



The Lutheran World Federation Myanmar Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCE for MID-TERM EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Projects: Rights-based Empowerment Projects – Rakhine (31-3634) // Kayin & Chin (31-4208)
Eval. Period: 01 January 2019 to 31 December 2020
Eval. Dates: January – March 2021

Note that this is open to national and international teams. A national team member is recommended. Travel by anyone to field sites is unlikely, so the proposal should indicate how the evaluation team plans to implement remotely, in collaboration with LWF Yangon staff and field teams who would help collect data.

1. Background of the evaluation

The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) Myanmar is an international non-governmental organization serving the people of Myanmar since 2008. We are a rights-based humanitarian and development organization. Therefore, people are at the centre of everything we do. LWF works with internally displaced persons, returnees, host community members, people living in poverty, and marginalized populations. LWF Myanmar engages with and supports duty-bearers while empowering partner individuals, households, and community development organizations to claim their rights.

LWF envisions the “People of Myanmar living in a just society in peace and dignity, united in diversity, are able to meet their basic needs, achieve their full potential, and claim their universal rights in order to improve their quality of life individually and collectively.” Within the present LWF Myanmar Strategy 2019-2024, our work spans the realms of humanitarian assistance, recovery, rights-based advocacy, and long-term development, building upon three interrelated programmatic areas: Livelihoods; Quality services; and Protection and social cohesion.

A commitment to the human rights of every individual, regardless of their status, guides our work, actions, and operations. A rights-based empowerment approach underpins all activities and projects. LWF is known for its timely, compassionate, and professional humanitarian work, and for our field presence in hard-to-reach areas. Above all, LWF works with the most vulnerable, and in order to claim and uphold their rights, we facilitate communities to engage proactively with government duty-bearers.

LWF’s work is expected to contribute to the national goal of poverty alleviation in Myanmar. It will contribute to the promotion and maintenance of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development that provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels.

The two projects to be evaluated are cornerstones of LWF Myanmar’s “Rights-based Empowerment Programme”. The projects are a continuation of a previous phase of the programme, and presently runs

from January 2019 – December 2021. These two 3-year projects are implemented in the following townships with number of partner communities in parentheses:

Kayin State: Hlaingbwe (11), Hpapun (5), and Kyainseikgyi (16) townships
Chin State: Matupi (27) and Mindat (36) townships
Rakhine State: Ann (29) townships

As-of June 2020, the programme was underway in 124 partner communities. LWF has been working in continuous partnership with many of these communities since 2013/4 in Chin, 2015 in Kayin, and 2016 in Ann. The three states have very different cultural, topographical, and livelihoods contexts. Funding partners are LWF related agencies, in order of contribution: Bread for the World (Germany), Act Church of Sweden, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, Dan Church Aid (Denmark), and the German National Committee. The Ann project is partially funded by another Finn Church Aid project that focuses on empowering women as entrepreneurs. Lessons from that project should transfer to other programme sites.

The projects directly contribute towards LWF’s Country Results Framework and Global Outcome Framework with the following objectives:

- 1) Livelihoods: Communities have increased access to livelihoods and income generating opportunities
- 2) Quality Services: Communities have improved access to quality basic services (incl. roads, water, toilets, electricity, education, and healthcare)
- 3) Protection & Social Cohesion: Rights-holders, especially women, are empowered in managing their individual, household, and village development through accessing their rights and entitlements

The most important aspect of the programme is not simply achieving the targets, but rather, the process through which communities gain the confidence, skills, and capacity to claim their rights. The programme is implanted by communities, with participatory self-assessments, action planning, selection of partner households, and management of community action groups all run by communities themselves. Thus, the roles of communities in managing their own development processes is paramount, with increasing ownership burden placed upon communities commensurate with gradual LWF phase-out. This “graduation approach” is central to the sustainable success of the programme and needs to be carefully evaluated. The role of women as empowered actors in their households and communities is also of paramount importance to the programme – including their election to official positions. COVID-19 had a major impact on partner communities and the project is expected to adapt accordingly.

