

# Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

## Local leadership for global impact

### Background for the Assignment

#### Purpose

GNDR seeks an external consultant to verify the achievements made in the “Local Leadership for Global Impact” (LLGI) programme that was commissioned by BMZ in June 2021, and will reach its conclusion in March 2024.

#### Project background

In the midst of a pandemic and when multiple national and international frameworks<sup>1</sup> were grappling with how to address risks that were increasing in frequency, intensity and becoming more complex, GNDR – in partnership with Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe – launched an ambition programme to address the lack of local actors in key decision making spaces. Since then, over 800 civil society organisations from over 50 countries have been actively engaged in research, action and advocacy to see those living on the frontline of risk lead planning decisions to reduce disaster risk. Its implementation has been seen in Asia, the Pacific, Africa, West Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean.

LLGI<sup>2</sup> has championed calls to action on risk-informed development, addressing the climate crisis and scaling up locally led anticipatory action. The calls were based on the problem that local actors at the frontline of crises, including civil society organisations, local government and community leaders, were excluded from resilience processes. 84% of local actors report not being included in assessing threats, preparing policies and plans, and taking action to reduce threats.<sup>3</sup> Women in particular were not systematically leading DRR despite having specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Including the Sendai Framework, Paris Agreement, Sustainable Development Goals and, since 2021, the Early Warning for All initiative

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gndr.org/project/local-leadership/>

<sup>3</sup> Views from the Frontline 2019 Report – Why are people still losing their lives and livelihoods to disasters? GNDR and its members asked over 100,000 local actors about their perspectives of risk and resilience across 42 countries. <https://global-report.vfl.world/>

needs during crises that are often not addressed. The project aimed to address three specific problem areas:

- (1) Ensuring all development considered the underlying drivers of risk by ensuring local data informed holistic development actions
- (2) Effectively reducing disaster risk in the context of unknown climate change by ensuring climate projections are used by local actors to plan for future disasters
- (3) Ensuring longer-term resilience is built whilst responding to emergencies through approaches contributing to community resilience are applied in local government contingency planning

### Goal, Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs

The goal of the LLGI was to ensure communities are more resilient to complex disasters. It was hoped that, once the project was complete, CSOs would have the capacities, experience, and the enabling environment to further build the resilience of communities to complex disasters according to 3 workstreams:

- (1) Local data informs holistic development actions
- (2) Climate projections are used by local actors to plan for future disasters
- (3) Approaches contributing to community resilience are applied in local government contingency planning.

Thus, the outcomes and outputs of LLGI were:

Outcomes	Outputs
CSOs have increased capacities to plan for complex disasters	1.1 Guidance on how to use local risk information to inform development actions is developed, disseminated and utilised 1.2 Training module to support CSOs in using localised climate projections available and used 1.3 Tools for contingency planning are developed and CSOs trained
Locally-led disaster planning approaches are trialled in most at-risk communities	2.1 Microgrants provided to 15 partners to implement evidence-based community resilience plans in 195 communities most at risk 2.2: Exchanges organised for climate scientists and local practitioners to share and jointly apply each other's perspectives and approaches in adapting to climate change 2.3 Local contingency planning developed and implemented

National and international systems are amended to support CSOs to plan for complex disasters	<p>3.1 Globally lessons learnt captured and campaigns realised on the benefit of implementing locally-led, risk-informed and coherent planning</p> <p>3.2 Findings from communities on localising climate projections are shared and campaigns launched with international decision makers</p> <p>3.3 Lessons learnt on locally-led contingency planning documented, and campaigns conducted with national and international stakeholders</p>
--	---

## Previous Evaluations

[Annual reviews](#) have been conducted by an external consultant in January 2022, for progress achieved between June–December 2021, and March 2023, for progress achieved between January– December 2022.

Recommendations drawn from these reviews included how to:

- Further engage multiple partners in various platforms
- Strengthen partnership between implementing partners themselves, and between implementing partners and civil society organisations
- Effectively document lessons learned and evidence from multiple sources
- Make improvements on monitoring processes
- Develop more nuanced advocacy messages, based on project evidence
- Further consider ways of working within the network
- (For future projects) Strengthening theory of change and project design elements

## Scope of Evaluation, Key Evaluation Issues, Questions and Criteria

The task is to implement a final project evaluation of the programme, across all of its activities. It will cover all activities that have taken place since the beginning of the project (June 2021) until the final evaluation (April 2024).

