



Consultancy Terms of Reference for Final Project Evaluation

ARTICLE 19 is seeking a consultant to conduct a full evaluation of a 15 month project “**Tackling the Roots of Hate against LGBTI People in Europe and Central Asia**” funded by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) Magna Carta Fund.

1. About ARTICLE 19

ARTICLE 19 is a global human rights organisation, with nine offices worldwide, which promotes and defends freedom of expression and information. ARTICLE 19's vision is a world in which all people can freely express themselves and actively engage in public life without fear or discrimination. ARTICLE 19 has been working in Russia for over 20 years, and has implemented a series of projects with a number of local partners.

2. About the project

Since September 2016, ARTICLE 19 has worked with five partners – Dotyk (Belarus), GenderDoc-M (Moldova), Russian LGBT Network (Russia), Insight (Ukraine) and Labrys (Kyrgyzstan)– to implement a 15 month project to “coordinate and strengthen regional efforts to safely challenge and counter hate speech and negative social attitudes targeting LGBTI people”, which will come to an end in December 2017.

Activities are focused in the following areas:

- Creating opportunities for knowledge exchange between activists in countries facing similar issues and capacity building on international standards on freedom of expression, hate speech and equality;
- Monitoring of hate speech towards LGBTI people in target countries to provide an evidence base for project activities;
- Engagement with bloggers/journalists on the effects of hate speech and freedom of expression principles, to encourage more positive coverage;
- Dialogue and coalition building with CSOs in target countries to promote equality and the universality of human rights;
- In-country campaigns challenging societal discrimination, negative social attitudes and hate speech directed at LGBTI people;
- Cross-regional campaigns and advocacy.

The location of the action is Russia, Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan.

3. Project Outcomes

The project seeks to achieve the following **objective**: *To coordinate and strengthen regional efforts to safely challenge and counter hate speech and negative social attitudes targeting LGBTI people; and to promote the universality of human rights.*

The **specific outcomes** of the project are:

- LGBTI activists, CSOs and journalists/bloggers have been supported to develop practical initiatives to counter hate speech and promote sensitive coverage of LGBTI issues, nationally and regionally
- Civil society activists and human rights defenders are aware of threats to FoEAA faced by LGBTI groups and individuals and understand how these undermine international human rights standards, resulting in increased solidarity to combat these threats and promote the universality of human rights

- Advocacy initiatives supported by coalitions of CSOs across the region result in international actors increasing pressure on governments to ensure respect rights of LGBTI people.
- LGBTI activists have increased ability to protect themselves from physical, legal and digital threats

4. Evaluation Objective

This evaluation will have multiple aims including:

- **Meeting objectives and key findings:** Assess the extent of the implementation of activities, the outcomes achieved and the challenges faced. This assessment should be completed with reference to the project's initial framework and other planning/proposal documents, and in line with the indicators set out in the project's log frame.
- **Lessons learned:** Identify lessons learned for future ARTICLE 19's planning
- **Key Recommendations:** Provide recommendations to build on the results and achieve sustainability.

The evaluation is a requirement of the project donor, and the results will also contribute to ARTICLE 19 and partners' internal learning, enabling more informed decision-making and strengthening future work on hate speech issues in the region

To achieve these objectives, the evaluation will focus on answering the following questions about the project keeping in mind ARTICLE 19's Freedom of expression and equality work in general. The evaluator should prioritise the following topics **subject to their weighting** and add additional topics they consider relevant.

1. **Relevance** (weighting = 15%)

- *To what extent are ARTICLE 19 project outcomes logical and coherent, and what are their strengths & weaknesses?*
- *Has ARTICLE 19 been able to adapt and refine outcomes based on the changing context in which they work?*
- *How relevant are project outcomes to ARTICLE 19's theory of change and strategy?*
- *How relevant is the project to donor strategy and policy?*

2. **Effectiveness/ (and to a lesser extent efficiency)** (weighting = 15%)

- What were the direct and indirect/unintended outcomes achieved as a result of the project, how do they compare to the original project proposal¹?
- How has the progress of actual activities compared to planned activities?
- Have project activities and outputs effectively delivered planned outcomes?
- What are the factors for success and/or any failures/weaknesses of the project?
- Has resource allocation been optimal?
- Has ARTICLE 19 been well equipped to achieve project outcomes?
- How successful was their project work in (a) gaining access to policymakers and national and international political actors in target countries and (b) collaborating with local groups and influencers?

