**Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**Final Evaluation of the project “Georgia Climate Action Project (GEO-CAP):**

**Promoting Civil Society Engagement in Climate Change Policy Design and Implementation”**

# Background and Context

Within the frames of the EU-supported **Georgia Climate Action Project (GEO-CAP)**, CENN is promoting civil society engagement in climate change (CC) policy design and implementation with the project’s implementing partners – [KRDF](https://www.krdf.ge/), [ACU](https://www.facebook.com/ChiatureltaKavshiri), [YPU](https://apk.ge/) and [RLS-ADA](https://www.facebook.com/agrotourismrachalechkhumi).

The project is strengthening the role of CSOs in tackling CC by establishing a multi-stakeholder national platform and regional action groups on climate change and building trust and collaboration between state and non-state actors for increased climate change resilience and water security. The project works nationwide and engage with CSOs and other actors at national and local levels in ten (10)[[1]](#footnote-1) municipalities of the 4 target regions of **Guria, Imereti, Kakheti and Racha-Lechkhumi and Lower Svaneti.** The project is empowering local CSOs in their actions for inclusive governance and equitable development, demonstrate benefits of innovative projects on water security contributing to CC mitigation and adaptation and protection of human health and the environment as well as increase awareness and recognition of the role of CSOs in advocating for the protection of the environment and human health.

The **Overall Objective** of the project is to strengthen the civil society of Georgia and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a particular focus on the rights to water and a healthy environment.

The **Specific Objective** of the project is to strengthen the role of CSOs in tackling climate change (CC) via establishing multi-stakeholder regional action groups and a national platform on climate change, environment and health and building trust and collaboration between state and non-state actors for inclusive policy development and increased climate change resilience and water security[[2]](#footnote-2) (as defined by UN-Water).

**Outcome 1:** Enhanced climate change (CC) participation mechanisms: A National Climate Platform and regional multi-stakeholder Climate Action Groups (CAGs) are created and ensure the engagement of civil society in CC policy design and implementation at various levels. The marginalized, disadvantaged and excluded groups are empowered, the voice of youth and gender equality are promoted through the application of RBA (Right-Based Approach). National and local climate policies are gender and child-sensitive.

**Outcome 2:** Stimulated evidence-based and participative climate-responsive decision-making: Priority issues of water security linked to CC vulnerability and environmental degradation are identified and assessed through participatory processes in 4 target regions. Stakeholder partnerships (corporate-CSO, PPPs) are created and pilot initiatives are implemented to demonstrate collective actions that successfully contribute to climate resilience and protect the rights of disadvantaged groups to WASH and a healthy environment.

**Outcome 3:** Strengthened CC mitigation and adaptation measures and protection of human health and environment via financial (sub-grants) and capacity-building support offered to the third parties for implementation of innovative projects (with a focus on new technologies, digital solutions and circular economy) on water security and CC resilience (particularly for marginalized groups). Human rights to water and a healthy environment are promoted, protected and fulfilled. Women and youth are empowered by supporting women and youth initiatives.

**Outcome 4:** Increased public awareness about climate change and the role of civil society participation in tackling its negative effects.

# Purpose and Objectives

The final evaluation is carried out at the end of the intervention, as a mandatory assessment of the design, implementation, and results of the implemented project. The results will be reported to the project team, project stakeholders, project beneficiaries, and a donor organization. The evaluation is both summative and formative. It is summative in the sense that it aims to assess accountability in terms of achieved results (intended and unintended, direct and indirect, positive and negative, and at output, outcome, and/or overarching goal level). At the same time, the evaluation is formative as it is aimed to contribute to learning for future similar interventions. As a result, the findings will be used to both promote accountability and learning. The findings will be used to foster accountability and learning not only vertically (between CENN and EU), but also horizontally – with project stakeholders, project beneficiaries, and with CENN colleagues. The evaluation is aimed to assess all interventions of the project from its start in 2021 up to the latest available data in 2024, as well as additional needs and entry points for its continuation.

The evaluation is aimed to assess the following criteria:

* 1. **Relevance:** The extent to which the intervention’s objectives and design responded to beneficiaries’ global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
  2. **Coherence:** The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) supported or undermined the intervention and vice versa, including internal coherence and external coherence.
  3. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.
  4. **Efficiency:** The extent to which the intervention delivered results in an economic and timely way.
  5. **EU-added value:** The changes which it can reasonably be argued are due to the EU intervention.

It is expected that the selected evaluation team prepares detailed interview guides corresponding to each target group and evaluation criteria, reviewed and approved by CENN.

