

CALL FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAMME EVALUATOR

Programme: "CSOs Action for Climate"

Terms of Reference (ToR) and application requirements

1. General information

1.1. Introduction

For the programme "CSOs Action for Climate" (AfC), funded by Sweden and implemented by the Center for Environmental Research and Information Eko-svest, in partnership with the Macedonian Young Lawyers Association (MYLA) and Connecting Natural Values and People Organization (CNVP Macedonia) in the first three programme years, Eko-svest is announcing a call for engaging of external programme evaluator for assessing the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the programme.

1.2. Evaluation object: intervention to be evaluated

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the outcomes and overall impact of the "**CSOs Action for Climate**" programme and to learn about the strengths and weaknesses of implementation.

The "**CSOs Action for Climate**" programme is with duration of 48 months with start date from June 1, 2021, and end date on May 31, 2025.

The general objective is: Strong and vibrant civil society that plays a meaningful role in the process of decarbonization, transformation and renewal of the society, resulting in a clean environment, green economies and healthy citizens in N. Macedonia.

Specific objectives

1. Strengthen and empower the civil society to take part in climate related decision making and take local action through improving their capacities, knowledge and skills and providing the necessary resources for this work.
2. Increase public awareness about the possibilities for low carbon economies and green transformation and build public pressure on institutions to ensure these developments through policy and programme changes.

Expected results:

Result 1: Strengthened capacities of civil society organization

- Strengthened capacities of civil society organisations to take part in climate related decision making.
- Improved skills and knowledge of civil society organisations to perform legal analysis and prepare policy documents and legislative proposals on the topic of climate.

Result 2: Ensured participation of CSOs in policy change

- Increased availability of data and facts on climate and environmental protection to be used by civil society organisations in their activities.
- Created opportunities for CSOs to serve as the "inter-sectoral connectors" between the public and governments and between different governmental institutions.
- Increased presence of CSOs in the public domain and improved image of the civil society organisations in the country.
- Improved policies and programmes on national level.
- Aligned legislation to the EU.

Result 3: Support to CSO organization for climate actions

- Empowered local partners to implement climate actions and watchdogging activities
- Implemented a number of sub-grants.
- Improved livelihoods and economies.

Result 4: Improved visibility, communication and advocacy of CSOs

- Performed studies and analysis with data.
- Implemented public information campaigns aimed at citizens.
- Strengthened Climate Coalition to perform advocacy towards institutions.

Result 5: Increased credibility of CSOs and mobilization of citizens for climate action

- Mobilised citizens to implement practical measures.
- Engaged wide variety of stakeholders to take action.
- Increased cooperation and communication among all stakeholders.

Target groups

- Members of the Climate Coalition and Ekosfera network, amounting to around 80 CSOs active in the field of environmental protection;
- More than 200 existing grass-root CSOs', national CSOs, formal and informal networks addressing different areas/sectors which are relevant to climate change.

Beneficiaries

- Governmental institutions of the system- central and local governments, more specifically - Ministry of Economy, Ministry of environment and physical planning, Ministry of agriculture, forestry and water management, Vice prime Minister office responsible for the economic affairs,
- Municipalities, Centers for regional development, members of Parliament, etc.
- Approximately 2 million citizens in North Macedonia which represents the general public, with a specific focus on vulnerable groups such as women, youth, the elderly, and impoverished communities.

1.3. Evaluation rationale

- To evaluate the progress achieved against objectives and indicators outlined in the project proposal, with a strong focus on assessing the outcomes, impact and sustainability of the intervention.
- To identify positive examples and practices with greatest impacts that could be replicated.
- To identify lessons learned, assess the need for continuous cooperation and provide inputs for designing possible future programme.
- To provide AfC implementation team and the donor, with a basis for determining the value of such cooperation and this contribution.

2. The assignment

2.1. Evaluation purpose: Intended users and intended use

The primary intended users of the evaluation are the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and Eko-vest.

The evaluation should provide an objective assessment of the achievements of the programme; feedback; strengths and weaknesses of the programme's implementation approach; and provide inputs and recommendations and lesson learned. The evaluation should also assess the project's success at integrating Sida's 5 perspectives: the poor people's perspective on development, the rights perspective, conflict, gender equality and environment and climate.

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and shall elaborate in the application how this will be ensured during the evaluation process.

2.2. Evaluation scope

The evaluation scope shall include the time frame of the AfC programme from June 1, 2021 to date, and focus on programme intervention, implementation and outcomes.

The evaluation shall assess the programme at all levels: including all result areas, consortium partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders. The evaluation shall assess the project management and activity implementation with a view to addressing the results (with a lesser focus on outputs and primary focus on outcomes and impact) achieved and assess the effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, it will assess preliminary indications of the potential impact and sustainability of the results, including successful engagement in advocacy at the local and national level. Furthermore, will collect and analyse lessons learned, challenges faced, findings, conclusions and recommendations with respect to a specific development intervention in order to draw lessons learned for future design and implementation.