Selected reference documents are listed under heading 5 below. Electronic versions will be provided to the evaluation team.

This evaluation is important as it occurs at the half-way point of a three-year programme, and the findings will be crucial towards the development of proposals for the ensuing phase of the project.

2. Purpose and time frame of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Review the projects in light of the 2019-2024 LWF Country Strategy;
- Examine the extent to which the RBEP has been able to achieve specific objective(s) and results as stated in the logical frameworks and the project document;

- Assess the suitability of the used approaches and methodologies in relation to the context and the expected specific objectives and results of the RBEP;
- Assess the ability of the programme to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic from the perspectives of preventing virus spread and mitigating the socio-economic impact;
- Indicate whether the project indicators effectively capture the intended impact of the project and make suggestions for improvement;
- Indicate the best practices as well as development needs of the programme and project management processes and practices of LWF Myanmar;
- Ascertain the degree to which the programme responded effectively to the impact of COVID-19 in meeting the needs of communities and duty-bearers; and
- Recommend considerations for next phase of RBEP for the period 2019-2021.

The external evaluation should be conducted from January through March 2020, with a draft report delivered to LWF Myanmar by 15 March 2021 and a final version of the report by 31 March 2021. The evaluation report, raw data, a PowerPoint presentation, and a three to five page abstract (as a stand-alone document) will also serve as a dissemination tool of the project main achievements and lessons learned.

3. Scope and focus of the evaluation

The evaluation is expected to provide answers to the following questions. The Evaluation Team are expected to add to these as deemed appropriate.

Relevance:

- To what extent does the programme comply with LWF strategies?
- To what extent is the programme supportive of government strategies / policies?
- How have any changes in the national policy environment (including democratization and solving the over-riding challenge of ethnic conflict) affected project's relevance?
- Is the programme logic coherent and accurate?
- To what extent have the approaches and methods been appropriate for the context?
- To what extent has the programme addressed the needs and aspirations of the participants (beneficiaries)¹?
- Are the indicators of outcomes, specific objectives, and results "SMART"?
- To what degree have stakeholders (rights-holders and duty-bearers) participated in the development process and do rights-holders have ownership?
- How appropriate was the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human, and administrative resources)?
- How effective and appropriate are monitoring arrangements, including quality assurance / coaching, data capture, and project management processes?
- How effectively have the risks been assessed and managed?
- How have recommendations from previous review/evaluations/studies been addressed?
- How has the project assisted communities to prevent and mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19?

¹ LWF acts as a facilitator of rights-based empowerment that partners with project participants who can include partner households, livelihoods participants, and community action groups such as village development committees, women's groups, community-based savings and credit associations (also called "rice banks"), farmer's groups, youth groups, community-based disaster risk management committees, school committees, and others. Hence, the term "project participants" is a more accurate use of terminology than "primary beneficiaries".

Effectiveness:

- To what extent have activities contributed to achievement of the country results framework outcomes, and RBEP specific objectives and results?
- How has the project promoted the roles of women as leaders within households and in civic governance, including representation of women's concerns, leadership, and decision-making roles²?
- What are some of the key unplanned impacts, both positive and negative?
- Have the project activities or approaches (including selection of partner households and beneficiaries of livelihoods or micro-business support, those excluded from savings and credit associations) lead to division, tension and/or aggravate inter-communal conflict? If so, how?
- How effective has coordination been with other humanitarian and development actors?
- How effectively do LWF and local authorities cooperate, including technical extension staff, and to what degree have the networking meetings between rights-holders and duty-bearers achieved results?
- How effective has the programme been in including people of different ages and those with special needs?
- To what extent are the activities and methods conflict-sensitive?
- To what extent does the programme comply with Core Humanitarian Standards?

