



Combined evaluation of projects in the area of climate change in Russia, Ukraine and Kirgistan and the South Caucasus

Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

This evaluation is designed as a cluster evaluation and will assess two projects that are active in the field of climate change. Cluster evaluations are a new evaluation format, which is promoted by Brot für die Welt (Bread for the World) to encourage cross-project learning and exchange among partner organisations and to promote a culture of evaluation within the organisation while also deepening discussions about different project approaches and results in different units within Brot für die Welt.

The first project is focused on NGOs in Russia, Ukraine and Kirgistan effectively supporting a social- and climate just development. The second project is focussed on South Caucasus NGOs introducing a sustainable energy model in the region that safeguards the rights of the people and the environment.

The first project is implemented by DRA e.V. – the association of German-Russian-Exchange which was founded in 1992. **DRA** focusses on strengthening civil society through regional and international networking, training courses and specialist events, the promotion of civic participation and voluntary work and the cooperation of NGOs with authorities, business and other sectors of society as well as on strengthening environmental protection and ecological awareness; strengthening democracy, civil and human rights and free media. Mitigation of climate change and its consequences has been adopted by the international community of states as a common, global goal. Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan have ratified the Paris Agreement and the Russian Federation has also joined it. Nevertheless, politics and society in the three countries (RF, UA, KGZ) are only hesitantly paying attention to climate change and its consequences. This is where DRA gets involved – advocating for social- and climate just development.

The second project is implemented by The Green Alternative (**GREENALT**) which was founded in 2000 by leading campaigners* of Friends of the Earth Georgia. The mission of GREENALT is to protect the environment, biodiversity and cultural heritage of Georgia. This is to be achieved by promoting economically viable and socially acceptable alternatives, establishing the principles of ecological and social justice, and securing and maintaining public access to information and decision-making processes. But GREENALT is also very active beyond the Georgian border. A particularly important network is the CEE Bankwatch Network, an association of Central and Eastern European environmental organisations, which is committed to transparency and ecological sustainability in the financing of projects. The long-standing cooperation within this network is the basis for the trinational project cooperation around a sustainable regional energy model with Azerbaijani and Armenian partners.

Brot für die Welt is a worldwide development programme of the national evangelical and free churches in Germany. Brot für die Welt is only a supporting partner in this cluster evaluation, which provides technical knowhow and guidance to the process for example in the formulation of the ToR, the advertisement and selection process and in the review of reports. Brot für die Welt works with poor and marginalised people around the world in an effort to improve their living standards. The focus of the work is on food security, provision of education and health, respect for human rights and the integrity of creation. Through lobbying, advocacy and educational work in Germany and Europe, it seeks to influence political decisions in favour of the poor and raise awareness of the need for sustainable living standards and economic activities.

2. Subject of the evaluation: Two projects active in the field of climate change

The two projects to be assessed in this evaluation are linked through related objectives:

The DRA Project: NGOs in Russia, Ukraine and Kirgizstan effectively promote climate and socially-just development has been implemented since February 2019 and will run until December 2020. It had the following goals and objectives:

Project objectives

1. Active people in civil society (NGOs, active citizens, journalists) in the UA, RU and KGZ, in cooperation with representatives from business, politics and science, have exerted influence on political decisions that result in a significant improvement in environmental quality.
2. NGOs have been able to win over more citizens, especially young people, for climate and environmental protection issues.

Indicators to the project objectives

1. In each target country, the civil society actors supported by the project (NGOs, informal civil movements) have demonstrably incorporated their interests/positions into one political decision-making process each, so that political and legal regulations serve the interests of environmental and climate protection and vulnerable population groups. At least four political programmes/laws have been influenced in this process.
2. At least 1,500 citizens and especially young people (16-30 years old) have been mobilised for climate protection issues: this becomes visible in the participation in about 18 campaigns or in the initiation of at least 4 environmental protection projects/activities.

The project targets: about 300 NGO representatives with outstanding expertise in climate and environmental protection; about 250 experts in climate and environmental protection, multipliers and decision-makers from various sectors (politics, economy, education), and about 600 citizens involved in climate and environmental protection.