2.3. Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

The key evaluation questions which will guide the evaluation are as follows:

1) Relevance

- To what extent has the programme's theory of change, objectives and design, particularly the expected results outlined under 1.2, responded to the needs and priorities of key project stakeholders and beneficiaries?

2) Coherence

Internal Coherence:

- Consistency within the project itself.
- Alignment of the project's objectives, activities, outputs, and outcomes.
- Whether the project's design and implementation strategies are logically connected and mutually reinforcing.

External Coherence:

- Coordination with other projects, avoiding overlaps or contradictions.

Stakeholder Coherence:

- Collaboration and alignment among stakeholders (partners, donors, beneficiaries).

3) Effectiveness

- To what extent has the programme delivered on its intended objectives and desired outcomes?
- Compare actual results with planned or expected results to identify gaps or successes.

- To what extent implementation of RBM (Result Based Management): to assess the extent to which the programme has adhered to the tools of results-based management, including the clarity and relevance of the results framework, performance indicators, monitoring and reporting mechanisms;

4) Efficiency

- To what extent has the programme delivered, results in a cost-effective and timely way?

5) Impact

- To what extent has the programme contributed or is expected to contribute to stimulating advocacy and local climate action?

6) Sustainability

Continuity of Benefits:

- Whether the project's outcomes and impacts will persist after funding or external support is withdrawn.

Stakeholder Ownership:

- The extent to which stakeholders, including beneficiaries, are committed to maintaining and supporting the project's outcomes.

Institutional and Policy Integration:

- Whether the project's practices, policies, or innovations are embedded within existing systems, organizations, or policies.

Financial Viability:

- Whether the financial mechanisms or resources needed to sustain the outcomes are in place.

Adaptability:

Considers the project's ability to adapt to changing circumstances, such as economic, environmental, or social shifts.

2.4. Evaluation approach and methodology

The purpose, scope and evaluation questions should determine the most appropriate approach and methodology for the evaluation that captures outcomes and impact. The methodology should include specification and justification of the design of the evaluation and the techniques for data collection and analysis. The selected methodology should answer the evaluation questions using credible evidence. It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods to answer the evaluation questions and present methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation. Selected methodology should acknowledge any constraints encountered and how these may affect the evaluation. The final evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis (including an analysis of the limitations of the chosen methodology) are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception phase of the evaluation.

A gender-responsive approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used¹.

Evaluation shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation² and the evaluator shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation³.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluator should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

2.5. Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by Eko-svest in the frames of "CSOs Action for climate" programme funded by Sweden, represented by the Embassy of Sweden in North Macedonia. Eko-svest will approve the final report of the evaluation. Eko-svest staff and Embassy staff will participate in separate start-up meetings of the evaluation, as well as in the debriefing/validation workshop(s) where preliminary findings and conclusions are discussed.

2.6. Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the call application and further detailed in the inception report. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews needs to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the proposal and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out over an 8-week period between from 15 January 2025 to 15 March 2025.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the evaluator and negotiated during the inception phase.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meetings in AfC team office and Embassy of Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation team ▪ Eko-svest AfC team ▪ Embassy representative 	Within one week of signing contract

¹ See for example UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group (2014) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

² OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/39249691.pdf>

³ Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation <https://www.sida.se/en/publications/glossary-of-key-terms-in-evaluation-and-results-based-management-2>

2. Draft inception report		2 weeks after signing of contract
3. Inception meeting(s) to present detailed evaluation plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation team ▪ Eko-vest AfC team ▪ Embassy representative 	2 weeks after signing of contract
4. Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance		5 weeks after signing of contract
5. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation team ▪ Eko-vest AfC team ▪ Embassy representative 	6 weeks after signing of contract
6. Draft evaluation report		6 weeks after signing of contract
7. Comments from intended users to evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation team • Eko-vest AfC team • Embassy representative 	Within 1 week of receiving draft evaluation report
8. Final evaluation report		8 weeks after signing of contract
9. A presentation of the finding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation team ▪ Eko-vest AfC team ▪ Embassy representative 	.

The inception report will form the basis for the final evaluation process and shall be approved by the Embassy of Sweden before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology *including how a utilization-focused and gender-responsive approach will be ensured*, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design, including an *evaluation matrix* and a *stakeholder mapping/analysis*. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed.

A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for the evaluator, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages.

The report shall clearly and in detail describe the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection and analysis and make a clear distinction between the two. The report shall describe how the utilization-focused approach has been implemented i.e. how intended users have participated in and contributed to the evaluation process and how methodology and methods for data collection have created space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users. Furthermore, the gender-responsive approach shall be described and reflected in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations along with other identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Limitations to the methodology and methods and the consequences of these limitations for findings and conclusions shall be described.

Evaluation findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation questions shall be clearly stated and answered in the executive summary and in the conclusions. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions and be specific, directed to relevant intended users and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term.

