Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of the Citizens for Financial Justice project

August 2020

1. Background and Rationale

1.1. Project's background

Citizens for Financial Justice is a three-year project funded by the European Union's DEAR programme. It is being delivered by a consortium of six organisations (referred to as 'co-applicants'): Christian Aid UK (lead organisation), Counter Balance (Czech Republic), Financial Justice Ireland, erlassjahr.de (Germany), Eurodad (Belgium) and Observatori del Deute en la Globalització - ODG (Spain). The project commenced in September 2017 and is scheduled for completion in December 2020.

The project aims to support the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by mobilising EU citizens to support effective Financing for Development (FfD). Under the broad FfD umbrella, the project focuses on two specific themes: debt and private finance. The project aims to increase and improve the capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) across the EU to raise awareness of development finance issues, engage in development education activities and undertake advocacy and campaigning on FfD. A key component of the project is the provision of grants to small and medium CSOs, to develop and strengthen their work on FfD, reach new audiences and create new opportunities for citizen action. A capacity development support programme is available to all grant partners.

There are four project goals:

1. To contribute to increased availability of reliable, democratically controlled and effective Financing for Development, as a key Means of Implementation for the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
2. European citizens are informed and engaged in discussion about the reforms needed to increase the quantity and improve the quality of financing for development.
3. European Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are supported and enabled to actively participate in strong civil society networks, in order to increase public awareness of Financing for Development, thus creating widespread support for European policy reforms.
4. Civil society organisations across the EU significantly increase and improve their capacity to promote awareness raising, development education, and advocacy and campaigning on financing for development.

Citizens for Financial Justice is coming to an end in December 2020 and will undertake an **evaluation of the achievements, challenges and lessons to date**, to inform future programming in this area.

1.2. Brief overview of the project

Project's governance

Citizens for Financial Justice is managed by six European NGOs – Christian Aid, Counter Balance, erlassjahr.de, Eurodad, Financial Justice Ireland and ODG and is supporting partners organisations to develop and strengthen their work on Financing for Development (FfD), reach new audiences and create new opportunities for citizen action through small grants, strengthened networks and capacity building activities.

The CFJ project works with 37 third party grant partners across 15 European countries, largely focusing on 4 themes: debt, infrastructure, natural resources and private finance. This page of the website will give you a clear overview of the grant partners location, focus and work: https://citizensforfinancialjustice.org/who-we-are/.

Key project's milestones

Through three rounds of applications, 37 grant partners from 15 countries were selected to undertake a variety of activities in the context of the promotion of Financing for Development (FfD). Activities ranged from development education and campaigning to networking and advocacy and covered different aspects of debt justice as well as private finance as key issues in FfD. Central key moments and events of the overall project were:

- Two face-to-face events for all project partners. The last event also included a lobby event with MEPs at the European Parliament in Brussels
- The launch of the CFJ communications platform and website
- Joint social media actions on the European elections
- The project's first 'Spotlight on Financial Justice' report. A second report will be published in September 2020.

One of the central parts of the project was the capacity building programme. Capacity building was delivered through dedicated sessions at the central face to face events as well as CFJ-wide webinars. The biggest chunk of capacity-building was however delivered through 1-1 support from co-applicants to their individual grant partners according to need. The latter often related to administrative support, helping grantees to understand the formal needs in relation to EU expectations and rules. However, it was also related to thematic support through sharing materials and expertise.

For more information regarding the project, please visit www.citizensforfinancialjustice.org.

2. Consultancy's objectives

2.1. Overall scope of the assignment

The consultancy's objective is to conduct the **final evaluation of the project** (including 6 case studies of third party grant projects), assessing its overall achievements and impact as well as the quality of its implementation.

As a result from this work, the consultant(s) are expected to provide **one final evaluation report** that will be mainly internally focused (towards the donor, co-applicants and grant partners) and **one succinct externally focused report**, highlighting key findings from the final evaluation.

2.2. Evaluation's sub-objectives

It is expected that the final evaluation responds to several sub-objectives as highlighted below:

a) Assess the **relevance**, **coherence**, **effectiveness**, **efficiency**, **impact** and **sustainability** of the CFJ project as well as of 6 grant partner's projects (case studies),
b) Determine the extent to which the project has **achieved the targets** set out in the logframe, identifying factors that have enabled timely delivery, and factors that have inhibited timely delivery as appropriate.
c) Assess the extent to which the project's scope, design and approach have **contributed to changes** as envisioned in the original project proposal by mobilising EU citizens to support effective Financing for Development,
d) Assess the relative effectiveness of the different **project strategies**: building **networks** and coalitions as a mean for achieving changes, third party **grant mechanism** (alongside **capacity building**) as a mean to supporting better localised impact and more relevant interventions,
e) Assess the relative effectiveness of the **communication activities** used by the project in supporting a wide awareness of the FfD policy agenda, as well as assessing the impact of external factors for a wider engagement,
f) Assess the extent to which the current **external funding landscape inhibits/supports the work of civil society** when it comes to Financing for Development,
g) Provide evidence to **how economic / financial justice support direct areas of rights and of the SDGs**.

