

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

PROJECT EVALUATION USING OUTCOME HARVESTING METHODOLOGY

Project Title: Promoting dialogue and collaboration among youth to counter extremism in Kyrgyzstan

Expected Start Date: 1 April 2020

Overview

Saferworld Kyrgyzstan is planning to hire a consultant to work with its Regional Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Coordinator to conduct an external end-of-project evaluation of the project “Promoting dialogue and collaboration among youth to counter extremism in Kyrgyzstan,” which was funded by the European Commission (EC). The consultant will look at the project’s impact on youth capacity in the country and in what ways it has (or has not) facilitated greater collaboration between young people and local authorities, and what effect it has had on civic activism and collaborative youth-led initiatives that address the security concerns of young people in Kyrgyzstan. The evaluation involves reviewing internal and external documents as well as conducting key informant interviews (KIIs) and/or focus group discussions (FGDs) with the project team, partner, project participants (including youth-led initiative groups), district- and province-level authorities, the donor, and other project participants.

1. Background and context

Saferworld is an independent international organisation working to prevent violent conflict and build safer lives. We work with local people affected by conflict to improve their safety and sense of security. We do this by supporting effective policies and practices through advocacy, research and policy development, and through supporting the actions of others.

From January 2017 to May 2020, [Saferworld Kyrgyzstan](#), together with its partner [Foundation for Tolerance International](#), implemented a project supported by the EC, which aimed at strengthening youth capacity in the south of Kyrgyzstan to promote open and public discourse on religion and democracy – in order to help them become less susceptible to harmful rhetoric that fuels conflict. The project targeted three southern provinces of Kyrgyzstan: Batken, Jalal-Abad and Osh. The project facilitated spaces for young women and men from southern Kyrgyzstan to collectively identify and articulate their peace and security concerns, empowering them to advocate for action and accountability from their authorities, and creating opportunities for meaningful youth participation in decision-making processes around peace and security in their communities. This project amplified the voices of young women and men through [youth-led research](#) – during which they were asked to contribute their ideas and concerns – and promoted inclusive processes in a context where young people have been largely excluded from decision-making. Our rationale for this project can be summarized in our **Theory of Change**, that: IF we support young women and men, including formal and informal female leaders in the south of Kyrgyzstan, to understand the negative impacts of extremist rhetoric, and analyze the factors that might drive more extreme behavior, THEN they can better formulate initiatives to address these factors and advocate for better approaches with other actors, BECAUSE a more nuanced understanding of these tendencies and the factors underlying them will provide a basis from which both youth and other actors can create responses that are targeted, preventative, and conflict-sensitive.

2. Project objectives

The **overall objective** of this project is to facilitate greater collaboration and civic activism, and to support youth to lead collaborative initiatives to raise awareness of, address and respond to youth concerns and the use of harmful rhetoric in Kyrgyzstan.

The **specific objective** of this project is to strengthen youth capacity in the south of Kyrgyzstan to promote open and public discourse on religion and democracy, and to become less susceptible to harmful rhetoric that fuels conflict. This will be achieved by accomplishing the following results:

- **Result 1:** Young women and men, including formal and informal women leaders, demonstrate an increased understanding of the effects of harmful or extremist rhetoric, the benefits of dialogue, and the ways in which they can use these approaches to address issues affecting them, the communities they live in and society more broadly.
- **Result 2:** There is greater collaboration between communities, local authorities and security providers through youth-led local initiatives, which also result in more effective solutions to young women and men's concerns in relation to harmful rhetoric.
- **Result 3:** Young women and men, including formal and informal women leaders, engage and advocate for more tailored and appropriate policies for youth collaboration, with the goal of reducing young people's susceptibility to this rhetoric.

3. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation aims:

- to assess project activities and results, and develop recommendations for Saferworld and our partner on improving the impact of our work
- to assess the intended and unintended outcomes of the project and to determine the level of the project's contribution to these outcomes
- to identify and analyse lessons from Saferworld's and our partner's approaches of working with young people.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- identify and describe the outcomes (both expected and unexpected) from project implementation and outline their significance in the project context
- establish the contribution (direct or indirect causal link) of the project to the identified outcomes
- identify lessons learnt and best practices related to the project context, actors engaged, strategies applied in the implementation, and changes observed.

