key strategic partner for regional and global institutions, organizations, and communities in promoting sustainable development, transforming innovative concepts into powerful solutions, and strengthening regional and global partnerships.

Background Information on INDEP

The Institute for Development Policy (INDEP) is a think tank and an advocacy centre that provides independent research-based policy solutions. Established in 2011 as an association of policy analysts, researchers and civil society activists, INDEP looks at regional policies, aiming to guide countries of South-East Europe on their path to Euro-Atlantic integration.

In Kosovo, where it is based, the institute has a special focus on strengthening democratic governance and plays the role of public policy watchdog. INDEP's mission is to strengthen and guide sustainable socio-political and economic development based on the principles of democracy and democratic values. Its vision is the establishment of a democratic society, able and willing to run a functional state, integrated in the region and international community. The work of INDEP is guided by the fundamental principles of transparency and accountability. The institute promotes active citizenship and participation in governance, as well as checks and balances between democratically elected institutions.

1. Evaluation Summary

Programme/Project	"Empower – Engage – Build Ownership"
Programme Phase	N/A
Evaluation Type	End of Project Evaluation
Evaluation Purpose	To measure the extent that objectives have impacted the beneficiaries and to identify any changes over time while exploring, as well, the unintended consequences of the intervention and broader impact.
Primary Methodologies	Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) are required for this evaluation. This will enable a better understanding of perceptions of changes by project end. Primary data refers to the quantitative and qualitative tools that will be used to measure indicators at the end of the project cycle. The secondary data refers to desk review of project relevant documentation and legislation.
Evaluation Start and End Dates	mid December 2020 – January 2021
Anticipated Evaluation Report Release Date	mid-February 2021

2. Description of Programme or Project Being Evaluated

The project 'Empower – Engage – Build Ownership' is a project implemented by BGF in partnership with INDEP and financed by the EU Office in Kosovo. The project objective is to enable Kosovo's civil society sector to fulfill its role in the democratic environment by acting as independent interlocutors, monitoring public institutions, increasing accountability and transparency in policy development and decision making processes regarding concerns of communities and civil society groups in the area of environment preservation, green energy and sustainable economic growth.

Specific objectives of the project are to:

- Improve the skills and information-sharing capability of CSOs on policy monitoring, advocacy and campaigning on the targeted thematic priorities;

- Increase the incentive to improve participation of CSOs in policy making and policy implementation, advocacy and grassroots activities through funding organizations in the whole Kosovo;
- Increase citizens' awareness on sustainable development in Kosovo through supporting activities that especially promote environment preservation, green energy and sustainable economic growth.

The project targets: Civil society activists (target group and beneficiary), public authorities (target group and beneficiary), and General population (beneficiary).

The project's main components are:

(i) Evidence Based Report for all 7 centers of administrative districts in Kosovo, identifying the utmost needs in 3 thematic priorities of this action,
(ii) Capacity Building Trainings sharing of know-how to other CSO activists,
(iii) Launching Events and Conferences, gathering relevant stakeholders of the sector to identify priorities and promote achievements from the activities,
(iv) Sub-Granting Program: providing financial support to empower CSOs in finding and presenting solutions to project priorities and address the needs of the local communities they work in.

Project Intervention Logic

Objectives/Results	Indicators to be measured
O1: Oc 1 – CSO sector with a firm base-platform of cooperation and information sharing.	1. Number of cooperation between the CSOs and information sharing "chatter".
O2: Oc 2 – CSOs participation in policy-making, advocacy and grassroots activities is present and effective.	2. Times when CSOs are invited, or initiated changes in policy through advocacy. Number of activities carried out by CSOs.
Oc 3 – Aware and mobilized citizens on sustainable development issues in Kosovo, and their rights.	3. Number of citizens engaged in projects activities and project outreach.
Op 1. – Inclusive, improved and organized communication platform for communication and cooperation between CSOs dealing with sustainable development issues.	1. Number of organizations joining the communication platform, and number of new cooperation's in tackling sustainable development issues.
Op 2.1. – Training - CSOs capable of conducting research, debates, implementing advocacy work, create meaningful outreach, work with public authorities, as the result of training provided by the Project. Op 2.2. – Implementation of projects by the sub-grantees, through sub-granting mechanism. Effective CSOs for tackling issues of project management, internal governance and management, transparent functioning, strategic planning, campaigning, communication, sustainable funding strategies, long and short term planning.	2. Number of interested CSOs in the capacity building programme of the Project. The impact from the implementation of grants by successful applicants.
Op 3.1. – Citizen participation in project implementation Op 3.2. – Citizen outreach through media outlets.	3.1. Involvement of citizens in Project implementation, in activities of the sub-grantees projects. 3.2. Clicks on the web-page and wide communication through the official channels of the Project.