2.3. Final evaluation criteria

As mentioned in the sub-objective (a), the evaluation criteria are the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and have supported defining the following key evaluation questions. The questions below are aligned with the sub-objectives above (and therefore, not a separate task).

Relevance: *The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.*

- To what extent has the project's design responded to the grant partners' (small and medium CSOs) needs?
- To what extent is the project's intervention responding to sectorial needs?
- To what extent has the geographical scope and set up (large number of countries with – in most cases - few partners in each country) inhibited/enabled good results?

Coherence: *The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.*

- To which extent is the project compatible (adding value, but also complementing and working in collaboration) with other projects' interventions in the sector (especially with the work of the co-applicants and grant partners)?

Effectiveness: *The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.*

- To which extent has the project achieved its intended goals (see introduction) and logframe targets?

- What was the relative effectiveness and added value of the sub-granting mechanism (coupled with a capacity building programme)? And how does the current funding landscape support/inhibit the work of civil society when it comes to Financing for Development?
- What was the relative effectiveness of the networking strategy (putting the emphasis on strengthening existing networks and supporting networking activities) in achieving meaningful changes?
- What has been the relative effectiveness of the communication activities used by the project in supporting a wide awareness of the FfD policy agenda? And what are external factors that limit a wider engagement?

Efficiency: *The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.*

- To what extent has the project delivered results ensuring good Value for Money[1]?
- To what extent has the project delivered results in a timely manner?
- To what extent has the timeframe attributed to the project enabled achieving expected results?

Impact: *The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.*

- To what extent does economic and / or financial justice support other areas of rights and of the Sustainable Development Goals?
- To what extent has the project contributed to a more engaged and mobilised citizenry?
- To what extent has the project achieved or contributed to achieving results that go beyond the scope and objectives of the project?

Sustainability: *The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.*

- To what extent are the CSOs that were involved in the project able to continue their work on FfD (considering organisational, technical and financial capacities)?
- To what extent are the project's results and impact sustainable beyond the scope of the project?

3. Audience and Use of Findings

As mentioned previously, the final evaluation of the CFJ project will be internally facing and the primary audience will be **EuropeAid (EU-DEAR)** as the donor, **CFJ co-applicants**, and **all the grant partners**. It is hoped that findings and learnings from the final evaluation will be used for reflections on the achievements of the project and better programming in future projects. External actors will be able to access this report upon request and therefore are considered as secondary audience.

However, in addition to the final evaluation report, the consultant(s) will be expected to provide an 5 to 10-page brief, presenting the key findings from the final evaluation. We aim for everyone involved in the project to be able to share this piece externally with **key stakeholders** in the sector, but also with **anyone else who might be interested** to have access to the project's findings.

[1] In Christian Aid we understand Value for Money through the 4Es lens (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Equity) which enables looking at whether the project has achieved meaningful results, for the right audience in a given timeframe with the best value. The consultant(s) is expected to provide a framework for VFM that is relevant for this project.

4. Methodology proposed and implementation plan

The method that we are expecting the consultant(s) to follow is the below.

4.1. Inception period

Once the contract is signed, the consultant(s) will be expected to start the desk review to adjust their proposal. An **inception report** including the final plan for the evaluation (methodology, outlined tools (including online sessions), timeline, etc.) will be expected about 10 days after the signature of the contract.

The consultant(s) will use these days to propose their **selection of 6 case studies** (grant partners' projects) with a rational behind the selection. It is expected that the case studies cover different key themes and that they are in different European countries to fairly represent the diversity of work and organisations involved in the project.

4.2. Secondary data collection: desk review

We are expecting that the consultant will be using the **Outcome Harvesting** methodology and will identify instances of change to map and assess how the change happened and what the **project and grant partners' contribution** was to achieve these changes. This will be based largely on a thorough desk review, but also on the below presented primary data collection methods.

The project's documents to be shared with the consultant are the below:

- Project's proposal (CFJ project and each grant partner's project)
- Logframe and Theory of Change
- Annual reports (from grant partners, co-applicants and from the consortium to the EU)
- CFJ Communications Strategy
- Midterm evaluation (internal)

Note that this list is not exhaustive, and it will be possible to access further documentation.

A desk review of **external documentation** and report should be used to support the findings for the final evaluation and for the learning paper.