Efficiency:

- What was the quality and timeliness of inputs delivered?
- To what extent have the costs been justified by the benefits/impacts?
- To what extent the project activities are synergized with other programme activities in the same project site, including other LWF and INGO activities?
- What is the level of participation of partner communities, community action groups³, and partner households in project implementation?
- What have been the contributions (monetary and non-monetary) from communities, duty-bearers, and other key stakeholders?
- Is the methodology of implementation the right one under the circumstances?
- What is the local government's assessment of LWF Myanmar work?
- What is the assessment of UN Agencies, INGOs, and LNGOs of LWF Myanmar work?
- What are the main implementation challenges (access, staff, security, community member time availability, technical expert availability, and others)?
- How effective was the day-to-day management: operational planning, implementation, budget management, personnel management, logistics, risk management, coordination, information management, reporting, and deadlines?

Sustainability:

- What is likely to happen to the positive effects of the programme after the external assistance comes to an end?
- To what extent can the outputs be expected to be sustainable over the longer (5-10 years) term?

² Decision-makers and leaders include Village Development Committee Chairperson, Village Administrator, 10 Household Leader, 100 Household Leader, Village Tract Administrator, and parliamentarians. What is the progress in promotion of women to other less influential leadership positions, and is that leading towards more women representation at these top levels?

³ Village Development Committees, Women's Groups, Youth Groups, Child Clubs, Farmer's Groups, Rice Banks, Savings & Credit Associations, etc.

- To what degree has the role of women as proactive community leaders transformed into permanent change?
- What characteristics make the outputs sustainable or unsustainable?
- To what degree will communities continue to engage proactively with duty-bearers, including the Karen National Union, after project phase-out?
- How are community action groups taking ownership of the concepts and approaches? Will they continue to function after their community “graduates”?
- To what extent are the people themselves contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives?
- Has LWF Myanmar formulated a practical exit strategy, do communities truly understand and buy into it, and is it working (“graduation approach”)? This is important.

(Immediate) Impacts:

- To what extent have project participants benefited from processes, activities, and outputs?
- To what extent have community action groups and their members benefited from processes, activities, and outputs?
- Will the project participants likely carry forward the achieved results?
- To what extent have duty-bearers benefited from the activities and outputs?
- To what extent are the overall objectives RBEP achieved?
- Can the approach and achieved results be replicated?
- To what extent is the impact likely to be sustainable over the longer term?
- What are the transformative or most significant changes?
- Has the project increased or decreased dependency on outside intervention? Why?
- Should there be a third phase of the project to consolidate the achievements? Why?

Management arrangements:

- How adequate are capacities (time, staff, finance, and other resources) versus the tasks?
- Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all involved?
- To what degree do Yangon staff, Area Coordinators, Community Empowerment Officers, and Community Empowerment Facilitators have a solid understanding of programme, including civic governance aspects?
- To what degree is downward administrative and technical support adequate?
- How are risks managed?
- How effective is the communication within the team?
- Is the PMER system in place and how effective is it? How can the indicators be made more “SMART” to capture achievement as well as impact?
- To what degree is useful data being systematically collected and analysed?
- How effectively is publicity being systematically produced from communities to Yangon, and utilized by LWF, Related Agencies⁴, and their back donors to demonstrate success and support resource mobilization?

4. Evaluation process and methods

The overall flow of the evaluation process and a tentative timetable is suggested to be as follows:

⁴ Related Agencies are other Act Alliance members who provide financial and technical inputs to the programme, including Bread for the World (Germany), Act Church of Sweden, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, Dan Church Aid (Denmark), and the German National Committee.

