

## Annex A – Terms of Reference

### 1. Background

According to the evaluation policy of the MFA, all types of bilateral development cooperation should be evaluated every 5-7 years with the dual purpose of learning and accountability. In 2017, the Danish support to civil society and administration amounted to 21.50% of total Danish ODA<sup>1</sup> or almost 2.5 billion DKK. Almost half of this, 1.2 billion DKK is implemented through the Strategic Partnership Agreements (SPA) between the MFA and 16 Danish NGOs including one consortium<sup>2</sup>. Another 260 million DKK is allocated through a number of delegated pool funds to promote a diverse range of civil society support and links between Denmark and countries in the Global South<sup>3</sup>. The most recent evaluation of Danish support to civil society was published in 2013. Furthermore, the strategy for Danish humanitarian assistance) was evaluated in 2015 during the evaluation of the humanitarian strategy (2010-15)<sup>4</sup>.

The policy and strategic frameworks for the implementation of the support are set out in the Policy for The World 2030 - the first Danish joint Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action<sup>5</sup>. As set out in the strategy,

*“Denmark acknowledges the value of a strong, diverse civil society and will support its central role in promoting the Sustainable Development Goals. Many parts of the Danish civil society contribute to translating a broad Danish popular involvement in international humanitarian action and development cooperation into meaningful results within thematic and geographic areas.”<sup>6</sup>*

This is translated into the following objectives for the strategic partnerships in the Information Note<sup>7</sup> guiding the SPA application process in 2017. Separate funding windows (so-called Lots) exist for civil society support and humanitarian action, and labour market support. With the following objectives:

Civil Society Development (Lot Civ):

*“to strengthen civil society in the Global South so that it has the independence, space, diversity and capacity to influence and promote the realisation of the SDGs with a particular focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups”*

Humanitarian action (Lot Hum):

*“to save and protect lives, alleviate suffering and promote dignity and rights of civilians in crisis situations and to initiate recovery through building resilience to and preventing future crisis by breaking the cycle between crisis and vulnerability”.*

Labour market and the private sector framework conditions (Lot lab):

*“to support activities of Danish labour and business member organisations (BMO) to promote labour rights and a better business environment in developing countries, including respect for human rights, and thus decent jobs and sustainable economic growth”.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Aid, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

<sup>2</sup> The SPA framework was initiated in 2018 for a period of 4 years.

<sup>3</sup> HCE

<sup>4</sup> Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-2015.

<sup>5</sup> The World 2030. Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, MFA 2017

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Information note, march 2017, MFA Denmark

While the SPA engagements promote alignment of the Danish CSO support to The World 2030, the support is based on respect for independence of civil society and by implication, builds on CSOs own vision, goals, strategies and result frameworks<sup>8</sup>. This principle guides the partnership and the subsequent reporting and accountability mechanism in the SPA partnership.

The most recent evaluations of the Danish support to civil society were carried out in 2013<sup>9</sup> and for humanitarian action in 2015. It revealed a need to rethink how to document the effectiveness of Danish support to civil society. Therefore, the Evaluation Department led a follow up process (2015-2019) with the purpose of providing the MFA and its civil society partners with inputs on how to capture results of the civil society support across the portfolio in line with the current strategies.

The process included a range of learning workshops with participation of CSOs and the MFA, which aimed at learning about aggregation and summarisation of results at outcome level. The result was captured in the report, *Danish Support to Civil Society: A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to demonstrate Results* and a number of publications, 2017<sup>10</sup> on options for summarising results and report on outcomes related to the support provided through civil society partners. They focus on how to document the change processes that the CSOs are contributing to in the countries where they work, which in turn are linked to the MFA strategies. For the humanitarian action, it is typically in the areas of lifesaving humanitarian assistance, protection, resilience, capacity development (crisis response) and for civil society support, it is in the areas of capacity development, enabling environment, advocacy, strategic service delivery, partnerships and public engagement in Denmark.