Op 4.1. – Evidence based report on assessment on three thematic priorities of the Action, in the seven regions of Kosovo. Op 4.2. – Evidence based report on the impact reached by sub-grantees.	4.1. Evidence based research 4.2. Effects of the project implementation by the sub-grantees.

3. Evaluation Target Audiences

The evaluation is intended primarily for the EU Office in Kosovo, the Donor, and the implementing organizations BGF (as the leader of the grant) and INDEP (implementing partner).

The primary audience for the evaluation consists also of the:

1. CSOs,
2. Project partners.

4. Evaluation Type

This is an end-of-project evaluation that will be primarily Summative.

5. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

Overall, the evaluation purpose is to provide evidence-base that enables to:

 i. *improve project effectiveness* by asking what worked, what did not work and why. Reflecting on these questions enables informed choices on how to improve project plans.
 ii. *increase accountability* by sharing evaluation results with all key stakeholders, including communities, partners, government and donors.
 iii. *advocate for change* by using evaluation results as evidence to persuade for changes to policy.

Specifically, the evaluation's aim is to measure the fulfilment of the project objectives and the extent that objectives of the project have impacted beneficiaries in all project regions.

The evaluation should address the following principles of Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability.[1] Evaluation questions set within each criterion guide the use of the criteria, *however*, it is expected for them to be refined during inception together with the evaluation team when data availability and context become clearer.

1.   Relevance: Assess the extent to which the objectives of the project fit into the priorities and needs of the beneficiaries.

• *Was the design of the project relevant to the wider context?*
• *Is the project in line with the needs and priorities of the set target group?*
• *Is the project design and objectives aligned with the needs of the target group?*
• *Is the project aligned with BGF, INDEP, partners, and donor policies and priorities?*

---

[1] http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf
  http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

• Was the design and implementation of the project gender/minority-sensitive?
• Did the design and implementation of the project consider the available capacities?

2.   ***Coherence:*** Assess the compatibility of the project with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the project, and vice versa.

• To what extent were context factors (political stability/instability, population movements, etc.) considered in the design and delivery of the project?
• To what extent was BGF's project coherent with policies and programmes of other partners operating within the same context?
• What have been the synergies between the intervention and other BGF, INDEP, and donor interventions?

3.   ***Effectiveness****:* Assess the effectiveness of the project in terms of its objectives and strategies, and progress against intended outcomes. Compare expected achievements of objectives at inception as stated in the logical frameworks against actual achievements of objectives at the time of evaluation.

• Was the project cost-efficient?
• Was the project implemented in a timely way?
• Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
• How well was beneficiaries' and stakeholders' (including government) participation incorporated in the project cycle?

4.   ***Efficiency****:* Based on the project plans, monitoring indicators and reports, assess how efficiently the project met the expected objectives by comparing outputs to interventions and engagements thereof.

• Were (are) the outputs and outcomes achieved (likely to be achieved); and what major factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes?
• Is the achievement of outcomes leading to/likely to lead to meeting project objectives? What major factors influenced this?
• Were results delivered for the project's beneficiaries?
• Were relevant assistance standards met?

5.   ***Impact:*** Assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors. The main impact evaluation question is what would have happened to the beneficiaries if they had not been part of the project.

• What were the effects of the project on the CSO's work on policy monitoring, advocacy and campaigning?
• Did a specific part of the project achieve greater impact than another (i.e. sub-granting scheme, advocacy, grassroots activities, capacity building for CSOs, campaigning, community awareness etc.)
• Were there unintended (positive or negative) effects of assistance for participants and nonparticipants?
• Were there any gender/minority-specific impacts? Did the intervention influence the gender/minority context?
• Were there impacts on institutions, communities, citizens?
• Did the intervention contribute to long-term intended results?