Activity	Dates	Activity Detail	Output
State 1: Preparation (10 days)			
Develop research methodology	(5 days)	Liaise with LWF staff to establish priorities for research and discuss logistics of field work and overall time frame for the research. Close joint review of the tools and sampling methods – usually evaluations break down at this point. Review logistics, select target sites, and produce evaluation schedule.	2-page methodology (inception report) Evaluation schedule
Desktop survey of all relevant project documents materials and current practices		Review of all documentation as outlined in ToR. Study any reports or publications relating to the project and the area	
Develop / review questionnaires and database	(5 days)	Produce and review questionnaires all categories of participants; individual participant interviews and key informant interviews are preferable to focus group discussions (except in specific cases). Review and amend database on which to input the data received from the field work. Review system and tools for collecting qualitative data to ensure common recording mechanism.	Questionnaires KoBo set-up & pre-tested Database
Stage 2: Data capture (25 days)			
Kayin assessment	(7 days)	Meet with project implementation staff and training session on data collection using KoBo Toolkit MS Teams and telephone meetings with interviewees, as per the evaluation schedule; review sessions with management	Trained staff Raw data
Ann assessment	(7 days)	Meet with project implementation staff and training session on data collection using KoBo Toolkit MS Teams and telephone meetings with interviewees, as per the evaluation schedule; review	Trained staff Raw data

Chin assessment	(10 days)	Meet with project implementation staff and training session on data collection using KoBo Toolkit MS Teams and telephone meetings with interviewees, as per the evaluation schedule; review	Trained staff Raw data
LWF management & field staff feedback session	(1 day)	Feedback of initial impressions and issues relevant to strategy and for inclusion in the report to LWF senior management team in LWF office	Meeting minutes
Stage 3: Report preparation (16 days)			
Produce rough draft of report	(5 days)	Clean and analyze data, produce rough report draft with summary graphics, findings, and recommendations	Draft report
Evaluation team reflection workshops with partners	(3 days)	Group meeting of evaluation participants and stakeholders by MS Teams or Zoom to review / discuss findings and agree on recommendation. One day per field site.	Meeting minutes
Produce draft report and present findings	(7 days)	Produce and present draft report including recommendation in agreed format and distribute for comments and amendments	Draft Report PowerPoint
Produce final report.	(1 day)	Produce final report incorporating appropriate amendments.	Final Report

The evaluation work, including the required deliverables (see below), should be completed in maximum of 51 working days.

The proposed are the overall evaluation approach and data collection methods to be used by the evaluators. The evaluators are encouraged to apply other methods within the “participatory” principles. The evaluation team should be aware of the cultural sensitivities (and their inherent biases) and therefore respect those and design the methodologies accordingly.

- Document review – list of documents is provided in section 7 below. This includes policies, manuals, guidelines, tools, management decisions and others). Any missing documents in the list will be added during the course of the evaluation;
- Qualitative and quantitative data – The evaluators will focus on qualitative data, but should also reflect on the quantitative aspects. Focus group discussions can be utilized, but with deliberate care, because they result in hearsay, social desirability bias, and second/third-hand information capture. That said, they could be useful for formative research or for triangulating individual interview findings;
- The evaluation team should interact with as many of the stakeholder groups as possible, including interviews in the group setting. Major stakeholders are described below:
 - a. Individual rights-holders: representatives of partner and livelihoods households, persons with disability, persons with specific needs, community leaders

- b. Rights-holders participating in community action groups: women’s groups, village development committees, community-based disaster risk management sub-committees, parent-teacher associations / school management committees, child clubs, and any others
- c. Duty-bearers: village administrators, village tract administrators, general administrative departments, government technical extension workers or decision-makers based on LWF engagement (disaster management, agriculture, social welfare, education, others)
- d. Development and humanitarian partners in LWF project sites: INGO, LNGO, UN
- e. LWF staff – all levels in the field and Yangon

5. Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of 2-5 members and one of them will be the Team Leader. At least one must be female. Among the members one will have expertise in development project/programme cycle management and another in social research. Experience required in applying integrated, rights-based empowerment processes in rural South-east Asian countries.

The Team Leader is responsible for planning, implementing, and reporting of the evaluation as stated in section “4. Evaluation Process and Methods”. The Evaluation Team is expected to incorporate into its methodology ways of estimating the reliability of the data gathered. It is also expected that the team will collect data only relevant to the key evaluation questions.

Depending on the availability, representatives from the government host department, LWF Related Agencies and funding partners will be invited for active participation in the process.