The conclusion from the follow up process was that due to the diversity and complexity of Danish support to civil society, a full-scale evaluation of the portfolio in its totality will not produce the body of outcome level results necessary to stimulate learning and improved results. Instead, it was recommended that the CSOs and MFA jointly identify a “a series of learning questions that could form the basis of peer learning among partners and possibly inform a more coordinated research, evaluation and communications agenda about Danish support to civil society<sup>11</sup>”. Given the diversity of the organisations, it was suggested to identify a few thematic areas that are central to the achievement of the CSOs’ and MFAs strategies and identify evidence of results achieved at outcome level. This could be done through thematic evaluations based on case studies provided by a group of organisations that would share a focus on a given thematic area. Themes that were discussed during the follow up process were: partnerships/localisation, advocacy through global alliances, hum-dev nexus, public engagement, shrinking civic space, and contribution to the SDGs.

The consultations with the CSOs showed great interest in this approach. Some of the Danish CSOs are already experimenting with using case studies and/or outcome harvesting as methods for data collection and documentation of results. The present series of evaluations, consisting of three distinct thematic evaluations outlined in this ToR will build on the experience from the follow up process, and jointly with the CSOs test new forms of providing evaluative evidence of results of Danish humanitarian assistance and development cooperation that serve both learning and accountability needs.

Against this background the Department of Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) will commission a series of evaluations with the purpose of improving results harvesting through learning from experience and at the same time account for public expenditure and results to stakeholders. The evaluation is timely because it responds to an immediate need by the MFA and the CSOs to improve the evidence

---

<sup>8</sup> Information Note, MFA 2017.

<sup>9</sup> Evaluation of Danish support to Civil Society, MFA, 2013

<sup>10</sup> Danish Support to Civil Society: A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to demonstrate Results, and related synthesis papers, MFA, 2017, and Desk review of Danish CSO summary results frameworks, MFA 2019.

<sup>11</sup> Desk review of Danish CSO summary results frameworks

base for the documentation of results at outcome level. Furthermore, the learning from the evaluations can feed into the programming of the new strategic partnership agreements (SPA) and benefit the next round of partnership applications due in 2021.

## 2. Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Capture outcome level results in selected thematic areas of development and humanitarian assistance implemented in the Global South by CSOs funded by Danish ODA.
- Stimulate learning based on evidence of achieved results to improve the quality of the Danish Government's support to civil society.

## 3. Scope and coverage

The follow up to the recent evaluations of the Danish Civil society support revealed a need for improving the collection of evidence of results at outcome level and linking them to the strategic level in the individual organisations and further to MFAs strategies for the support to civil society. Furthermore, there is a need to document results across the portfolio for communication and accountability to the wider public. In the interest of achieving analytical depth rather than width in the scope, ELK and the Department for Humanitarian assistance, Civil Society and Engagement (HCE) have decided to limit the scope to the 16 SPA organisations and the pooled funds that together implement nearly half of the ODA allocated to Civil Society.

### Thematic scope

These evaluations will focus on three thematic areas: humanitarian-development-peace (HDP) nexus, partnerships with particular focus on localisation and public engagement in Denmark. The themes represent priorities for both MFA and for the CSOs, and they are central to the effectiveness of the CSO's work. Hence, most organisations can participate and contribute data to one or more of the thematic evaluations and the lessons learned from the evaluations will overall be significant for their future programming.

- Thematic evaluation no. 1: Evaluation of the Danish Public engagement in the international cooperation agenda promoted by Danish CSOs

The Danish civil society plays an important role in retaining a broad Danish popular involvement in international humanitarian action and development cooperation, as well as in informing Danish citizens of living conditions and development around the world. In order to ensure increased public engagement up to two percent of the government funds can be allocated to programme related information activities in Denmark. In return, the strategic partner should raise an amount corresponding to minimum five percent of the partnership engagement budget from collections or donations in Denmark in order to ensure a strong public engagement. The thematic evaluation will examine the various approaches to public engagement and draw out lessons to be learned about engaging a wider segment of the Danish public around the SDGs, the effects of globalisation, migration issues, international development cooperation and development policies. More specifically the evaluation will examine methods used to reach new groups of the Danish public to engage them in CSO activities – be as volunteers, donors, members and other.