The overall purpose of the final evaluation is to:

- (1) Verify evidence of change by evaluating both qualitative and quantitative data against the project’s indicators; capturing achievements of the programme’s results and indicators; going beyond the recommendations of the annual reviews. This should include verification of how the program influenced changes on policy at local and global levels.

- (2) Draw lessons and concrete recommendations contributing towards (a) Programme Goal and Outcomes and (b) overall GNDR strategy 2021-2025.
- (3) Showcase examples of change of policies and practices and lessons learnt particularly in the areas of (a) localisation<sup>4</sup> - including the group finance mechanism developed in the project, (b) risk-informed development and (c) strengthening the collaborations across levels for building a coherent approach towards risks and resilience.
- (4) Showcase examples of how the programme has ensured accountability towards the communities most at risk.
- (5) Highlight how overall resilience has been strengthened through the project

For the purposes of this evaluation, the key questions identified by the stakeholders were organised in line with OECD DAC criteria under several main evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and (road to) impact. Furthermore, the evaluation will look at capacity development, partnerships, visibility and results-based management (RBM)/ monitoring/ evaluation as cross-cutting themes.

## Evaluation questions and rating

Relevance and Coherence	Are the project's objectives and target groups addressing identified needs at the local and national context?
	Were the conclusions at the global level and national level feeding into the overall global policy frameworks as well as the strategic framework of GNDR (internally)?
	How appropriate was the methodological project approach?
Effectiveness	Is the project design articulated in a coherent way? Is the definition of goal, outcomes, and outputs clearly articulated? To what extent were the originally defined objectives of the intervention realistic (achievable)? Was the project planned adequately?
	To what extent have the existing management structures supported the programming and implementation, including monitoring?
	What are the changes produced by the project at the national and global level? What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and

<sup>4</sup> As per the [GNDR strategy](#), localisation involves the transfer and sharing of resources by not only directing international funding to local actors, but also gathering community resources for collective action. Policies and practices must be risk-informed, prioritising the most vulnerable and reflecting the realities on the ground and requires upholding the human rights of people most at risk. It also recognises that communities most at risk, and frontline organisations, must have space to influence, access to resources and the power to make decisions.

	<p>expected results? What are the results achieved? What were the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?</p> <p>To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the results?</p> <p>How were lessons learned identified in the annual reviews addressed?</p> <p>What is GNDR and DKH's comparative advantage in designing and implementing this project?</p> <p>How has LLGI contributed to the global policy dialogue and influence to accelerate the achievement of the Sendai Framework for DRR, Agenda 2030, Paris Agreement, etc.?</p>
Efficiency	<p>Were the project funds managed effectively? Could the activities and outputs be delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity? How was the efficiency affected owing to the impacts of COVID 19?</p> <p>Have GNDR and DHK's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme?</p> <p>Was the project cost effective, and how appropriate were the financial means?</p>
Sustainability	<p>Is the project supported by national/local civil society organisations (CSOs)? Do they demonstrate ownership of the project results, leadership, commitment and technical capacity to maintain/implement the benefits of the project?</p> <p>What is the likelihood that the benefits from the project will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time following the end of the project? How far were the project results institutionalised at the local and national level?</p> <p>What have implementing civil society organisations put into place to guarantee sustainability, and what can be learnt from this?</p>
Impact (road to)	<p>What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative, long-term effects of the project?</p> <p>What would the development have been like without the project intervention?</p> <p>How has resilience been strengthened?</p>
Capacity Development	<p>How did the project contribute to capacity development of its stakeholders/beneficiaries? What adaptive or management capacities of national partners have been supported? (Please mention also under all other relevant evaluation criteria, and consider as a general cross cutting theme).</p>
<b>Cross-cutting themes<sup>5</sup></b>	
Gender	<p>To what extent has the project supported women's equal participation with men as decision-makers?</p>

<sup>5</sup> Use scoring rubric for each of the cross-cutting themes documenting evidence for the score

