

## **Annex F. TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

### **Evaluation of Danish Refugee Council and Mines Advisory Group's Global Humanitarian Mine Action and Small Arms Light Weapons Project 2018-2023**

#### **1. Introduction/Overview**

Danish Refugee Council (DRC) Humanitarian Disarmament & Peacebuilding (formerly Danish Demining Group (DDG) and now one of the five core sectors in Danish Refugee Council) and Mines Advisory Group (MAG) are seeking bids from independent experts and external evaluators to undertake an evaluation of a 5.5-year global Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) and Small Arms Light Weapons (SALW) project funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). The project is being implemented between 1 January 2018 and 30 June 2023, with activities conducted in 20 countries.

The evaluation is to start before the end of August 2022 with the final report to be submitted to DRC and MAG no later than 11 November 2022.

#### **Project Overview**

The overall objective of the project to be evaluated is: To reduce the global impact of mines, cluster munitions, other ERW and weapons proliferation on vulnerable populations, thereby reducing poverty and inequality and improving human safety and security and promoting sustainable peace in fragile and conflict-affected states.

DRC and MAG contribute to the achievement of this objective through the implementation of the following key activities: 1) clearance of mines, ERW, UXO, AXO and cluster munitions; 2) risk education on mines, ERW, IEDs and cluster munitions; 3) small arms and light weapons (SALW) management; and 4) support to local, national and regional stakeholders and civil society.

These activities seek to increase levels of human security in targeted communities and countries, as well as increasing opportunities for improved livelihoods, access to essential services, safe movement/increased mobility and enable the provision of humanitarian aid and reconstruction efforts. Reducing and removing the risk posed by mines, cluster munitions, other ERW and weapons proliferation is thus a key step in establishing a safe environment and reducing levels of violence and fear – a precursor to the establishment of an overall legitimate security, stability and lasting peace that will foster socio-economic development. Therefore, the project contributes to the Swedish Policy Framework objectives on improved human security, improved development, reduced poverty and Sida's strategy on Sustainable Peace 2017-2022<sup>1</sup> addressing the need for solutions related to human security. The project is funded by three Sida strategies: Sustainable Peace for the 'global component' and the bilateral strategies for Afghanistan and Iraq for activities in these respective countries.

Activities have been conducted in the following countries/contexts: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Libya, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Ukraine, West Africa (Guinea), Western Sahara, Yemen and Zimbabwe. Both organisations have conducted activities in Iraq, Myanmar and Syria, as well as implemented projects of a cross-cutting nature.

#### **2. Objectives of the Evaluation**

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the project which DRC Humanitarian Disarmament and Peacebuilding (HDP) and MAG have undertaken with this funding and assess the extent to which they have met the overall and specific objectives of the grant.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Strategy for Sustainable Peace 2017–2022 - Government.se](https://www.government.se/press/meddelanden/2017/06/strategy-for-sustainable-peace-2017-2022)

In particular, the evaluator/evaluation team will be required to examine and report on the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability of the activities, in line with OECD evaluation criteria. This will support the wider sector in communicating the link between activities in this project and wider development and peace-building objectives.

The evaluation should also provide a useful and relevant reference document for other demining operators in the sector, as a means of identifying areas for complementarity with the work of different actors.

### **3. Scope of the evaluation**

The scope of this evaluation is to assess the degree of fulfilment of the specific aim of, and the results achieved by, the project detailed below:

**Title:** Global Humanitarian Mine Action and Small Arms Light Weapons Programme

**Implementing agencies:** Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and Mines Advisory Group (MAG)

**Donor:** Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

**Locations:** Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Libya, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Ukraine, West Africa (Guinea), Western Sahara, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Both organisations have conducted activities in Iraq, Myanmar, and Syria, as well as implemented projects of cross-cutting nature.