- Thematic evaluation no. 2: Strengthening civil society in the Global South. An evaluation of the results of Danish CSO partnerships

Denmark acknowledges the value of a strong, independent, representative accountable, vocal and diverse civil society and its central role in promoting the Sustainable Development Goals in the Global South. Through the SPAs and the delegated pool funds the Danish Government supports equal partnerships between Danish and southern CSOs that develop the capacity of the civil society in the Global South to play their role as rights holders in their home countries by holding authorities to account. The thematic evaluation on partnerships will examine the results achieved in this area and bring about lessons to be learned about different approaches taken to promoting equal partnerships in both development and humanitarian settings. The evaluation will also look at the value added by supporting the civil society in the Global South through the Danish CSOs.

With the introduction of the SPA agreements, the Strategic Partners have an opportunity to experiment and innovate with 10% of the allocated funds to seek improved outcomes, based on flexible and high-risk investments and new partnerships. The evaluation will seek to draw out any lessons learned from these initiatives. The recent review of the innovation funds will be an important background source.

- Thematic evaluation no. 3: Evaluation of the Humanitarian-Development-Nexus. Results achieved by Danish CSOs.

The increasingly protracted nature of conflicts and the high numbers and long-term nature of forced displacement in the world pose significant challenges for humanitarian and development aid efforts. In response to the Grand Bargain and the Global compact on refugees Denmark wants to strengthen the link between its humanitarian operations, development cooperation and peacebuilding efforts with the purpose of improving conditions for affected populations in protracted relief situations. Denmark channels approximately 20 % of its ODA annually through Danish CSOs, and some have already worked a long time in situations that span across the HDP divide, others have recently embarked on that venture when they entered the SPAs in 2017.

In an attempt to make funding allocation more flexible to promote more coherent approaches in response to conflict, fragility and displacement, the new SPAs contain both humanitarian and development funding when relevant. MFA Guidelines entail flexibility in the use of humanitarian vs. development funds in sudden and protracted humanitarian crises allowing strategic partners to work effectively across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

This thematic evaluation will stimulate joint learning in the CSO community and the MFA based on evidence of outcome level results achieved across the hum-dev-peace divide. Through case studies, the evaluation will highlight lessons to be learned about different approaches to linking humanitarian and development funding. It will also analyse to what extent the new funding procedures/set-up and ways of collaboration that were introduced with the SPAs are adequate for implementing this linkage in practice.

#### Geographical scope and selection of interventions to be evaluated

Based on the experience from the evaluation in 2013, it is not efficient (evaluation cost related to outputs) to look at all organisations in all countries. Instead, a sample of interventions (case studies) will be selected jointly with the evaluation team, the CSOs, ELK and HCE during the inception phase. The evaluation team will design a purposeful sampling strategy that will ensure transparency and a meaningful coverage and representation of the CSOs. The design will use the CSOs annual reporting and the recent reviews to identify particularly instructive cases to be selected. Annex A is a draft overview of the total volume of interventions abroad under the SPA agreements, the delegated pool funds, and their geographical location. This shows a large concentration of a variety of organisations and high amounts of funding in Mali, Syria (and related operations in Lebanon and Jordan, and East Africa (Sudan, South Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia, Kenya) making these areas the likely geographical focus for the thematic evaluations numbers two and three. It is expected that 3-4 country case studies per

thematic evaluation will suffice and can be supplemented by document review. The geographical scope for the first evaluation about public engagement is Denmark.