The report should be no more than 30 pages excluding annexes. If the methods section is extensive, it could be placed in an annex to the report. Annexes shall always include the Terms of Reference, the Inception Report, the stakeholder mapping/analysis and the Evaluation Matrix. Lists of key informants/interviewees shall only include personal data if deemed relevant (i.e. when it is contributing to the credibility of the evaluation) based on a case-based assessment by the evaluator and AfC programme. The inclusion of personal data in the report must always be based on a written consent.

2.7. The Evaluator should possess the following qualifications:

- University degree or professional experience in the related field to the AfC programme objective (natural sciences, education/capacity building, civil society, etc.);
- At least seven (7) years of work experience in external project evaluation, including Sida, SDC or other internationally funded projects;
- Experience conducting large program evaluations;
- Familiarity of the climate change sector and relevant stakeholders;
- Knowledge of the principles and methodologies of Sida's Result Based Management (RBM) approach is desirable;
- Strong analytical and research skills, with the ability to synthesize complex information;
- Excellent communication and report writing skills;
- Fluency in English;
- Ability and availability to work independently in a flexible schedule;

- Demonstrated experience in conducting project evaluations, preferably in project related to climate change and engagement of civil society.

2.8. Application method and conditions:

An individual or a team of evaluators may apply.

In both cases, the application should be consisted of the following documentations:

- Expression of interest maximum one (1) page, highlighting relevant experience and knowledge in the field of programme activities;
- Technical proposal with evaluation approach, including a proposed methodology (maximum 3 pages) annex 1;
- Financial offer, expressed in day fees; the total value of the offer cannot exceed 7.000 euro.
- Updated work resume (CV), if team, a CV for each team member should be included in the offer. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience;
- Two (2) references with provided contact information; the evaluators must be independent from the evaluation subject and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.
- Signed statement (annex 3)

Please note that if team of evaluator apply on the call, the applicants must propose a team leader that takes part in the evaluation by at least 30% of the total evaluation team time including core team members, specialists and all support functions.

For any questions, please contact Eko-svest at zarko@ekosvest.com.mk by 9/1/2025. Inquiries from interested bidders will be answered, forwarded to all invited bidders, and published on the Eko-svest website under the announcement of the call.

Submitted documentation will be archived by Eko-svest. Offers received after the deadline or without complete documentation will not be considered.

2.9. Application submission

Please submit your application no later than 13/1/2025, noon, to the following e-mail address: zarko@ekosvest.com.mk

Subject: "Application_AfC programme evaluator_NAME "

2.10. Evaluation method and criteria:

The evaluation of the received offers shall be conducted according to the following methodology:

- Offered price - 30 points;

- Proposed evaluation methodology 30 points;
- Relevant experiences and knowledge 40 points.

Total: 100 points

Eko-svest will contact the selected bidders no later than ten days after the end of the bid submission period. A contract will be awarded to the candidate with the highest overall score, considering both the quality of the offer and the price.

Annexes

Annex 1: Technical proposal

1. Outline an evaluation methodology
2. Financial offer

	Activity	Days	Day fee	Total
1				
2				
3				
....				
Total				



Annex 2:

Format for the evaluation report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A summary of the evaluation, with particular emphasis on the main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the purpose of the evaluation, questions and main findings.

THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

Description of the evaluated intervention and its purpose, logic, history, organization and stakeholders.

FINDINGS

Factual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions posed by the evaluation.

EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation of the intervention and its results against given evaluation criteria, performance standards and policy issues.

LESSONS LEARNED

General conclusions that are likely to have potential for wider application and use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Actionable suggestions to evaluation users for improvement management and policy of intervention cycle. The recommendations from evaluations shall be addressed in a Management Response, including actions, deadlines and responsibility.

ANNEXES

Description of tasks, methodology for data collection and analysis, references.

Annex 3:

STATEMENT

I, the undersigned _____(name and surname) as the official representative of _____(name of company) with moral and material liability hereby state that the legal entity I represent has no limitations to apply for this call, and specifically the legal entity is not/has not:

- bankrupt or being wound up, are having affairs administered by the courts, have entered into an arrangement with creditors, have suspended business activities, are the subject of proceedings concerning these matters, or are in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- been convicted for an offence concerning the professional conduct by a judgement which has the force of res judicata;
- been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means justifiable;
- been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that the economic operator is guilty of grave professional misconduct by having violated applicable laws or regulations or ethical standards of the profession to which the economic operator belongs, or by having engaged in any wrongful conduct which has an impact on its professional credibility where such conduct denotes a wrongful intent or gross negligence, including, in particular, any of the following: fraudulently or negligently misrepresenting information required for the verification of the absence of grounds for exclusion or the fulfilment of selection criteria or in the performance of a contract, influenced decision-making process, attempting to obtain confidential information for advantages in the procurement procedure.
- has not fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which they are established or with those of the country where the contract is to be performed; they have been the subject of a judgement which has the force of res judicata for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organization, or any other illegal activity detrimental to the donors' financial interests; they are currently subject to an administrative penalty referred to in section 2.3.5 of the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions:

On _____(date)

Signatory (Representative of legal entity)

Stamp and signature