**Period of the grant:** 1 January 2018 – 30 June 2023

**Total value of the grant:** SEK 440,000,000

#### **Project details:**

Overall Objective: To reduce the global impact of mines, cluster munitions, other ERW and weapons proliferation on vulnerable populations, thereby reducing poverty and inequality and improving human safety and security and promoting sustainable peace in fragile and conflict-affected states.

It is important to note that the grant is managed within three areas, with each area having its own outcome and output objectives and associated indicators. These are:

- i. Afghanistan: DRC HDP
- ii. Iraq: Both DRC HDP and MAG
- iii. 'Global' – this envelope covers the remaining 18 countries where DRC HDP or MAG have worked alone. The only exceptions are Myanmar and Syria, where both organisations have implemented project activities.

Details of the specific outcomes and outputs are detailed below:

#### **Afghanistan**

Outcome objectives: To assist the Government of Afghanistan and DMAC (before 15 August 2021 and the takeover by the Taliban, after that DRC have been implementing the project purely in accordance with the humanitarian principles with no direct assistance provided to the de facto authorities also in line with Sida additional guidelines to its bilateral strategy for Afghanistan) in achieving compliance with the APMBC and to create a safe environment where people can live free from the dangers of landmines and Explosive Remnant of War's contamination.

Output objectives:

- 1) Increased knowledge amongst returnees and target communities of threats mine and ERW threats.
- 2) Increased capacity within DRC HDP to respond to pending clearance tasks including the conduct of anti-tank mechanical mine clearance in line with DMAC's priorities.

- 3) Reduced threat of death and injury to landmine and ERW-affected populations.

#### Iraq

Outcome objectives: To reduce the global impact of mines, cluster munitions, other ERW and weapons proliferation on vulnerable populations, thereby reducing poverty and inequality and improving human safety and security and promoting sustainable peace in fragile and conflict affected states.

Output objectives:

- 1) Increased awareness of the risks posed by mines, cluster munitions and other ERW within the communities.
- 2) Increased physical safety of communities affected by Mines, cluster munitions and other ERW.

#### 'Global'

Outcome objective: To reduce the global impact of mines, cluster munitions, other ERW and weapons proliferation on vulnerable populations, thereby reducing poverty and inequality and improving human safety and security and promoting sustainable peace in fragile and conflict affected states.

Output objectives:

- 1) Increased awareness of the risks posed by mines, cluster munitions and other ERW within the communities.
- 2) Increased physical safety of communities affected by mines, cluster munitions and other ERW.
- 3) Improved SALW control and practices within state security forces/actors.

A table summarising the key activities conducted in each of the target countries, by year, in this project is attached as an annex to this ToR.

Specifics on the scope of the evaluation are provided below:

**Timeframe of evaluation:** The evaluation should be initiated by August 2022 and completed no later than October 2022, with the final report to be submitted to DRC and MAG no later than 11 November 2022. It is the responsibility of the evaluator/evaluation team to propose and present a comprehensive timeline/workplan for the evaluation.

**Thematic areas:** The evaluation will cover the key areas of implementation under this grant, in relation to HMA and SALW, as detailed in the list above. Main priorities of this evaluation will be 1) to assess how mine action activities have been designed and implemented to complement and support broader development and humanitarian efforts, including how the flexibility in country focus have been used, 2) to what extent humanitarian mine action and small arms and light weapons can contribute to the peacebuilding realm and vice versa 3) Participation and accountability. This evaluation will also assess key cross-cutting themes such as gender and diversity, environmental considerations, and coordination between DRC and MAG as well as with Sida.

**Geographical areas covered by the evaluation:** The evaluation will extend across four (4) countries covered by the grant. Due to the nature of the grant structure, the evaluator/evaluation team will be required to assess the implementation of grants in three areas: Afghanistan, Iraq and the remaining 18 'global' countries/territories. Noting that the outcome objectives and output objectives differ across the three implementation areas.