#### Time scope

The scope in time for the evaluations is the period since the most recent evaluation in 2013. There is a shift in the modality of the support in 2017 with the introduction of the SPA, but many of the activities supported have been implemented under previous framework agreement and or humanitarian partnership agreements. Hence, the time scope will facilitate an examination of the effectiveness of the SPA modality.

#### Coverage

The evaluations do not intend to cover the totality of the support to the CSOs, but the selected operations should constitute a significant volume of support and variety of SPAs supported. While not representative of the entire portfolio, a significant body of outcome evidence will be built. This would increase over the years if this approach were to be continued beyond this first series of evaluations.

### **4. Approach and organisation of the evaluation**

Present series of evaluations include three distinct thematic evaluations to be carried out during 2020-2022. They are three individual evaluations, but they will share the intervention logic describing the contribution of the CSO interventions to the MFA strategy World 2030. A summary report will conclude on the contribution of the CSO support to MFAs goals within the selected themes and lessons to be learned from the process.

As far as the civil society development funds are concerned the support and hence the intervention logic should be based on the civil society policy from 2014 and the strategy World 2030. Seeing that the result agreements between the CSOs and the MFA are based on the organisations own strategies and result frameworks, the intervention logic should establish the contribution of the CSO interventions to the MFA goals through organisation specific outcomes. The humanitarian support implemented prior to 2017 is anchored in the Humanitarian Action 2010-15, and after 2017 in the World 2030.

The Consultant will design the thematic evaluations in a way that promotes joint learning with MFA and the CSOs based on evidence- based information about results achieved within the three thematic areas. This will require a high degree of participation in the evaluation process ensured by a reference group for each thematic evaluation with participation of the relevant CSOs and departments of MFA and possible external resource persons. To ensure that the learning reaches outside of the participating NGOs, larger learning events will be organised at key points in the process.

The decision on which organisations will participate in each thematic evaluation is based on self-selection adjusted by a sampling strategy to ensure coverage and representation of the CSOs. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will facilitate a design event held jointly with CSOs and MFA. The purpose of the event is to:

- Give the CSOs the opportunity to choose the thematic evaluation they will participate in and share options for case studies conducive to learning.
- Consult the general design of the thematic evaluations including the strategy for joint learning e.g. the modality of cooperation and communication.
- Consult the methodology to be used for the thematic evaluations, noticeably how to sample and develop the case studies and data collection strategy.

- Consult the intervention logic and M&E matrix and the lines of inquiry and learning questions to focus the evaluation.

## 5. Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions

The use of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, coherence and appropriateness will be used for the thematic evaluations as relevant to the context. Given the need to find evidence of results at outcome level, it seems pertinent to focus on relevance & appropriateness, effectiveness, sustainability and coherence. This will be specified in the ToR for each of the specific thematic evaluations.

The thematic evaluation seeks to understand the extent to which the Danish support to civil society is achieving its goals as set out in The World 2030 and for the civil society development funds, the Civil Society Policy. This series will conclude based on the three thematic evaluations topics. The evaluation team will elaborate the final evaluation questions during inception based on following general evaluation questions.

Thematic evaluation no. 1: Evaluation of the Danish Public engagement in the international cooperation agenda promoted by Danish CSOs

- Is there evidence that the Danish CSOs are effective in engaging an increasing segment of the Danish public around the SDGs, the effects of globalisation, migration issues, international development cooperation and/or development policies as stipulated by MFA? What can be learned collectively about different approaches?
- Is there evidence that Danish CSOs are engaging new segments of the Danish public, i.e. through partnerships that differ from traditional partners?
- Is there evidence that engaging in public engagement increased public support for overseas development and or humanitarian assistance?
- Is there evidence that engaging in public engagement helps the work of Danish CSOs overall, and/or leads to more pressure to change international policies?
- To what extent are the organisations reaching the expected level (20%) of own financing? And the 5% expected to be raised in Denmark in the form of cash or similar?