6. Information sources

Electronic versions of written documents will be provided to the evaluators upon signing of the contract. Additional documents will be made available as need arises. The following documents are available to the evaluation team.

List of documents:

- LWF Myanmar Country Strategy 2019-2024
- Project proposals, results frameworks, and grant agreements
- All six-month and annual progress reports, with annexes
- COVID-19 community impact assessments
- Success stories, LWF Myanmar annual reports, videos, other publicity
- M&E Tools and databases
- LWF Graduation Guidelines (Cambodia)
- LWF Myanmar Partner Communities List
- LWF Myanmar Writing Guide
- LWF Myanmar Word List
- Others as relevant

7. Remuneration and practical arrangements

Remuneration

The LWF Myanmar Programme Coordinator is the staff responsible for this evaluation task. The Evaluation Team will communicate with the Programme Coordinator on a regular basis.

This consultancy will be both product and time based. This means that remuneration will be based on the timely fulfilment of the deliverables.

- LWF Myanmar will pay a consultancy fee as stipulated in the consultancy agreement.
 - o 10% will be paid upon acceptance of the methodology / inception report;
 - o 40% will be paid after submission of the rough draft report & PowerPoint;
 - o 50% will be paid after the acceptance of the final report by LWF Myanmar.
- Taxes will be deducted as required by the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.
- All travel, accommodation, and meals of the evaluation team (if any) will be paid by the LWF. There will be no honorarium or stipend.

- Travel may be limited because of COVID-19 considerations. Social distancing and government guidelines for COVID-19 must be followed strictly.

- The consultant(s) must sign the LWF Code of Conduct, Abuse of Power and Declaration on Child Protection.

Consultant Selection Process

- Interested organizations, consulting firms, or teams are invited to submit proposals. Submission of proposals is open to all interested within Myanmar and outside Myanmar.
- The proposal should contain, a letter justifying capability; organization profile; past experiences; human resource capacity; 2 - 3 sample of reviews and evaluations done in the past; full CVs of two experts who will be involved in this review; and expected per day fee. Also, the proposal should include copy of document proving its legal status.
- If the applicants are teamed individuals than the proposal should include, a letter justifying capability; proof of past relevant experiences; copies of full CVs of the Team Leader and the member; contact details; and expected per day.
- The requirements listed in above bullet points will form the criteria for shortlisting.
- The shortlisted proposals will be invited for interview as appropriate.
- The applications should be submitted via email to: procurement.myanmar@lutheranworld.org
- The deadline for the submission of the applications is **31 December 2020**.
- LWF Myanmar reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals.

Miscellaneous

The evaluators are responsible to avail themselves with equipment such as a laptop with necessary software and others. An ability to arrange online meetings between selected respondents and the evaluators is required.

LWF Myanmar staff will accompany the team and arrange with partner communities and interviewees. Translators shall be arranged by LWF as necessary.

8. Deliverables

***** All deliverables must strictly align to LWF Myanmar Writing Style Guide, LWF Myanmar Word List, and MiMu place spellings per LWF Partner Communities List *****

Final Report:

- Title Page
- Table of contents
- Executive summary
- Introduction (purpose, TOR, Methodology, etc.) – *Much of this can be taken from the ToR*
- Background, History – *Much of this can be taken from the ToR*
- RBEP 2019-2021 Review – *With main focus on effective mainstreaming of the RBE approach*
 - Analysis of the context and the work - *With main focus on effective mainstreaming of the RBE approach*
 - Main Findings and Conclusions (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and management arrangements)
 - Recommendations - *With main focus on effective mainstreaming of the RBE approach*
 - Discussion chapter on women empowerment
 - Discussion chapter on COVID-19
- Annexes
 - Methodology, questionnaires, raw data (including Excel, Word, and other e-files)
 - Dissemination materials (a three to five-page abstract in English and Myanmar language which is understandable as a stand-alone document)
 - TOR
 - Itinerary
 - Meeting reports
 - List of persons met (gender disaggregated)
 - List of reference documents