The selection of the assessed countries was made considering the grant structure, the thematic areas covered in each country and the accessibility to the areas where project activities have been implemented. Against this backdrop, it is envisaged that projects will be assessed through two field missions and two remote assessments. ***Field missions are expected in Iraq (both DRC and MAG) and Senegal (only MAG), and remote assessment in Afghanistan (only DRC) and Myanmar (both DRC and MAG).***

**Actors' management and participation:** It is expected that the evaluation will involve meeting (either face to face or through virtual interviews) with a variety of stakeholders in some countries of operation. These will include, but not be limited to:

- i. Project participants (beneficiaries) either in group or individually,
- ii. Representatives from relevant national authorities,
- iii. International programme staff,
- iv. National programme staff,
- v. Management and support staff in DRC HDP HQ in Copenhagen, Denmark and MAG HQ in Manchester, UK.
- vi. Sida

The evaluator/evaluation team will be expected to identify a diversified and representative group of interviewees based on diversity factors in a given context to ensure a comprehensive analysis and assessment.

The evaluator/evaluation team will be expected to report regularly to the joint DRC-MAG HQ based evaluation management teams on the progress of the evaluation and any issues arising. They will be available to respond to questions and provide any appropriate practical support. A timetable for reporting will be finalised following selection of the evaluator/evaluation team, the establishing of the work plan and the signing of a contract.

While visiting programmes, the evaluator/evaluation team will be under the responsibility of the Country Director/Head of Programme who will ensure that visits to relevant sites are facilitated and supported, and that any necessary in-country information is made available for analysis. This individual will also hold overall responsibility to assist the evaluator(s) in their work, for instance by setting up appropriate meetings with external actors, where possible and if requested by the evaluator.

**Intended use of the evaluation findings and recommendations:**

DRC HDP and MAG HQs as well as their respective country offices will utilise the findings of the evaluation to inform and guide future planning and implementation of similar projects/programming. Also, the evaluation will help to ensure complementarity with other interventions in the mine action sector and enable mine action agencies to better communicate the impact of their work and how demining is linked to overall development. For Sida, it will provide an external and independent report on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the use of their funding under this grant.

**4. Key evaluation criteria and questions**

Within the selected countries and taking into consideration key OCSE DAC criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability), this evaluation should provide a clear response to the following:

- i. To what extent did the project activities undertaken by DRC HDP & MAG under the remit of this project meet, at an individual country level and taken as a whole, deliver:
  - The expected overall objective, and
  - The expected specific outcomes of this grant? (For each three areas: Afghanistan, Iraq and 'global')
- ii. What additional outcomes were achieved that have strengthened either DRC HDP and/or MAG or the wider mine action or SALW sector? Reference can be made, for instance, to reinforcing synergies between weapons related activities and peacebuilding ones or NEXUS programming.
- iii. What are the lessons learned from the implementation of this project, both at the global and individual country levels?

- iv. To what extent this project was underpinned by gender and diversity mainstreaming and environmental considerations
- vii. Along the evaluation, further consideration and assessment of the following elements is expected:
  - Coordination between DRC HDP and MAG in Iraq and Myanmar and at the global level, and coordination with Sida including assessing the required documentation.
  - Adaptation in response to, and impact of, the Covid-19 pandemic

An inception phase of 15 working days will allow to develop an interview guide in agreement with DRC HDP and MAG. The evaluators should also engage with Sida during the inception phase to understand expectations.

## 5. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator/evaluation team is required to deliver the following:

- a. Draft report
- b. Formal presentation of results/findings to DRC HDP and MAG
- c. Final report, including executive summary, key findings, and recommendations
- d. Lessons Learned Note
- e. Formal presentation of results/findings to Sida

The evaluator/evaluation team is required to deliver one evaluation report addressing the key evaluation criteria and questions as detailed above in section 4. Prior to the completion of the final evaluation report a formal presentation of results, based on the draft report, to the evaluation management teams in both organisations HQs, as well as to senior members of staff in relevant programmes. Offering an opportunity for feedback which can be considered within the final report. The final report should also be presented to Sida (which can be done digitally).