Thematic evaluation no. 2: Strengthening civil society in the Global South. An evaluation of results from Danish CSO partnerships.

- To what extent do partnerships between Danish and Southern CSOs promote sustainable results in a cost-effective manner?
- What evidence shows that CSOs contributed to a strong, independent, representative, accountable and diverse civil society in the Global South? What lessons can be learned? Are they applicable elsewhere?
- Which different local partnerships are being supported, e.g. traditional structures, new forms of civil society? What challenges does this present, and how are the associated risks managed?
- To what extent do the Danish CSOs add value directly or indirectly to the desired change process and result in the global south?
- To what extent do the Danish CSOs contribute to the agenda of localisation (increased involvement of local partners in terms of decision-making, control of funds, etc. in humanitarian and development support)?

- To what extent are the partnerships equal? (Is there evidence of re-balancing the partnership i.e. making it responsive and accountable to the partner and including the gradual transfer of financial and decision-making responsibility?)
- What can be learned from different approaches to localisation in different contexts?

Thematic evaluation no. 3: Evaluation of Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus. Results achieved by Danish CSOs

- What different approaches are found to bridging humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts among the strategic partners?
- To what extent have sustainable **results** been achieved when working across the humanitarian-development nexus? (What are the barriers? What lessons can be learned? Are they applicable elsewhere?)
- To what extent does the intervention ensure stronger linkage and **coherence** between humanitarian assistance and development cooperation, including the Danish country programmes, e.g. by supporting durable solutions for displaced populations or addressing root causes of crisis through building resilience and capacity for crisis response?
- How have the interventions contributed to collective **outcomes** across the wider assistance community with respect to vulnerability and marginalisation?
- How **adaptive** have the organisations been to changing risk patterns and extreme events e.g. natural disasters or effects of climate change?
- To what extent has the SPA modality been conducive to more coherent approaches in response to conflict, fragility and displacement in countries prioritised by MFA?

## 6. Methodological considerations

The development of the learning methodology within the thematic evaluations is the responsibility of the evaluation team. It will use latest methods for learning for programme improvement within civil society organisations.

The methodology of the thematic evaluations will be proposed by the evaluation team and consulted with the CSOs and MFA during inception phase. The thematic evaluations will be based on a number of case studies (existing or developed for the evaluation) and rely predominantly on qualitative data supplemented with programme monitoring data and assessments and reports from other sources.

The case studies for each thematic evaluation will be selected by the evaluation team jointly with the CSOs and MFA and agreed as part of the inception phase. The selection will be based partly on CSOs own knowledge about instructive case material, annual reports, reviews and evaluations commissioned by themselves and MFA.

## 7. Outputs and timetable

The Consultant (the evaluation team) will design and carry out the series of evaluations that consist of three thematic evaluations and a series of learning events that will stimulate the collective learning in the CSO community and the MFA, and a final report that summarises the lessons to be learned from the thematic evaluations. The concrete outputs are:

1. **An inception report** containing the general design of the thematic evaluations including the strategy for joint learning, the individual ToR for the three thematic evaluations outlining

methodology to be used, the selection of interventions to be used as case studies, the sampling and data collection strategy, the intervention logic and M&E matrix including the interventions to be evaluated and the lines of inquiry, specific evaluation questions and learning questions to focus each of the three thematic evaluations, and a schedule of activities

2. **An inception workshop** to consult the design of the thematic evaluations as described above
3. **Three separate thematic evaluation reports**
4. A number of **learning events** related to the thematic evaluations
5. **A final evaluation report** that summarises the lessons to be learned from the thematic evaluations, including an assessment of the evaluation process as an effective model for collecting evidence for the results of the Danish support to civil society.

Below is a tentative plan for implementation. It is assumed that there will be some overlap between evaluation teams and that the field visits of evaluations two and three could be done simultaneously to ensure cost-efficiency of the evaluations.