	To what extent are female and male stakeholders satisfied with the results of LLGI in their community?
	Did women and girls face any particular constraints or obstacles in their participation with the project and its activities? If so, how successful was the project in addressing these constraints?
	To what extent were the needs and priorities of women, girls, boys and men reflected in the: (i) activities implemented following the design of the local action plans? (ii) overall design of the LLGI project?
	Were efforts made to ensure equal representation by men and women at all levels of project delivery?
Partnerships and Coordination	How were relevant regional, national and local actors and stakeholders included in GNDR's programming and implementation, incl. policy advocacy processes?
Visibility	Did the project implement EU visibility guidelines? Were project partners and beneficiaries aware of these?
Inclusion	How did the project contribute towards addressing the needs of women, children & youth, people with disabilities through the implementation of the project?
Safeguarding and Protection	What mechanisms were in place to safeguard and protect rights of the communities most at risk?
Forward looking insights <sup>6</sup>	Should VFL programming continue in the future? Were the approaches and strategies used by GNDR effective, relevant and potentially sustainable?
	What did the stakeholders and beneficiaries consider the most necessary approaches/areas of future VFL interventions in their respective countries? At the regional and global level?
	Based on the information and assessment of project progress and achievements, what other approaches/beneficiaries/donors etc. should be considered for a future iteration? How should a future iteration change?

The final set of evaluation questions will be agreed in the inception report.

---

<sup>6</sup> These are not scored but documented for the future iterations

The project performance should be assessed on an agreed sample based on a scoring rubric<sup>7</sup> across workstreams, and against local, national level and global levels.

## Evaluation Approach & Methods

The evaluation shall mainly be conducted remotely through interviews, group discussions and a desk study. The evaluation will develop and apply a rigorous analytical framework to identify the impact of LLGI, particularly in terms of capacity strengthening, locally led planning, action and advocacy - at local, national and international levels. Evaluators are expected to detail this framework in the technical offer.

The evaluation will assess the impact of the activities led by the GNDR Secretariat, DKH staff and that of its implementing partners. The evaluation will draw out how this contribution has fared in comparison with factors affecting the engagement of the stakeholders for the type of work highlighted, and a critical analysis of the impact of factors external to the project.

The evaluation will be expected to collect data from a cross-section of representatives of implementing partners and external key stakeholders, including a diversity of respondents and different levels of seniority. Interviews with implementing and external partners, including representatives of donor agencies, national governments and international institutions should be undertaken. The list of interviewees and subjects for any case studies will be determined with GNDR and DKH at the inception phase. The evaluation methodology and data collection tools will need approval from GNDR.

Principles underpinning the evaluator's approach are:

---

<sup>7</sup> Suggested scoring rubric (Adapted from "Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review", New Zealand Qualifications Authority, September 2009 and further drawing on Rich Tobin):

**Excellent (Always):** Performance is clearly very strong or exemplary in relation to the evaluation question/domain. No gaps or weaknesses were identified.

**Very good (almost always):** Overall strong, but not exemplary performance on virtually all aspects of the evaluation question/domain. Weaknesses are not significant and are managed effectively.

**Good (Mostly, with some exceptions):** Performance is reasonably strong on most aspects of the evaluation question/domain. No significant gaps or weaknesses, and less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively.

**Adequate (Sometimes, with many exceptions):** Performance is inconsistent in relation to the question. There are some serious but non-fatal gaps/weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/requirements as far as can be determined.

**Poor (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses evident):** Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the evaluation question/domain. Serious and widespread weaknesses on crucial aspects. Does not meet minimum expectations/requirements.

**Insufficient evidence:** Evidence unavailable or of insufficient quality to determine performance.

- Participatory and culturally sensitive process valuing knowledge and approaches from within the context
- Impartiality and independence of the evaluation process from the programming and implementation functions
- Credibility of the evaluation, through use of appropriately skilled and independent expert
- Transparency of the evaluation process, including wide dissemination of results
- Usefulness of the evaluation findings and recommendations, through timely presentation of relevant, productively critical, clear and concise information, and commitment to building capacity.

The evaluation will have a cross-cutting consideration for inclusion, ensuring that factors related to gender, culture, language and other areas are taken into account.

The evaluation will consist of several phases:

- (1) **Contracting:** Contract is signed, and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents are provided to the evaluator.
- (2) **Inception phase:** An inception meeting will be held, along with the submission of an inception report. This should be more detailed in terms of the overall design and process of evaluation. It should also mention the method and approach that will be taken in regard to how data will be obtained and analysed based on the key documents provided. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report. Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix shall be discussed and validated at that stage.
- (3) **Evaluation phase:** The evaluator studies all necessary project documents; re-constructs and analyses the intervention logic and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted. It is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face (with a limited number of persons) or by phone, group discussions, online-surveys (if applicable), others. Field trips to visit the partners and members as foreseen as necessary and on the availability of the budget.
- (4) **Final draft report:** Submission and presentation of final draft report to GNDR Senior Leadership Team, DKH leadership and those directly involved in the project. It should include all the comments from the partners and stakeholders.
- (5) **Final delivery:** Submission of final deliverables.