The evaluation report structure and presentation are to be suggested by potential evaluators/evaluation team as part of their submission. All written communications with DRC and MAG, including the final report, are to be in English.

<b>DRC &amp; MAG plan on making two payments linked to the main milestones</b>
A down payment equal to 20% at the beginning of the evaluation work.
A final payment upon delivery of the full and satisfactory findings/report.

The final report will be the property of DRC, MAG and Sida and must not be circulated to other parties by the author or any other parties without prior consent by all actors.

## 6. Methodology and Timeline

The methodology to be used is to be defined by the evaluator/evaluation team as part of their submission of their application and should be designed to effectively respond to the questions raised above.

Activities are expected to include, but not be limited to:

- Desk top review of all relevant documents provided by DRC and MAG and available from other sources
- Primary data collection from staff teams and key stakeholders through field visits in Senegal and Iraq.
- Review and discussion of initial findings with DRC HDP and MAG evaluation management teams
- Submission of draft/final report

Supporting documentation available:

- Original proposal, including logical framework (in English)
- Annual Reports for 2018, 2019 and 2020, 2021 (in English)
- Project Mid-Term Review 2020 (in English)
- Work Plans and Budgets for 2018-2023 (in English)
- The Cost Extension request (in English)
- *Evaluator/Evaluation team can also request additional documentation*

The evaluation is to be undertaken between August 2022 and October 2022. The evaluation will include a maximum of 10 days of fieldwork in each of two (2) selected countries (Iraq and Senegal). Locations may change based on the current global context and travel restrictions. The evaluator/evaluation team will organise own travel. All DRC pre-approved travel expenses will be reimbursed based on actual cost and submission of expense documentation.

DRC HDP and MAG expect to convene at least 2 meetings with the evaluator/evaluation team over the course of the evaluation to monitor its implementation and adjust, when necessary.

The final report is to be submitted to DRC HDP and MAG no later than 11 November 2022 and following agreement with the evaluator/evaluation team this will be preceded by a formal presentation of initial results to grant management teams in both organisations HQs, as well as to senior members of staff in relevant programmes.

## 7. Procedures for submission of Proposal

DRC HDP and MAG invites submissions of a technical proposal in response to this ToR. Interested companies, teams or consultants are expected to submit the following items in response to these terms of reference:

### Administrative documentation:

- Kindly refer to the RFP cover Letter, section A) Administrative Evaluation.

### Technical Bid:

- Updated CV (maximum 3 pages)
- 2 writing samples (this could be evaluation report, research or other)
- A technical proposal containing the broad outline of a research design and work plan reflecting the deliverables and the consultants understanding of DRC and MAG's requirements under these ToR.
- A financial proposal which reflects the technical offer and includes an all-inclusive daily consulting fee. Travel costs are to be excluded from the financial proposal, as these costs will be re-imbursed based on documentation of expenses.

Interested candidates should submit the proposal documents to [tender@drc.ngo](mailto:tender@drc.ngo) **by August 8th at 16:00 Local Copenhagen time.**

Criteria weighting for the "Proposal Evaluation"	
<b>1. Company qualifications (30%)</b> (Documented with the filled-out Supplier Registration Form with ref. To three similar research projects executed, including two samples)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General capacity of the company (10%)</li> <li>- Previous relevant research projects executed (with focus on the set-up as required, with a consultant coordinating and supervising a team of researchers across several geographies or similar) (10%)</li> </ul>

	- Relevant sector experience and experience working with NGOs (10%)
<b>2. Proposed services (40%)</b> (Documented with the technical proposal)	- Content of the proposal suitable for the requirements as stated in the ToR (20%) - Proposed methodology for the qualitative and/or quantitative research (20%)
<b>3. Personnel qualifications (30%)</b> (Documented with CVs of relevant staff involved in the project)	- Experience of core people who will work on the project with similar projects and NGO experience (30%)
Total	<b>100%</b>