3. **Impact** (weighting = 30%)

- To what extent has this project contributed ARTICLE 19's theory of change?
- What positive changes have occurred that are demonstrably attributable to ARTICLE 19 and partners?
- For areas where it is too early to assess, is ARTICLE 19 on track compared to its original proposal?
- What has been the overall impact for end beneficiaries and target groups?
- What has been the overall impact for the target country or region?

¹ If the project has a logical framework and/or ToC this must be referred to in the evaluation

- How could outcomes and impact have been further improved?
- Were there any risks that limited the project's overall impact?

4. Sustainability (weighting = 20%)

- How durable are the outcomes of the project?
- Have the right actions been undertaken to make outcomes and impacts sustainable?
- Has the project been designed and executed in such a way that the activities will not stop when the project has ended, and have sound exit strategies been developed?

5. Partners and relationships with stakeholders and beneficiaries (weighting = 20%)

- How would you assess the relationship between formal partners of this project (i.e partners that have signed a partnership statement or MoU)?
- How would you assess the relationship between ARTICLE 19/partners and the authorities in project countries? How has this relationship affected the project?
- How would you assess the relationship between ARTICLE 19/partners and end Beneficiaries and Target groups?

6. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the project?

7. What lessons can be learned and what recommendations can be given?

5. Process, Methodology and Deliverables

The evaluation will be a combination of desk based research and at least two trips to chosen target countries to conduct interviews. The countries to visit will be agreed with ARTICLE 19. The evaluator will be expected to conduct a review of all documents provided by ARTICLE 19, as well as Jitsi/telephone interviews with project implementers, target beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. The consultant will work closely with ARTICLE 19's Programme Officer for Europe and Central Asia, who will ensure that the consultant has access to all necessary project documents and will facilitate setting up meetings with interviewees, as well as providing other support as required. In target countries, the evaluation meetings will be agreed and organised by our project partners and will provide an opportunity to meet and interview several of the project beneficiaries.

Methodology will adhere to the principles of full participation, and include both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

The duties of the evaluator and the methodology used will include the following:

- Design of comprehensive qualitative evaluation questionnaires
- Comprehensive review of supplied project documents
- Telephone interviews with ARTICLE 19 staff; representatives of partner organisations and 3 x project beneficiaries from each of the target countries
- Conduct at least two trips to chosen target countries to attend a partner led evaluation and hold interviews with beneficiaries relevant for the project to be agreed with ARTICLE 19 in advance.

The methodology should adhere to the '[Bond evidence gathering principles](#)' as a reference framework for good evaluation practice.

Evaluation outputs

6.1. The evaluation report:

The report is to be presented in English, clear and simply written (free of jargon) and should not exceed 15 pages, excluding annexes, and be presented in Calibri Font 12. The executive summary should not exceed 2 pages. The structure should be according to the following format:

- *Executive summary:* this should summarise the main findings and recommendations in a concise manner.





- *Introduction:* The first part should describe the background and context (summary of overall project concept and design) as a basis for the analytical and evaluative sections that follow. The introduction includes a short explanation of the purpose and objective(s) and the evaluation methodology
- *Analysis and major findings:* This section focuses on the findings related to the questions listed above under 'Evaluation Objective'. The section not only lists the findings, but also contains an analysis of the evaluator regarding these findings. Background information should only be included when it is directly relevant to the report's analysis and conclusions. All analysis of achievements/consequences (inc. unintended) must be supported with relevant data and the data source must be included.
- *Conclusions.* The conclusions follow logically from the main findings and the analysis but are clearly distinguishable from these. The conclusions should provide answers to the main evaluation questions. Please use table 1 below for the assessment of the different criteria. It should include the project review rating table (see table 1).
- *Recommendations.* The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions. They should be actionable, ideally within a one year timeframe, and prioritised to help develop ARTICLE's work.
- *Annexes*
 - Terms of reference
 - List of organisations and persons interviewed and documents reviewed
 - Evaluation team's work schedule

Table 1 Project review rating

Please use the following table for scoring the project's performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, etc.