4.3. Primary data collection

Online sessions

The CFJ co-applicants will organise three 2-hour online sessions to cover key areas:

- Impact of the CFJ project,
- Key lessons from the CFJ project,
- Next steps: how will the project's stakeholders continue working together.

It is expected that the consultant(s) lead on the first two sessions. These two sessions should be designed to ensure that they meet the information needs of the consultant(s) (based on their desk review to date) and to ensure that they enable the participants to reflect on the project and to provide a good overview of the achievements of the project.

The consultant(s) will be expected to provide the outline of their sessions with a short rationale for them in the inception report.

Primary data collection

Given the uncertainty of the situation around the Covid-19 pandemic, all activities related to the final evaluation **must be conducted remotely**.

Below are the tools that we believe should support the collection of key information to complement the findings through the extensive desk review and the online sessions:

Tool proposed	Objectives of the tool	Sample size
Key Informant Interviews with the co-applicants	- All evaluation objectives / questions - Case studies	6 to 8
Key Informant interviews with the grant partners[2]	- All evaluation objectives / questions - Case studies	25 to 37
Key Informant Interviews with external actors (external NGOs, donors, or key duty bearers)	- Verification of some of the changes identified - Relevant evaluation questions (all criteria should be covered - to some extent - except the efficiency)	5 to 10[3]
Remote FGDs or Interviews with citizens[4] (for the 6 case studies)	- Impact and sustainability criteria - Inform the case studies	6 to 12 citizens per case study

Key Informants will be English speakers (even if second language) but for citizens to engage in the FGDs (or interviews), the consultant(s) is expected to propose an international consultancy team or to budget translation/interpretation work.

Additional online surveys can be proposed to complete the information collected as needed.

4.4. Participatory interpretation with co-applicants

After the data collection and once the consultant can extract primary findings from the information received, it is expected that these are shared with co-applicants in a remote workshop setting, during which the consultant will:

- Present the primary findings,
- Facilitate discussions around these key findings,
- Propose and discuss key recommendations.

This discussion will support the consultant(s) in writing the report and will serve as a participatory interpretation of the data collected with co-applicants and the evaluation consultant(s).

4.5. Data analysis and report writing

The interviews and focus group discussion should be coded for key themes in relation to the evaluation criteria, and to key evaluation questions. As a consistent number of Key Informant

---

[2] Note that the list of informants with contacts will be provided at the launch of the consultancy for project's stakeholders.
[3] Final list / number of respondents to be agreed upon with co-applicants.
[4] Grant partners will support the consultant(s) to get contacts for the involvement of citizens who participated in some of the project's activities. The consultant(s) and partners will ensure that they are GDPR compliant in the way the contact information is shared (prior consent from the respondents).

Interviews are expected to be conducted, the consultant should feel free to use infographics to support the findings. In addition, citizen engagement tools will provide quantitative information presented through graphs or table in the report to support conclusions. In both cases, appropriate software should be used (such as Excel or Power Bi). Desk review and data collected should be the basis of the report.

5. Scope of the consultancy

To recap, as highlighted in the different paragraph above, the consultant will be responsible for:

- Providing an inception report (10 days after the signature of the contract) that details the methodology to be used and provides an outline of the tools, online sessions, case studies chosen and timeline for the final evaluation. This should be based on a desk review.
- Leading on 2 online sessions with co-applicants (on impact and lessons learnt),
- Conducting a full desk review, identifying outcomes and contribution to changes,
- Finalise the data collection tools as required,
- Conducting Key Informant Interviews with co-applicants, grant partners and external stakeholders as needed (including for the 6 case studies)
- Conducting remote focus group discussions for the 6 grant projects used as case studies,
- Conducting an online workshop with co-applicants (consortium members) to discuss primary findings and initial recommendations,
- Producing a final evaluation report including 6 case studies and a sound executive summary,
- Producing a 5 to 10-page brief that would be externally focussed and presents the key findings from the evaluation.

6. Ethics considerations

Christian Aid is committed to complying with privacy and data protection laws including the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Christian Aid's Data Protection Policy sets out the principles that Christian Aid applies when handling individual's personal information. Any consultants offered a contract with Christian Aid is expected to be GDPR compliant when handling individuals' personal information as well.

In addition, Christian Aid has a Safeguarding Framework that includes Staff Code of Conduct and a Child Protection Policy which have been developed to ensure the maximum protection of programme participants and to clarify the responsibilities of Christian Aid staff, visitors to the programme and partner organisations, and the standards of behaviour expected of them. We have the responsibility to ensure that any persons hired or consulted during the process are made familiar with the policies and commit to abide by them during the execution of this work. Any consultants offered a contract with Christian Aid will be expected to sign Code of Conduct and Child Protection Policy as an appendix to their contract. By doing so, consultants acknowledge that they have understood the contents of policies and agree to conduct themselves in accordance with the provisions of these two documents.