The evaluators will work closely with the GNDR Secretariat, DKH Head Office and DKH Mozambique Office to ensure regular communications and meetings throughout the evaluation phase. Support for the logistical aspects of the evaluation can be provided by the GNDR Secretariat.

## 5. Deliverables

The following is required to be delivered during the evaluation period:

- (1) **Inception report**, including a detailed methodology, list of interviewees and tools for the evaluation
- (2) **Draft and final evaluation report** in English addressing the evaluation questions and including:
  - (a) executive summary of key findings and recommendations;
  - (b) evaluation findings, analysis and conclusions with associated evidence and data clearly illustrated. Use of tables, graphs, quotes, anecdotes and stories to illustrate findings and conclusions is encouraged;
  - (c) case studies, which should illustrate stories of the impact of GNDR, DKH and local implementing partners on specific policies, processes and their implementation;
  - (d) recommendations for the next actions, which should be practical and linked directly to conclusions;
  - (e) appendices, including methodology and evaluation tools, list of interviewees/interview dates, questionnaire, and brief biography of evaluator(s)
- (3) **Presentations** of final findings to GNDR Secretariat, DKH staff and LLGI programme team.

## 6. Profile and qualifications of the consultant

Applicants may be individuals or a team of consultants. As a diverse network, GNDR encourages mixed teams, with different backgrounds and genders.

Key qualifications should include:

## Essential

- Relevant academic degree.
- A minimum of ten years' experience and expertise in the non-profit sector, preferably networks in the field of development and linked to networks.
- At least three evaluations in the last five years, ideally impact evaluations, and experience of focusing on capacity strengthening, advocacy and policy and/or themes of risk-informed development or disaster risk reduction. At least one evaluation should have been remotely conducted in the last two years.
- Demonstrated experience of evaluation involving qualitative data and 'soft' outcomes
- Working experience in several countries and continents
- Experience in project cycle management
- Excellent oral and written English skills

## Preferred

- Demonstrated experience of evaluating multi-country projects that are funded by BHA
- Capacity to study documentation and conduct interviews in English, French, Portuguese and/or Spanish.<sup>8</sup>

## 7. Application procedure

The application documents must be submitted no later than Monday 4 December 2023 in electronic format to the following address: [elise.belcher@gndr.org](mailto:elise.belcher@gndr.org) "Final Evaluation: LLGI" in the subject line.

The application file should include:

### (1) A technical offer including:

- Evaluation methodology: Describe your overall approach and evaluation methodology including, but not limited to, evaluation questions, evaluation design, proposed tools and methodology.
- Understanding of the issues at stake and the Terms of Reference.
- Relevant experience: Provide details of projects of similar scope, complexity and nature you have worked on previously.
- Specific expertise on themes mentioned

---

<sup>8</sup> Translation and interpretation can be provided if necessary

- Key personnel and staffing: Describe the key personnel and include CVs (no more than 2 pages each and attached as annex) of key personnel who will be part of the proposed plan
- Timeline: Include a suggested timeline of key activities.
- Three references (including telephone numbers) and any web links to previous work (if available) or annexes.

Applicants should clearly highlight any current or previous working or personal links to GNDR, as well as any risk around conflict of interest.

### (2) A detailed financial offer including:

- A line-item budget detailing the cost estimates. The budget should be presented in Euro (including VAT and any other taxes). The tenderer should include his/her proposed daily rate, including all costs.
- A budget narrative.

## 8. Provisional calendar

### Selection process

- Bids should be submitted no later than 4 December 2023
- Interviews of shortlisted candidates will take place during the week of 11 December 2023
- Final contract aims to be signed by 22 December 2023

### Evaluation process

A total maximum of 30 working days over 11 weeks is currently estimated for this assignment (negotiable depending on methodology). The contract will set out payment milestones, including that a final payment is dependent on the submission and approval of the final evaluation report.

Contracting of evaluators	December 2023
Inception phase, including kick-off meeting / inception meeting	8 January 2023 - 26 January 2023
Evaluation phase	5 February 2023 - 8 March 2023

Draft report	15 March 2023
Final delivery	22 March 2023