Criteria	Scoring*	Explanation/Comments
Relevance		
Effectiveness		
Impact		
Sustainability		
Partners and relationships with stakeholders and beneficiaries		

* Scoring:

	Highly Successful
	Successful
	Partially Successful
	Unsuccessful

6.2. Debriefing session

The consultant is required to schedule a debriefing session to discuss findings with ARTICLE 19 and partners (via Jitsi or other secure method of communication).

The debriefing session should take place within 30 days of the report's submission.

Additional notes:

Management Response: Evaluators should be aware that it is ARTICLE 19's policy to draft a management response to all evaluations undertaken on its projects. This will take place within 60 days of its submission.

Transparency: It is ARTICLE 19's policy that external evaluations contribute to its aims of becoming a transparent and accountable organisation. Evaluation reports will be published on its website and will be shared with external stakeholders unless there are clear security risks with doing so.

7. Evaluation Duration

The proposed evaluation (document review and interviews) would preferably start in mid-December 2017. The submission of the draft evaluation report should take place before the end of January 2017 and a final report agreed in by the end of February 2018.

	<i>Activities</i>
1	Revise documents, develop and refine questionnaires, agree interview time line
2	Trip to target countries (at least two countries, to be discussed with A19).
3	Additional Interviews conducted by Jitsi (primarily in Russian)
4	Analysis and Report preparation
5	Initial findings shared with ARTICLE 19 and partners via Skype
6	Submission of draft report
7	Incorporation of ARTICLE 19 and partner feedback and finalisation of report

ARTICLE 19 will provide a management response to the evaluation within two months of receiving the final report, commenting on the recommendations. The consultant will not be expected to respond formally to this.

8. Budget

The Consultant will be paid **£4,000**. They may also claim back costs incurred while conducting the evaluation, for example, for travel costs, telecommunications, photocopying or research materials (however, these should be agreed in advance with ARTICLE 19).

9. Supervision

The consultant will be supervised by ARTICLE 19's Head of Europe and Central Asia Programme and will work in close cooperation with the Programme Officer for Europe and Central Asia as well as the Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Officer, based in London.

10. Confidentiality

All the outputs e.g. reports, documents, information etc produced by this evaluation will be treated as ARTICLE 19 and partners' property and consequently confidential. No outputs or any part of it may be sold, used or reproduced in any manner by the consultant without prior permission from ARTICLE 19.

11. Skills Required

- Relevant academic background (Master's Degree preferred)
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in the design and undertaking of programme evaluations using participatory M&E methodologies
- Knowledge of human rights trends, particularly on freedom of expression and equality & non-discrimination in Eastern Europe and Central Asia
- Knowledge of international human rights law and awareness of mechanisms for the protection of human rights at international and regional level
- Knowledge of historical context and recent political, economic and social developments in the region

- Excellent analytical, interpersonal and communication skills
- Written and spoken fluency in English and Russian

12. How to apply

Applicants should send:

- CV and a covering letter introducing the evaluator and how the skills and competencies described above are met, with concrete examples
- A two page outline of the proposed evaluation process and methodology
- One recent example of a previous evaluation
- Two referees we can contact to verify experience

Application deadline: **Thursday 30 November 2017**

Applications to be submitted to: Katie@article19.org

13. Attachments/annexes:

The Consultant will be provided upon appointment with a list of people to interview. Key project documentation shall be shared with the evaluator to facilitate the process of evaluation, which will include:

- ARTICLE 19's Theory of Change
- Full Project Proposal (Narrative inputs, log frame and budget)
- Annual Donor Reports (financial and narrative)
- Campaigns and advocacy/communications pieces produced during the project
- Training Feedback from participants