The three technically best scoring candidates will be invited to an interview to assess the candidates' qualifications and proposed services. The interviewees will be further evaluated against:

- Previous relevant research projects executed
- Quality and feasibility of the proposed methodology for the research
- Professional competencies & experience of the person(s) who will work on the project

## **8. Profile of the Evaluator/Evaluation team**

Experts expressing an interest in doing this work should be able to demonstrate experience in the following areas:

### **Essential**

- Experience of successfully undertaking similar evaluations for international NGOs in conflict/post conflict countries
- Research skills and knowledge of good practice in evaluation
- Interpersonal skills that evoke trust and are gender and culturally sensitive
- Strong verbal and written English language skills
- A knowledge of the humanitarian disarmament sector and how it links with humanitarian action and socio-economic development
- Professional experience in the mine action/SALW sector

### **Desirable**

- Experience of carrying out evaluations of multi-year, multi-country grants

## **9. Additional Information**

For additional information regarding these terms of reference or submission instructions, please send your questions to: Camilla Roberti, Global HDP Advisor on email: [camilla.roberti@drc.ngo](mailto:camilla.roberti@drc.ngo) until **July 20th, and between 1-5 August, 2022**

**NB! Please note that bids sent to the above email address will be rejected**



**Annex**

Country	RE	NTS	TS	EOD	Clear.	SALW / WAM	VA	Other
<b>DDG</b>								
Ukraine		X	X		X			Advocacy
Libya HMA		X	X	X	X			
Colombia	X	X	X	X (added in 2020)	X			Gender
Yemen	X	X		X (not included as of 2020)				
West Africa (Guinea)						X		
Syria	X	X (not included in 2020)						
Iraq HMA	X	X	X	X	X			
Afghanistan	X	X	X	X	X			Gender
Myanmar	X	X					X (as of 2020)	
LBY WAM/SALW						X (as of 2020)		
Western Sahara	X (only in 2018 and 2020)	X (as of 2020)						
DKHQ - Gender Review								Gender
HDP Advocacy								Advocacy (as of 2021)
Iraq SALW						X (as of 2022)		
<b>MAG</b>								
Lebanon	X			X	X			Gender
Iraq HMA	X	X	X	X	X			



Bosnia HMA			X		X			Advocacy (as of 2022) Capacity Building (as of 2022) Conflict Sensitivity/Monitoring (as of 2022)
Zimbabwe	X		X	X (added in 2020)	X			Gender (as of 2022)
Somalia	X (as of 2022)					X		Gender (as of 2022) Advocacy (as of 2022)
Myanmar	X	X						Gender (as of 2022) Advocacy Capacity Building (as of 2022) Conflict Sensitivity / Monitoring (as of 2022)
Sri Lanka			X		X			Advocacy
Angola	X			X	X (as of 2022)			Gender (as of 2022) Capacity Building (as of 2022)
Bosnia SALW						X (as of 2020)		
Nigeria HMA	X (as of 2020)	X (as of 2020)						Gender (as of 2022)Capacity Building (as of 2022)Treaty Compliance (as of 2022)
Nigeria SALW	X (as of 2021)					X (as of 2021)		Gender (as of 2021) AVR (as of 2021)
Global Conflict Sensitivity								Gender (as of 2021) Conflict Sensitivity (as of 2021)
Senegal HMA		X (as of 2021)						Gender (as of 2021) Capacity Building (as of 2021) Conflict Sensitivity (as of 2021)
Senegal SALW						X (as of 2022)		Gender (as of 2022) Capacity Building (as of 2021)
Guinea-Bissau						X (as of 2022)		Gender (as of 2021) Capacity Building (as of 2022)
Iraq SALW						X (as of 2022)		Advocacy (as of 2022)
Syria	X (only in 2021)	X (only in 2021)		X (only in 2021)	X (only in 2021)			

END