6.   ***Sustainability****:* Assess the extent to which the project benefits will continue to pay off into the foreseeable future. Analyze factors that promoted / or hindered ensuring long-term benefits of the project.

• To what extent did the project implementation consider the long-term improvement of the situation on the ground relating to the thematic priorities of the action (environment, energy, green economic growth)?
• To what extent is it likely that the benefits of the intervention will continue after the project ceases? (i.e. Financial sustainability, Institutional sustainability, Policy level sustainability, Environmental sustainability)
• Has the intervention made any difference to increase citizens' awareness on sustainable development in Kosovo through activities that promoted environment preservation, green energy and sustainable economic growth?

Other factors that will also influence evaluation objectives include:

• Visibility
• Duration of project
• Project management environment
• Donor special needs/requirements
• Programmatic risk
• Influence of COVID-19

6. Evaluation Methodology

The detailed evaluation methodology will be based on participatory approaches and will be developed after the consultant is selected.

Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, different qualitative and quantitative tools will be used such as: focus groups discussions (virtual ones accepted too), key informant interviews, surveys, etc. In evaluation processes the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a deeper understanding of what the issues are and why they exist. Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) are strongly recommended for this evaluation. This will enable a better understanding of perceptions of changes based on project intervention.

Secondary documents will be available for review including: project design documents, which include the project proposal, log frame, baseline assessment report, annual and semi-annual management reports, and annual operation plans. Also, some available secondary data can be used as relevant for the evaluation process.

The qualitative indicators and qualitative evaluation objective questions will be developed by the consultant in collaboration with the project staff of BGF and INDEP.

7. Authority and Responsibility

7.1 Team Members and Roles

This evaluation will follow a participatory approach, aiming to be also a learning process. Based on the above mentioned reasons and approach, the team will be composed of BGF and INDEP project staff, consultant and the donor.

	Role	Primary task
Planning	*Consultant*	• Literature/project documentation review; • Develop of the Evaluation Design Methodology, share it with BGF and INDEP staff for comments; • Reflect comments and get final approval from the above staff for the Evaluation Design Methodology; • Provide necessary translations if any; • Update the BGF and INDEP staff on the progress of the evaluation on weekly basis; • Keep continuous contact and consult with project staff.
	Project staff	• Provide list of project partners/stakeholders and relevant documentation to the consultant; • Approve the Evaluation Design Methodology and relevant tools; • Participate (*if applicable*) in planning phase, data collection and analysis; • Provide feedback accordingly on the methodology and tools proposed by consultant; • Compile evaluation schedule in consultation with consultant and project stakeholders.
Data Collection and Analysis	*Consultant*	• Lead the field/virtual evaluation process after approval of the Evaluation Design Methodology; • Conduct field/virtual data collection and analysis; • Keep record of methodology used for data analysis and raw data provided; • Provide feedback on a continuous basis to the project staff on the progress.
	Project staff	• Continuous/close consultation with consultant on the process; • Keeps track of the evaluation process progress based on the input from the consultant; • Provides suggestions and recommendation *(if applicable)* to technical issues related to the field phase to the consultant i.e ways of questionnaires are administered etc.
Reporting and Follow-Up	*Consultant*	• Draft the preliminary findings of the report and share it project staff and relevant project stakeholders to validate findings; • Incorporate comments/feedback into the report and provide recommendations; • Produce a final report of findings and recommendations.
	Project staff	• Share draft report with stakeholders; • Review and provide technical feedback to the preliminary findings of the consultant; • Review if comments have been reflected and approve the final evaluation report.
	Donor	• Reviews and approves the final report of the evaluation.

Profile of the Consultant

The evaluator must demonstrate:

• Previous experience of EU funded project evaluations;

- Strong experience in designing and leading multi-faceted program/project evaluations with proven experience in the field;
- Ability to facilitate and relate to stakeholders at multiple levels (e.g., BGF and INDEP staff, NGOs, public and private organizations, field participants, etc.;)
- Proven ability to use quantitative, qualitative and participatory evaluation methods, with examples and references that can speak to this experience;
- Data analysis and presentation skills, and strong writing ability;
- Sensitivity to cultural/historical context in the data collection process;
- Fluency in English, Albanian and/or Serbian.