The GREENALT project: Towards the Energy Paradigme Change in South Caucasus: South Caucasus NGOs successfully introduce sustainable energy model in a region, that safeguards rights of the people and environment has been implemented **since September 2018** and will run **until August 2021**. It had the following goals and objectives:

Project objectives:

1. Lobbying and awareness raising: Sustainable energy concepts are accepted in the South Caucasus and integrated into political practice.

2. Networking for more transparency and public participation in decision-making processes: Energy policy decision-making processes and projects are transparent and ensure broad public participation at national and regional level.
3. Monitoring human rights violations in the energy sector: Energy policy and practice are in line with international human rights standards.

Indicators to the project objectives

- 1.1 At least three legislative and/or policy proposals on sustainable energy from the project partners will be adopted by governments and international decision makers.
- 1.2 At least 15 journalists (> 50% of them women) report continuously and professionally on sustainable energy issues and publish at least 50 newspaper articles or TV contributions, 20 blogs and 200 posts by the end of the project period.
- 2.1 There is at least one functioning regional network that addresses the common challenges of energy policy in the South Caucasus.
- 2.2 At least 35 municipal representatives and 7000 people participate in round tables, public hearings, municipal (town hall) meetings at different stages of public participation in energy structure projects.
- 2.3 The public has access to at least six impact assessments (economic, social and environmental impact) on controversial energy structure projects.
- 3.1 At least six complaints from affected communities are submitted to different national and/or international redress mechanisms.
- 3.2: At least 500 workers per year receive legal advice.
- 3.3: At least three annual policy briefs of the project partners provide information on current issues of legislative or executive protection measures and on the observation of human rights in planning processes in the energy sector.

The project **targets**: about 60 NGO representatives per year, approx. 30 citizens from target communities (per year) with whom the project team works on a daily basis, about 1500 workers receiving legal advice, at least 30 journalists and at least 60 national and 30 international decision-makers per year, who are reached mainly through lobbying and advocacy work and by mobilising target groups for their own interests.

3. Aim of the cluster evaluation

The general idea of a cluster evaluation is that two or more projects are assessed with one set of ToR that contains project specific as well as overarching questions. One evaluation report will be written by the evaluator(s) that provides project specific assessments but also answers the overarching evaluation questions. The evaluator(s) will be contracted by the projects directly for the working days and travel relevant to their project. Working days for the overarching analysis are shared between project partners.

The cluster evaluation should provide insights into the impact logics of the project conceptions, the achieved impacts and areas for improvement in order to further strengthen project strategies in the future.

1. The underlying impact logic of the projects is assessed and reconstructed.
2. The goals and indicators of the two projects have been assessed in accordance with OECD/DAC criteria.

Within this assessment:

- a. Hindering and helpful factors concerning the project impact, unintended positive and/or negative impacts and external factors which have an impact on the impact logic have been captured.
 - b. Good practices and lessons learned from the two projects are highlighted.
3. The appropriateness of the project strategies and the implementation design have been reflected upon and recommendations for following project phases have been made.

4. Key questions in accordance with OECD/DAC criteria

The following questions are divided in accordance with the evaluation criteria of the OECD/DAC. They should be understood against the background of an evaluation of every project and include overarching questions.

Relevance

1. How do the projects relate to the relevant strategic reference frameworks/policies at national, international level?
2. To what extent do the project conceptions respond to the core problems and needs of the target group(s) in the sense of supporting sustainable political processes?
3. To what extent are the projects adequately designed to achieve the defined project objectives?
4. Are the project objectives still valid today? Which goals do the partners and other stakeholders see as reasonable and promising for the next years and next project phase?

Coherence

5. To which extent does the project fit to other interventions implemented in the area and to other relevant strategic reference frameworks?

Effectiveness

6. To what extent were the selected target groups reached? How was participation and ownership amongst the different target groups [for example women or youth]?
7. Are the selected target groups the right people, who in turn make a difference / promote change?
8. To what extent have the project objectives been achieved (or will be achieved until end of project), measured against the set performance indicators? Which political processes have the projects influenced?
9. How do the activities and outputs of the projects contribute to the achievement of the project objectives (outcome)?