4. Key evaluation questions

This evaluation seeks to answer the following questions (note: the evaluator may adjust or add to these questions, in consultation with Saferworld, to ensure sufficient data is collected):

a) For monitoring and evaluation of project activities and results:

- Have the project outputs and objectives/results been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
- Are the project participants being engaged in a way that is in accordance with the original project plan? Are they satisfied with the project activities? Are activities tailored to their needs?
- What activities have worked? Why? What was the outcome?
- What activities haven't worked? Why?

b) For assessing the intended and unintended outcomes of the project:

- Who are the different actors (individuals, groups, communities, institutions) who were involved in or benefitted from this project? What did each do/are doing differently (change/outcomes), when, and where?
- Why are each of the identified outcomes (in which actors do things differently) significant to the project context?
- How has the project contributed to each outcome? Who else has contributed to these changes? What is the evidence?
- Are the outcomes of the project the result of project activities, external factors or both?
- What do the different actors and stakeholders themselves perceive to be the impact of the project?
- What are the major external and internal factors influencing the achievement of the project's outcomes?
- What were the changes within the local, provincial and national-level authorities or structures that helped in ensuring that needs and perspectives of different youth groups were met during decision-making processes, in regards to peace and security?
- Do the project's specific objective and three results listed above remain valid and relevant as originally envisioned, or have they become less relevant?
- What are the gender implications of the identified outcomes? Do they affect young women and men differently?
- Are the outcomes sustainable, or are they one-off changes?
- Are there areas where we there have been no outcomes, or where there have been negative outcomes? If so, why? Do we need to change our approach or ways of working or should we focus on other areas instead?

c) For identifying lessons from the project's contribution to strengthening capacity of youth to facilitate civic activism, develop and lead youth-led collaborative initiatives addressing young people's concerns:

- Will the benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
- How did local institutions support the project, and was the project well integrated into social and cultural structures?
- How useful have the implemented initiatives been in strengthening the capacity of young people in the three targeted provinces?
- During the development and implementation of the initiatives, what could have been done better, and what outcomes could be expected from these improvements?
- What are your recommendations for improving the sustainability of the project's impact?

5. Evaluation methodology and process

As Saferworld's approach to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) is done through outcome harvesting, this evaluation will use the outcome harvesting methodology. This approach is detailed in our learning paper [Doing things differently](#). The focus of such an outcome harvesting evaluation is to interact with various categories of project participants with the aim of establishing what changes in behaviour and relationships have taken place as a result of our work, and what the significance of those changes are – both in the short and long term. It is expected that the evaluator will engage with the project team, our partner, and select project participants to identify and document significant outcomes realised during the project implementation.

The outcome information should be collected in the following ways:

- Review project documents, including monitoring data on the project outputs and outcomes, and identify preliminary outcomes.
- Participation in the Outcome Harvesting workshop

- Conduct KIIs and/or FGDs with selected project participants (youth, women, local/sub-national [province-level] and national government authorities) to substantiate and verify harvested outcomes and to identify additional outcomes.
- Conduct KIIs and/or FGDs with the project team (Saferworld and partner FTI) to expand on the identified outcomes, contextualise, and analyse their significance, as well as discuss how they contributed to achieving the project objectives (as applicable).
- By speaking to selected project participants, identify two topics on which to write stories of change (case studies) that will go into the final evaluation report.

The outcome harvesting and data collection methods should be described in more detail in the expression of interest, clearly outlining how they will be used in practice during the evaluation process.