The general evaluation questions are provided below:

*Relevance*

* To what extent have the (original) objectives proven to be appropriate for the project?
* How well did the (original) objectives correspond to the needs and priorities of the target groups?

*Coherence*

* To what extent has the project been consistent with the relevant international norms and standards to which CENN and EU adhere (e.g. HRBA, SDGs)?
* To what extent is this project coherent with other projects that have similar objectives?

*Effectiveness*

* To what extent has the intervention achieved the intended objectives?
* To what extent did different factors influence the achievements observed?

*Efficiency*

* To what extent were the costs associated with the project proportionate to the benefits it has generated? What factors were influencing any particular discrepancies?
* To what extent are the costs involved justified, given the changes/effects which have been achieved?

*EU-added value*

* What is the additional value resulting from the EU intervention, compared to what could be achieved by others (i.e. EU Member States, other donors, and the country/region)?
* To what extent do the issues addressed by the intervention continue to require EU support?

Evaluations must comply with the OECD-DAC quality standards for development evaluations (<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>), as well as EU [Better regulation toolbox](https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox/better-regulation-toolbox_en) and [DG NEAR Guidelines on linking planning/programming, Monitoring and Evaluation](https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/funding-and-technical-assistance/monitoring-and-evaluation_en) (updated May 2024).

# Design and Approach

The relevant judgement criteria and indicators, and identification of data collection tools and sources, are expected to be finalized by the evaluation team and agreed upon by CENN. The evaluation team is expected to provide relevant methods for addressing the evaluation criteria. The triangulation of data, sources, and methods should be ensured as much as possible to promote credibility and use of evaluation results. The evaluation design, approach, and methods should clearly show how data collection will be human rights-based, foster environmental sustainability, and be gender sensitive.

Under the overall guidance of CENN, the selected partner will be responsible for providing the following tasks:

1. To design the qualitative study methodology (including sample designs) in close consultations with the CENN team
2. To develop and pilot qualitative research instruments
3. To conduct desk study and review relevant secondary data for measuring achievement of intended project targets;
4. To analyze the collected quantitative and qualitative data (including the secondary data obtained from desk study) and submit the first draft report in English language to CENN
5. To incorporate feedback in the report and submit the final report in English to CENN.

The main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project are listed below (indicating number of people in each category). Selection and justification of each method appropriate for the given group of stakeholders/beneficiaries should be provided in the technical proposal.

**Direct beneficiaries of the project:**

1. National Climate Platform (NCP) members (central government, parliament, private, non-government organizations and academia (96 people in total)
2. Regional Climate Action Group (CAG) members (regional authorities, local authorities, non-government organizations and academia, 121 people in total)
3. Grant recipients (20 people)
4. Thematic camp participants (60 people)
5. Project implementing partner organizations, local NGOs (4)
6. Participants of thematic competitions for journalists, students and graphic designers (30)

**Indirect beneficiaries of the project:**

1. Beneficiaries of pilot projects (community members)
2. Beneficiaries of thematic camp initiatives (mostly schools and kindergartens)
3. Journalists (10) at local and regional level

# Deliverables

As a result of the evaluation the following deliverables are expected to be submitted to CENN:

* **Draft and final inception report**, including:
  + Introduction
    - Objectives and scope of the evaluation
    - Structure of the report
  + A synthesis of all activities conducted
  + Analysis of the subject of the evaluation’s framework
    - Reconstruction of the intended intervention logic
  + The proposed EQs (EQ's heading, judgement criteria and indicators, and relevant sources of
  + information and data collection tools)
  + Methodology for the remaining phases
    - Key methodological elements for each of the phases
    - Overall approach for the desk phase
    - A proposal of a sample of countries/interventions subject to in depth desk review and field work, if any
    - Limitations
  + Work plan
  + The conclusions of the kick-off meeting
  + A draft outline of the final synthesis report amending if necessary that included in the ToR
  + A list of proposed dissemination materials
* **Draft and final report**, including:
  + Executive summary
  + Introduction
  + Key methodological steps, including:
    - Description of all evaluation activities, focusing on the choice of evaluation questions, approaches and methods, limitations to the research (including those linked to data quality and if relevant, to monitoring systems), problems encountered and solutions implemented, and explanation of any difference between the evaluation design and the final report
  + Analysis of the subject of the evaluation’s framework
  + Reconstruction of the intervention logic
  + Findings of the evaluation by evaluation question
  + Overall assessment
  + Conclusions
  + Recommendations (including, if relevant, directions for further research and evaluation). Recommendation should include an indication on: i) responsible actors for their implementation, ii) their importance and iii) their urgency.
  + A list of dissemination materials produced and of dissemination initiatives performed
  + The Final Report is accompanied by the following annexes:
    - The ToR
    - The methodological approach
    - The evaluation matrix (data collection and analysis by EQs' indicators)
    - List of documents consulted
    - List of persons met
    - Table with the achieved results based on the log frame
* Data collection instruments
* Feedback matrices to the draft reports
* A PPT presentation summarizing main findings of the study
* Workshops (2) for presentation of inception and final report results
* A final debriefing with project staff