Specific foci:

- What kind of training measures for multipliers were carried out? Who were the participants? How were they able to use their increased knowledge/qualification to achieve the intended changes?
- What were the mayor achievements in terms of building coalitions and strategic alliances?
- How well did the capacity building of project partners and CSOs in the countries covered by the project work?
- How did the professional exchange manifest itself and what did the partners gain from it?

10. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency

11. Were the funding amounts sufficient to achieve changes through the project activities or would more funding have been necessary to achieve the desired changes?
12. What can the projects learn from one another with regards to efficiency in relation to impact?
13. Which means / elements of simplification seemed feasible / useful in project management and in the relationship with funders and partners?

Impact

14. Which influence on creating lasting change at local and regional level did the partner organisations, stakeholders and their targets groups have?
15. Which other intended and/or unintended positive and/or negative changes have occurred as a result of the project at impact level?

Sustainability

16. To what extent are the results of the projects likely to be lasting in the long-term under the given conditions?
17. What have the projects done to ensure that the results can be sustained in the medium to long term? Which factors have supported or hindered the long-lasting effects of the projects in the long term? How dependent are lasting effects on the political set up?
18. How can sustainability be addressed even better in future project designs?

In the following some overarching questions are formulated that are of interest to both organisations. Some of the analysis necessary for answering these questions may already have been conducted under the OECD/DAC criteria. This section can be based, where relevant, on answers to the former questions or build on them.

Overarching questions around access, the networks, capacity building and visibility:

1. Do the organisations have the **right access** to actors in politics, science, the cultural sphere and amongst other NGOs? How important is the 'factor access' for achieving the project goals?
2. Are the organisations (sufficiently) active in NGO/activist **networks**?
3. How effective are the networks? How good and effective is the coordination with the partners in the networks?
4. How do the network partners view their relationship with DRA/GREENALT? Do they consider the exchange as fruitful? How could the exchange be further improved?
5. Could multilateral potentials and synergies be gained from the participation of several different partners in the project or was it rather a hindrance? If synergies and potentials arose or were used, what kind of synergies and potentials were these? If not, what were the reasons? Was communication between partners of the core project sufficient or would they have preferred more communication?
6. What potentials for cooperation and synergies are there with other partners, especially in the South Caucasus/Central Asia, including Brot für die Welt? Which other potential future allies do exist?
7. Did the projects succeed in strengthening **NGOs as experts**? Which activities have contributed to NGOs in the target countries acquiring expert knowledge? What kind of

expertise was this and what did the NGOs do with it? Where and how were they able to use the expert knowledge to achieve changes for society? And did they do it (effectively)? Who considers the NGOs as experts, or who uses their expertise?

8. Is there a risk that NGOs, as experts, will take on tasks that should actually be carried out by the state itself (e.g. project activities that provide state employees with free further training in environmental protection issues - and can this be justified, e.g. as an initiation of rethinking, or is it wrong)?
9. Which means of communication were used for what and how effective were they in relation to which target group? What kind of **visibility** did the project activities reach? How publicly visible were the issues among the national publics? Did a multiplier effect occur and if so, how did it occur and how was it strengthened?

Questions around lessons learnt and recommendations for future projects

10. What were **good practices** in the two projects in this project phase?
11. What were **central lessons learned** from the two projects from this project phase?
12. What are the **central recommendations** for future projects in the region with a focus on the impact of their energy, climate and agricultural policies and in terms of the political landscape?

5. Methods and Standards

It is a requirement that the principles and standards of the OECD/DAC for a participatory, credible, gender-sensitive and fair evaluation will be observed. Both **quantitative** and **qualitative** methods shall be used.

Due to the current restrictions imposed by the Covid 19 pandemic, it is currently not possible to predict whether and to what extent physical encounters with interviewees will be possible. We therefore ask for an evaluation design that allows for the use of digital methods.

Data collection shall promote self-reflection amongst the target groups. The chosen methods shall be inclusive and respect the social and cultural context of the target groups. In the development of the evaluation design and the choice of methods, correct research ethics need to be applied.

The documentation for the methodical approach is requested by Brot für die Welt as a fundamental component of each evaluation report. The evaluation should be conflict sensitive and be guided by the “do-no-harm” principle.