6. Evaluation outputs

The expected outputs include:

- Inception report, including methodology and work plan, produced and shared after an initial briefing with Saferworld
- Participation in an Outcome Harvesting workshop
- Conduct FGDs and KIIs, with the selection of participants to be determined in consultation with Saferworld and partner during the briefing meeting
- Draft evaluation report produced for Saferworld's and partner's review
- Production of a final evaluation report, incorporating Saferworld's and partner's feedback. The report should be written in clear and concise English, be of high quality to share both internally and externally, and should not exceed 20 pages, excluding any annexes (for example, list of people interviewed)
- At least two stories of change (maximum two pages each) included in the annexes

7. Timeframe

The final report should be **submitted to Saferworld no later than 30 April 2020**. The suggested timeframe is below, although it could be subject to change at a later stage.

Days required	Activities
0.5 day	Debrief on methodology and preparation session with Saferworld
5 days	Desk review of existing programme documentation (including project proposal documents, youth-led community security assessments, documents related to youth-led initiatives, training materials and participants' evaluation sheets, outcomes collected through regular Outcome Harvesting with partner, partner reports, and annual donor reports)
2 days (in April)	Participation in Outcome Harvesting workshop with Saferworld and partner FTI that will be held in April 2020
10 days	Data collection/field visit to project locations to conduct FGDs and KIIs with project participants, the project team (including FTI), the donor, authorities and any other relevant people or groups involved in the project
10 days	Write up draft final evaluation report (including case studies) for review/feedback from Saferworld and FTI
1 day	Validation workshop with Saferworld and FTI (and MEL Adviser in London if needed) to discuss the findings
3 days	Incorporate feedback from Saferworld and FTI, and produce the final evaluation report

0.5 days	Debrief and feedback meeting with Saferworld and FTI
----------	--

8. Approaches

- The evaluator will work closely with Saferworld and the partner project team, as well as with Saferworld's Regional MEL Coordinator, to design and undertake the evaluation using the Outcome Harvesting methodology.
- The evaluator will manage the process from inception to completion, working closely with Saferworld and partner FTI; the evaluator will be managed by the Saferworld Project Manager.
- The analysis, approach, and methods should adhere to Saferworld's conflict and gender sensitivity approaches and its community security model, and should strive for simplicity in design and for practical application.
- The analysis, approach and methods should be participatory, whereby team members, partner and participants are involved throughout the process.

9. Required qualifications, skills, and characteristics

The assignment will be contracted to an evaluator/company with experience in the following areas:

- Significant experience designing and leading evaluations and/or reviews based on Outcome Harvesting, including a demonstrable understanding of qualitative and participatory approaches
- Experience working in fragile and conflict-affected contexts
- Strong experience and communication skills to facilitate interviews (including remotely), with a range of actors
- Practical experience in Outcome Harvesting, or in using 'most significant change' and utilisation-focused evaluation tools
- Demonstrable experience of producing high-quality, credible reports in English
- Excellent written and verbal communications skills in English
- Sound knowledge of Central Asia, highly desirable knowledge of Kyrgyzstan context
- Preferable fluency in Russian and/or Kyrgyz language (non-Russian and non-Kyrgyz speakers will need to budget for adequate translation as part of their application)
- Demonstrable experience conducting evaluations for conflict prevention, peacebuilding or youth projects

Application process

Saferworld invites expressions of interest from evaluators/companies with the required skills and experience. The expression of interest should comprise:

- A cover letter outlining relevant experience and suitability for the consultancy (maximum 1 page)
- An outline of the methodology proposed for the assignment (maximum 2 pages)
- CV/company profile, including contact details for two referees/references
- A sample of previous work relevant to the assignment (in English)
- Indicative budget (maximum 1 page) covering daily rate(s) and any related expenses. Rates should be in USD and inclusive of VAT. The budget should be inclusive of visa fee and translation costs (if the evaluator does not speak local languages), including all travel-related costs (international and local flights, and in-country accommodation).

Please submit expressions of interest with all supporting information to recruitment@saferworld.org.uk. Your e-mail must have a subject heading with 'Kyrgyzstan EC Project Evaluation' included.

Deadline for applications is 26 February, 2020.

We regret only shortlisted candidates/companies will be contacted. It is anticipated that interviews will take place the week following the application deadline.