Preferable:

- A university degree at the postgraduate level in the social sciences, management or other relevant field of study.
- Good knowledge of the CSOs work and its role in the community.
- Good understanding of three thematic areas of the project.

1. Application Procedures

The interested applicants may submit the relevant documentation electronically to the following email address: info@balkangreenfoundation.org under the subject line '*EEBO – Response to ToR for End of Project Evaluation*'.

Deadline for application is **30 November 2020**

The required documentation for application:

- Resumes of key qualified staff to be assigned to this assignment - not exceeding two pages for each.
- Capability Statement: skills and competencies, experience that are aligned to the TOR Objectives;
- Proposed Evaluation Design Methodology herewith attached the template;
- Implementation schedule/work plan of ToR tasks-work plan on a GANTT chart - period it would take to complete the field work and submit the final consultancy report.
- Clear financial proposal with break-down of each cost that will be checked against our available budget. Please itemize the cost to a level that is easy to understand.
- References from at least two recent engagements of a similar nature

8. Logistics

The project implementation team will provide support in providing logistics during the evaluation process. The project staff, partners (and donor if applicable) need to provide a list of the relevant stakeholder's subject to evaluation measurements.

The expected timeline for conducting the evaluation process **mid December 2020 - January 2021**.

Evaluation Final report due by **mid-February 2021**.

9. Products

The consultant is expected to produce the followings:

- **Evaluation Design Methodology:** The existing standard Evaluation Design will be customized by the external consultant in consultation with the BGF and INDEP.

- **Weekly Report:** The external consultant is expected to report weekly on the evaluation process to the project staff on to allow for a smooth evaluation process.

- **Evaluation Reflection:** The external consultant will present the preliminary findings of the evaluation to the project partners and stakeholders at a meeting organized by the project staff.

- **Draft Evaluation Report:** As per the guidelines given by the BGF and INDEP, the Draft Evaluation Report will be prepared by the external consultant. The main components of the evaluation report are key findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The consultant will send the soft copy of the Draft Evaluation Report in MS Word format to the BGF and INDEP together with relevant annexes. The BGF and INDEP staff will provide their comments on the Draft Evaluation Report to the consultant within ten working days from the submission.

- **Final Evaluation Report:** The consultant will incorporate the comments provided by the BGF and INDEP staff and will submit the Final Report in both soft and hard copy within five working days after receiving comments from the BGF and INDEP. This Evaluation Report will be reviewed by the BGF and INDEP staff and donor and any comments will be incorporated by the consultant. The consultant shall present the final report to the BGF and INDEP staff and get the final approval.

10. Lessons Learned

The learning and experiences in the evaluation processes will be captured by the project team who then will record the lessons learned and recommended improvements in the evaluation report.

11. Budget

The consultant must prepare a budget proposal.

12. Documents

Reference materials to be used in the preparation for the evaluation are:

- Evaluation Terms of Reference;
- Evaluation Design Template (design methodology of evaluation process);
- Project Assessments reports;
- Project Monitoring reports;
- Project proposal and budgets;

- Project Quarterly and Final reports.

13. Appendices

Evaluation objectives	Issues	Methods	Sources
1. Assess the programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes.	1.1. Participation of stakeholders in the programme design. 1.2. Monitoring and evaluation system. 1.3 Relevance of design (Does project address the needs of the target groups?). 1.4 Relevance of activities toward expected goals, purposes and outputs.	1) Documentary review. 2) Field visits, observations, (if possible considering COVID-19) 3) Virtual communication with beneficiaries	1) Proposal, design, PRA Reports, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, annual operation plans, financial reports (And other grant project reports). 2) Visit and observation checklists (if possible due to COVID-19). 3) Virtual communication semi-structured questionnaire.
2. Assess the progress towards achievement of goal and outcomes. **(Effectiveness)**	2.1. Achievements in terms of goals, outcomes and outputs based on logframe indicators. 2.2. Accomplishment of planned activities. 2.3 Quality of services.	1) Documentary review. 2) Field visits and observations (if possible considering COVID-19). 3) Virtual communication with beneficiaries.	1) Proposal, PRA, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, annual operation plans, financial reports. 2) Visit and observation checklists. 5) Survey questionnaire.