7. Expected Outputs

Inception report (up to 10 pages) **–** the inception report should highlight (not limited to):

- Understanding of the assignment,
- Methodology proposed to achieve the objectives of the consultancy,
- First draft of tools that will be used (including online sessions),

- Timeline,
- Any need from the project's management team.

Online sessions outline and material:
- Plan of the 2 sessions that will be led by the consultant,
- Material that will be used to achieving the objectives of the sessions[5]

PowerPoint of primary findings:
- PowerPoint of primary findings to be shared ahead of the meeting (FGD with the co-applicants)

Final evaluation report (up to 25 pages excluding annexes) – should include:
- Executive summary (should be possible to share the executive summary separately – up to 4 pages)
- Introduction
- Methodology
- Findings
  - Aligned with the final evaluation objectives
  - Using extracts from the case studies to inform the findings
- Recommendations
  - for similar projects in the future (this should also cover what worked well in this project and should be duplicated in the future)
  - For the different organisations on other pieces of work (co-applicants and grant partners)
- Conclusion
- Annex
  - Each case study should be presented in annex as a 2 to 3 pager.

Externally facing paper (5 to 10 pages)
- The content and structure of the externally facing paper will be proposed by the consultant and approved by the co-applicants.

8. Expected scope for the evaluation

8.1. Timeline

The consultant should work on the final evaluation of the CFJ project **between mid-October and mid-December 2020**.

Below is the expected timeline of the consultancy:

Activities / Milestones / Outputs	Expected Deadline	Responsibility
Proposal from consultants	September 30th	Consultants
Selection of the consultants	October 9th	Co-applicants
Launch meeting with project manager	October 14th	Manager
Share project documents with consultant	October 14th	Manager
Inception report	October 26th	Consultant
Desk review / Online sessions / Data collection	November 20th	Consultant

[5] Support from the Christian Aid M&E specialists can be provided if needed.

Activities / Milestones / Outputs	Expected Deadline	Responsibility
Participatory interpretation workshop with co-applicants	November 20th	Consultant
First draft of final evaluation report	November 27th	Consultant
First draft of externally facing paper	November 27th	Consultant
Comments on both reports	December 4th	Co-applicants
Final evaluation report	December 11th	Consultant
Final externally facing paper	December 11th	Consultant

8.2. Budget

The budget that is available for this evaluation is **EUR 15,000**. The evaluation consultant(s) should provide a financial proposal that includes the breakdown of the costs engaged in the evaluation (including consultant's time, translation or interpretation, any admin costs, etc.). If the consultant(s) considers that the methodology should be amended to ensure that the proposal is not over budget, then they should provide a rationale for it.

9. Evaluation team / consultant

Given the nature of the assignment and the timeframe proposed, we are happy for the consultant(s) to propose a team or to propose to conduct the evaluation themselves. In any case, note that the below list of competences will be expected for this consultancy:

- Extensive experience in Evaluation of Advocacy projects (5+ years),
- Experience in Research for development programme,
- Proven experience in Outcome Harvesting or similar methodology,
- Experience in using Theories of Change for Advocacy projects,
- Good knowledge and experience of Financing for Development related issues,
- Experience in using qualitative methods of interviews,
- Experience in facilitating remote workshops,
- Good understanding of EuropeAid requirements,
- Good ability to write concise but precise reports on difficult subjects,
- Ability to speak several European languages would be an asset.

10. Submission of proposal

10.1. Technical proposal

The technical proposal should cover the below:

- Understanding of the assignment in consultant's own words
- Methodology proposed to achieve the objectives of the consultancy (including which tools will be developed as part of the consultancy)
- Risks and limitations of the proposed methodology
- Overview of the evaluation team / consultant to demonstrate how they match the criteria highlighted above
- Overview of 3 similar assignments undertaken
- Timeline
- Annexes should include: 3-page CV from each members of the team (or from the consultant) and a report produced by the consultant on a similar assignment.

10.2. Financial proposal

The financial proposal should include **all costs that will be incurred during the assignment**. As mentioned, this final evaluation in its entirety will be conducted remotely, therefore, no travel expenses should be included in the financial proposal. The financial proposal, should, however, include a translation or interpretation budget to enable reaching citizens in the different CFJ grant partners' countries (as chosen for the case studies).

10.3. Deadline and contact

The Proposals should be submitted by the **30th of September, 2020, at midnight UK time** to the project's manager, Ida Quarteyson: IQuarteyson@christian-aid.org.