Potential interviewee groups could include:

- Decision-makers (politicians, civil servants, advisers, European Development Banks Board of Directors and bank staff and corporate decision-makers)
- Employees of the partner organisations
- Journalists
- Social media users
- Youths and activists
- The Public in general

6. Duration and timeframe

The outcomes and the corresponding deadlines are summarised in the following table:

Deadline	Interim result/outcome
20.09.2020	Expression of interest plus questions
24.09.2020	Circulation of responses to questions raised by interested parties
11.10.2020	Submission of offers
26.10.2020	Virtual contract clarification meeting
06.11.2020	Draft Inception report
18.11.2020	Final Inception report
November/December	Data collection and analysis
December 2020	Individual debriefings with partner organisations
17.01.2021	Draft final evaluation report
Week 3	Virtual Presentation of evaluation results with partner organisations and Brot für die Welt
31.01.2021	Final evaluation report

Inception report

After the contract clarification meeting and the provision of the core documents in digital form, the evaluators should prepare an inception report, which describes how the required results are achieved and which data will be collected with which methods. The Inception Report shall contain an evaluation matrix. The Inception Report should also contain a detailed activity and time schedule and a preliminary table of contents for the final report.

Evaluation Report

The evaluation report should not exceed 50 pages (without appendix). It is expected that the report presents the results of the analysis of both projects as well as the overarching discussion. That it formulates recommendations that are as precise, feasible and clearly addressed as possible. The description of the methodology and procedure as well as an understandable executive summary are an integral part of the evaluation report.

The results and recommendations will be presented virtually to the partner organisations and Brot für die Welt.

Estimation of working days for partner organisation 1: DRA	20
Estimation of working days for partner organisation 2: GREENALT	20
Estimation of working days for overarching analysis and overall process	8
Total estimated working days	48

7. Roles and responsibilities

The two partner organisations are direct counterparts for the evaluator. Each organisation will conclude a contract with a certain number of working days with the evaluator. One report is expected as a final product that covers both projects. The Project Officers from Brot für die Welt responsible for the two projects and the Evaluation Team in Results Management Department will review and input into the reports.

8. Qualification of evaluators

The evaluator(s) should fulfil the following requirements:

- thematic skills and experience in the area of climate change, environment (including energy topics), social justice, networking, lobbying and advocacy
- very good knowledge of qualitative and quantitative data collection and ICT applications

- sound evaluation experience
- experience of working with civil society organisations,
- experience of working in Eastern Europe and South Caucasus
- good working knowledge of English and Russian
- experience in conflict sensitivity

9. Offers

The submission of tenders for this evaluation is based on a two-stage process. In the first step, the expression of interest, you introduce yourself as an evaluator and ask all questions you might have in relation to the ToR. You will receive answers to all questions and on that basis submit an offer in the second step.

a) Expression of interest

We kindly ask all interested evaluators/evaluation teams to send the expression of interest to the e-mail address below by **Sunday 20 September 2020**.

Please send it to us as part of the expression of interest:

- a short profile description that gives us information about your competences and suitability for the implementation of the assignment, including meaningful CVs of all participating evaluators. For data protection reasons, we ask you to send the CVs as a separate file;
- any questions you may have about the Terms of Reference.

By **Thursday 24 September 2020**, feedback on all questions will be sent to those who have expressed their interest. We kindly ask you to refrain from telephone enquiries.

b) Submission of offers

Offers must reach the EWDE Results Management Department by **Sunday, 11 October 2020** at the latest. A complete offer consists of:

- a content-related offer, which conclusively sets out the methods to be used to achieve the objectives of the evaluation and specifies the timetable;
- a financial offer, in each case stating the fees of the respective evaluators for each project and for the overarching analysis, the estimated number of working days or hours, the expected travel costs or costs for virtual implementation. All costs, including VAT must be listed in the financial offer. Lump sums for general administrative/administrative costs cannot be paid.

The two organisations reserve the right to conduct telephone or personal interviews with providers in order to reach a decision. Furthermore, they reserve the right to award the contract at the time of the submission of the offer.

Please send questions and a complete offer by e-mail to

evaluation_ausschreibung@ewde.de

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V.

Results Management Department

Friederike Subklew-Sehume

Caroline-Michaelis-Strasse 1

10115 Berlin