4. To investigate whether the resources (financial, human, and materials) have been used efficiently and effectively for the well being of the target community. (**Efficiency**)	4.1 Quality of structures and services. 4.2 Cost-effectiveness of services.	1) Documentary review. 2) Field visits and observations (if possible considering COVID-19). 3) Virtual communication with beneficiaries.	1) Proposal, PRA and other survey report, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, annual operation plans, financial reports. 2) Visit and observation checklists.
5. Assess the minority inclusion in planning, implementation, monitoring & evaluation as well as the access to benefits.	5.1 Accomplishment of minority inclusion through programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.	1) Documentary review. 2) Field visits and observations. 3) Focus group Discussions. 4) Interviews with randomly selected CSOs	1) Proposal, PRA and other survey report, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, annual operation plans, financial reports. 2) Visit and observation checklists. 3) Focus groups semi-structured questionnaire. 4) CSOs semi-structured questionnaire.
6. Assess the management and potentials for programme ownership, sustainability and any basis to make decisions on programme transition and/or phase out.	6.1. Programme sustainability strategy. 6.2. Level of community participation.	1) Documentary review including TDI reports 2) Focus group discussions.	1) Proposal, TDI summary reports, PRA and other survey report, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, and financial reports. 2) Focus groups semi-structured questionnaire.

7. Analysis of major problems that have affected the programme (status of risks and assumptions) and analysis of the lessons learned.	7.1 Existence and appropriateness of a risk management plan. 7.2 Quality and efficiency of problems/risk management.	1) Documentary review. 2) Field visits and observations (if possible considering COVID-19). 3) Virtual communication with beneficiaries	1) Proposal, PRA and other survey report, semi-annual/annual narrative reports, annual operation plans, financial reports. 2) Visit and observation checklists. 3) Focus groups semi-structured questionnaire. 4) Beneficiary semi-structured questionnaire.

Evaluation Matrix Example

Appendix D: Example of Evaluation Achievement Matrix Goal and outcome	Key question Pointing to the relevant criteria to be measured on the level of the goal and the outcomes.	Assessment		Responsibility, methods of verification What methods to apply? Where to obtain information? Who collects it? When? Results addressed to whom?
		Indicator	Target value Target value or threshold value to be achieved.	
For example – *Project for improving the functioning of a public bus company:* **Outcome:** **Bus company is capable of providing good services to the customer.**	*Are the passengers satisfied with the services?* *Criteria: Customer satisfaction*	*Percentage of satisfied passengers in a survey at the project's end.*	*At least 80% of passengers give a positive answer to the question: "Are you satisfied with the service of the bus company (3 or 4 on a scale of 1-4)?"*	*Results of survey; project team and hired surveyors; project end; survey with standardized question during one day, interviewing at least 1,000 passengers, etc.*
	What is the technical state of the bus fleet? *Criteria: Technical reliability*	*Number of breakdowns per bus per month.*	*Less than one breakdown per unit per month at the end of the project.*	*Records of bus company; project team; analysis of workshop records; etc.*
	How punctual are the departures? *Criteria: Punctuality*	*Percentage of delayed departures per month.*	*Less than 5% of delayed departures at terminals per month at the end of the project.*	*Records of bus company; project team; analysis of company statistics, etc.*

What are the attitudes of bus drivers about customer service?	*Description of attitudes expressed by drivers.*	*N/A. Date to be used for planning experiences to improve attitudes.*	*Interviews of bus drivers.*	
What are the mechanisms for customers to make complaints and obtain redress if the service is not acceptable?	*Number of passengers able to identify the complaint mechanism.* *Number of passengers who have used the mechanism and obtained appropriate redress.*	*At least 80% of passengers aware of complaints mechanism* *At least 80% of passengers who have used the complaints mechanism and are satisfied with the outcome.*	*Surveys and interviews with passengers.*	
What impact does a punctual bus service have on the lives of the passengers?	*Description of impact on lives expressed by passengers.*	*N/A. Data to be used for planning next stage.*	*Interviews with passengers.*	