### Tentative implementation plan

Task	Date / Period	Responsible
Contract signed	Expected August 2020	ET /ELK
Workshop to consult design of the series of evaluations	September 2020	ET with ELK and HCE
Inception report	October 2020	ET
Implementation and sharing of results of thematic evaluation number 1: on public engagement	Q1 2021	ET
Implementation and sharing of results of thematic evaluations numbers 2 and 3 on partnerships and HDP nexus.	Q1-Q2 2021	ET
Summary evaluation report containing lessons learned during the series of evaluations	Q2/Q3 2022	ET

HCE: Office of Humanitarian response, Civil Society and Engagement, ET: Evaluation Team, ELK: Evaluation, Learning and Quality

## 8. Evaluation principles and management

The thematic evaluations will be carried out in accordance with the Danida evaluation policy on development cooperation (October 2015), the Danida evaluation guidelines (2018) and the OECD-DAC standard criteria for evaluations including quality standards (2019).

The basic DAC-evaluation principles of independence of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention, and of utilisation of evaluators external to the development partner and implementing organisations will be applied.

Responsibility for the content and presentation of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation rests with the evaluation team. The views and opinions expressed in the report will not necessarily correspond to the views of the Danish Government and or the implementing organisations. The final evaluation report will be available to all relevant stakeholders, published on the internet, and submitted to the Danish Minister for Development Cooperation.

Three sets of roles are contained in the evaluation process: the Evaluation Management, the Evaluation Team, and the Evaluation Reference Group

### 8.1 Role of the Evaluation Management

The series of evaluations will be supervised and managed by ELK that will approve all related outputs:

- Be responsible for the selection of the Consultant (the Evaluation Team) based on the received tenders and based on a process administered by a tender consultant.
- Validate the selection of consultants to carry out the thematic evaluations
- Approve inception report, workplan, and draft thematic evaluation reports
- Present the final summary report the internal Danida Programme Committee and the Minister for Development Cooperation.
- Organise graphic layout and editing of the final evaluation report and prepare it for publication.
- Prepare a four-page Danish summary of the evaluation report and prepare for publishing.

### 8.2 Role of the Evaluation Team (Consultant)

The Evaluation Team will carry out the evaluations including the learning events based on a contract between ELK and the incumbent Consultant. The Evaluation Team will:

- Design and carry out the evaluations according to the ToR, the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines when relevant.
- Deliver an inception report that clarifies the intervention logic, the methodology, the intervention specific evaluation questions, the data collection strategy, a schedule of activities and a consultation plan.
- Be responsible to ELK for the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the thematic evaluations.
- Quality assurance is carried out for the thematic evaluations according to the Consultant's Quality Assurance Plan as described in the proposal.
- Report to the Evaluation Management regularly about progress of the evaluation series.
- Organise and coordinate meetings and field visits, and other key events, including debriefing session and/or validation workshops in country.
- Be responsible for the safety and security of the employees of the Consultant, sub-contracted consultants, including local staff, also if the assignment involves missions in an area of conflict or an area with high security risks.

### 8.3 Role of Evaluation Reference Group

The thematic evaluations will have a reference group (ERG) comprised of the evaluation manager from ELK, a representative from HCE and evaluation advisors from participating CSOs. This is to ensure

transparency, quality control and a high degree of learning and ownership of the evaluations by the main stakeholders of the process. The ERG may choose to invite external resource persons to add specific technical perspectives.

*The task of the ERG is to:*

- *Validate all outputs such as the inception report, workplan including the learning events, ToR for the thematic evaluations and final summary evaluation report.*
- *Ensure that the evaluations are carried out according to ToR, and in line with good evaluation practice, and in a cost effective and timely fashion.*
- *Provide the evaluation team with relevant background information and facilitate the communication with key informants in their respective organisations.*
- *Disseminate evaluation results to stimulate learning beyond the ERG.*
- *Advice relevant stakeholders on matters related to the evaluation.*<sup>12</sup>

## **9. Composition, organisation and qualifications of the evaluation team**

The organisation of the evaluation team's work is the responsibility of the team leader (TL) and should be specified and explained clearly in the tender.

