



Improving the monitoring and effective implementation of core international conventions in GSP+ countries and Kyrgyzstan

Terms of Reference Project Evaluation

1. Background

The Equal Rights Trust (ERT) will soon complete the implementation of a 51-month EIDHR funded project (initially 36 months), which began on 2 December 2017 and will conclude on 28 February 2021, titled *Improving the monitoring and effective implementation of core international conventions in GSP+ countries and Kyrgyzstan*.

The project's **overall objective** is to improve the implementation of selected core international conventions in GSP+ beneficiary countries and Kyrgyzstan.

The project's **specific objectives** are:

- (i) To build the capacity of civil society organisations and trade unions in target countries to monitor the implementation of selected core international conventions related to non-discrimination;
- (ii) To build the capacity of civil society organisations in target countries to advocate for the effective implementation of selected core international conventions related to non-discrimination.

The project activities are implemented in Armenia, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Paraguay and the Philippines. The target group of the project includes civil society organisations (CSOs) and trade unions; the European Commission; the UN Treaty Bodies and the ILO; local and national authorities in the target countries.

The beneficiaries of the project include all persons subject to discrimination and other human or labour rights violations in the target countries.

The project has four estimated results:

- (1) Improved capacity of CSOs and trade unions in target countries to monitor the implementation of selected core international conventions related to non-discrimination;
- (2) Improved capacity of CSOs in target countries to advocate for effective implementation of selected core international conventions related to non-discrimination;
- (3) Increased cooperation among civil society in monitoring and advocacy related to selected core international conventions;
- (4) Increased level of engagement of target governments with regard to selected core international conventions.

The project involves four main activities:

- (1) In-person and online capacity building workshops;
- (2) Practical skills development through sub-grants for monitoring, and advocacy and collaboration;
- (3) Establishment of national Equality Forums;
- (4) Advocacy with international and national stakeholders.

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the implementation and impact of the project activities. The evaluation should consider all aspects listed below.

2.1. Relevance

The project was designed to improve the implementation of selected core international conventions in GSP+ beneficiary countries and Kyrgyzstan by strengthening the capacity of CSOs and social partners to contribute to the monitoring and effective implementation of the relevant conventions in synergy with the GSP+ process.

To this end, the project identified the following four issues: (1) the limited technical and practical capacity of CSOs and TUs to monitor the implementation of core international conventions in the target countries; (2) the limited technical and practical capacity of CSOs to advocate for the implementation of core international conventions in the target countries; (3) the lack of effective collaboration among civil society as constraining advocacy efforts by limiting resources, access and voice; (4) the insufficient engagement by governments in the target countries with the selected core international conventions, despite ratification of all the core conventions and significant benefits derived from the GSP+ scheme.

Assess the extent to which the project responded to these identified needs, as well as the extent to which the project responded to opportunities or challenges arising in the current context.

- (1) How relevant were the project interventions in increasing the capacity of CSOs and social partners to contribute to the monitoring and effective implementation of the selected core international conventions?
- (2) Did the project target the right group of participants with the right set of strategies and activities?
- (3) How timely was the project intervention considering the political and legislative context in the target countries?
- (4) Did the project create space for civil society and social partners to engage in the monitoring and effective implementation of the selected core international conventions?
- (5) How did the project adapt to the context in terms of sensitivity and security?
- (6) How did the project adhere to the overall capacity-building methodology?

2.2. Impact

Assess the extent to which the specific objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and how far the project's results were attained, or are expected to be attained.

- (1) What are the major outputs and outcomes of this project? How is the progress in comparison to the relevant baseline data?
- (2) How has the project contributed to achieving the specific objectives and results?
- (3) Have the planned benefits been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders?
- (4) Have the intended beneficiaries participated in the intervention?
- (5) If the assumptions and/ or risk assessments turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly was the project adapted to achieve its results?
- (6) If unintended outcomes were produced, how did they effect the overall impact of the intervention?
- (7) How well were cross-cutting or over-arching issues addressed?

2.3. Efficiency

Assess how efficiently the resources used (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted to impact (quality, quantity, timeliness, etc.).

- (1) Were activities cost-efficient?
- (2) Were objectives achieved on time?
- (3) Were there any unplanned outputs?
- (4) Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

2.4. Sustainability

Assess whether and to what extent the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the donor funding has been withdrawn.

- (1) What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project?
- (2) To what extent is the impact expected to continue after the intervention comes to an end?

- (3) What steps are planned or have been taken by the project team to create long term processes to strengthen the capacity of CSOs and social actors to contribute to the monitoring and effective implementation of the core international conventions in the target countries?

2.5. Coherence and ERT's added value

Assess the extent to which the project contributed to the achievement of ERT's mission and [strategy](#).

- (1) To what extent is the project intervention complimentary to ERT's area of expertise?
- (2) How well did ERT utilise its added value in the intervention logic and its implementation?
- (3) How likely is the project to contribute to ERT's mission and [strategy](#)?
- (4) Is the intervention in line with evolving strategies for equality and non-discrimination work?
- (5) To what extent is the project complementary to-, and coordinated with other EU initiatives and other stakeholders' interventions?

2.6. Recommendations

Provide recommendations to improve project implementation in the future. In particular:

- (1) How could ERT had improved the implementation of this project?
- (2) What future work could be undertaken to further strengthen the impact of this project?

3. Evaluation Methods and Scope of Work

The evaluator(s) is/are expected to undertake the evaluation in as rigorous a manner as possible to produce information and make recommendations that are sufficiently valid and reliable based on data, interviews and analysis.

The scope of work of the evaluator will include the following:

- (1) Develop the monitoring and evaluation framework, design and methodology;
- (2) Develop the evaluation implementation plan;
- (3) Assess project implementation;
- (4) Prepare the evaluation report and share the finding with ERT and the donor.

It is expected that the evaluator(s) will conduct a participatory evaluation that will involve project implementers, ERT's National and Regional Contact Points (NCPs/ RCPs) in the target countries, the donor, and target beneficiaries in all key evaluation tasks. Existing project documents and progress reports will be shared with the evaluator to facilitate completion of the tasks. The methodology must include the following approaches:

- (i) Inclusiveness – the methodology should ensure to include a wide range of viewpoints;
- (ii) Mixed-method approaches – both qualitative and quantitative methods need to be included in the methodology.

4. Evaluation Report

The final output of the evaluation is expected in the format of a report. The report should be submitted in English. It should provide a substantive evaluation of the project’s achievements in all the areas outlined in sections 1 and 2 of the Terms of Reference and should assess progress against project objectives through use of indicators in the project log frame.

The expected annexes are:

- (1) Programme of evaluation/ review
- (2) Terms of Reference of the evaluation/ review
- (3) List of people interviewed
- (4) List of documentation consulted

5. Schedule

Deadline for Letters of Interest	7 March 2021 (Midnight GMT)
Interviews and selection of evaluator/(s)	w/c 8 March 2021 with interviews on 12 March 2021
Evaluation period	15 March – 30 April 2021
Submission of the evaluation report	3 May 2021

6. Budget and Payment

The budget proposed by the evaluator(s) must not exceed 8000 EUR. The budget should cover all consultancy fees, expenses to be incurred, taxes and VAT.

The consultant will be paid when the evaluation report and annexes have been submitted and deemed of a suitable quality by ERT, in line with the requirements of this Terms of Reference.