The tender shall include:

- One CV of an evaluation expert (TL) with proven expertise in the conduct of learning focused evaluation of civil society support. The TL will be responsible for designing and implementing the evaluation series including the learning process and events and will have the overall responsibility for the three thematic evaluations. The TL is also responsible the team's reporting to and communication with ELK. The inputs of the TL can vary in the three thematic evaluations subject to the tenderer's proposal for the team compositions with other experts. The TL's CV will be assessed individually as part of the tender.
- Three CVs for experts covering each of the thematic evaluations (one and only one designated CV for each). These experts will participate in the respective thematic evaluation but may also participate in others. These CVs will be assessed individually as part of the tender.
- Additional CVs of experts that may be included in thematic evaluations (maximum 3 CVs per thematic evaluation – each CV should not exceed 6 pages). The tenderer can decide the additional composition for each of the teams for the thematic evaluations. The CVs of these additional experts will not be assessed individually as part of the tender but as part of the overall team composition ("Organisation") for each of the thematic evaluations with the purpose of ensuring that all technical areas are covered.

The evaluation team members are expected to complement each other, and some could participate in more than one thematic evaluation. The number of consultants will depend on the skill set of the individual consultant in relation to each thematic evaluation. The requirements are stated in Appendix 1, section B. The organisation of the evaluation team's work, e.g. their share of inputs between team members will be assessed as part of the assessment of the technical proposal under the criterion "organisation".

The team leader should participate in the design workshop and the subsequent learning events

- The team leader must be overall responsible for the quality of the thematic evaluation reports

---

<sup>12</sup> See the Codes of Conduct, which form part of the Danida Evaluation Guidelines, and which can be found at <http://evaluation.um.dk>

- The team leader is responsible for the team's reporting to and communication with ELK.

The Tenderers should clearly state which of the proposed team members cover the different thematic areas of the evaluation in the task assignment chart.

## 10. Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. Any firm or individual consultant that has participated in the preparation or implementation of the evaluated Danida programmes will be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest.<sup>13</sup>

## 11. Financial proposal

The maximum budget for the consultancy services under this Agreement is DKK 3.0 million net of VAT. This includes all fees and project related expenses required for the implementation of the contract, including field trips and learning events. The exact selection of countries and interventions to visit will be determined with the CSOs and the MFA during inception, but the financial proposals for the HDP nexus and the partnership with particular focus on localisation evaluations should each include travel to 3-4 countries in Africa and the Middle East. The concentration of a variety of organisations and high amounts of funding in Mali, Syria (and related operations in Lebanon and Jordan, and Eastern Africa (Sudan, South Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia, Kenya)) making these areas the likely geographical focus.

The geographical scope for the evaluation about public engagement is Denmark.

The tenderer will prepare a budget including the thematic evaluations and the related learning events.

ELK will cover the expenditures incurred in preparing the final evaluation report for publication and any additional dissemination activities as and if agreed upon.

## 12. Requirements of home office support

The Consultant's office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultants fees:

- General home office administration and professional back up. The back-up activities shall be specified.
- Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the Tender. Special emphasis should be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports. ELK may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

The Tender shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the Tenderer has fully internalised how to implement it and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

---

<sup>13</sup> See: Danida Evaluation Guidelines (2018), annex 1.

The Tenderer must select a QA team with a designated QA Manager to be responsible for Head Office QA. The member(s) of the QA team must not be directly involved in the evaluation. The QA Manager could be either an external expert or a company staff member. As indicated above, the QA Manager's CV should be included in the tender and will be assessed as part of the assessment of the technical proposal.

All QA activities should be properly documented and reported to ELK.