# Schedule

The process of the evaluation should follow the next steps:

**Kick-off and Inception Phase (November 2024)**

The first phase comprises of the following actions/deliverables by the evaluation team:

1. Desk research and a study/desk review of documents and data (portfolio analysis) provided by the project and documents identified by the evaluation team (other literature/evaluative evidence)
2. Focus group discussion with project team focusing on project theory.
3. Agreement on prioritizing of DAC criteria and selection/focus of the evaluation questions
4. Review of existing evaluations and studies as a basis for enhancing the project theory
5. Draft inception report (10 pages plus annexes) that must contain at least the following points:
6. Incorporation of the written comments into the draft inception report and submission of the final inception report.
7. A workshop for the presentation of inception report results.

**Data Collection and Interview Phase (November-December 2024)**

The main components of the second phase are:

1. Data collection as agreed upon in the inception report. Any changes to the inception report need written permission from CENN
2. Key informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and survey data, as applicable.

**Data Analysis and Submission of Report (December 2024-January 2025)**

1. Data analysis and preparation of triangulation matrix.
2. Submission of a Draft Evaluation Report that must contain at least the following points:
3. Incorporation of the feedback (or else non-incorporation of feedback based on a sound justification) by the evaluation team and submission of the final draft report and replication strategy (in separate documents) to CENN
4. Provision of a PPT presentation summarizing the main findings of the evaluation
5. Holding of a concluding workshop, including the presentation of results and conclusion as well as a discussion on refining the recommendations by the evaluation team
6. Incorporation of the written comments by the evaluation team and submission of the final version of the report to CENN for coherence screening.
7. **MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The evaluation is mandated by CENN, and the selection of the evaluation team and daily management will be provided by the CENN team. Furthermore, CENN will ensure timely communication with EU about all deliverables and will communicate the received feedback back to the evaluation team. The evaluation team is responsible for providing all deliverables in a timely manner, taking into consideration requirements as defined in this ToR. The study results including recommendations will be discussed among the members of the project partners, as well as representatives of the target groups, and **serve as the basis for learning, adaption, and improvements of the intervention strategy for the future interventions.**

# List of Documents

The evaluation team will be provided with:

* Project documents (including annexes, revisions, and budget)
* All progress reports
* Information on other projects closely connected with the project to be evaluated
* List of contacts containing all persons involved in the implementation of the project (with function, task, contact data, and information on language skills) as well as all local partners (including representatives of the target group, as far as feasible)
* All other relevant documents prepared by the project (e.g. guidebooks, recommendations, etc.).

# The Evaluation Team

The evaluation should be conducted by a team of evaluators, including at least one national evaluator from Georgia. The team composition should be detailed and explained in the technical offer, together with a division of tasks among all team members and the added value of each member.

The team leader should have the following qualifications:

* University degree (at least Masters) in Sociology, Social Sciences, or related field, PhD is strongly preferred
* Track record in leading evaluations during the last 5 years (at least three evaluations conducted), proven by at least one such evaluation annexed to the offer
* Solid experience in developing methodologies and research instruments in line with international academic standards and guidelines proven by at least one writing sample (published or unpublished, to be annexed to the offer)
* At least 5 years of experience in designing and implementing donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development and/or environment in Georgia
* At least 5 years of experience in evaluating donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development
* At least 5 years of experience in working with multi-stakeholders: government, civil society, community-based organizations, and UN/multilateral/bilateral institutions
* Sound understanding of climate change, sustainable development and participatory decision-making process in the regions of Georgia
* Experience in applying HRBA during the assessments/surveys
* Fluency in English and Georgian

The other team member(s) should have the following qualifications:

* University degree (at least Masters) in social sciences, law, economy or environmental sector
* At least 5 years of experience in leading the design and conducting social research, writing study reports
* At least 5 years of proven work experience on project/program evaluations with the OECD/DAC and EU Better Regulation Guidelines & Toolbox evaluation criteria; previous evaluations in the climate change/environmental field in Georgia will be an asset
* Proven familiarity with or work experience in Georgia; evaluation experience in Georgia
* Proven understanding of HRBA methods
* Fluency in English and/or Georgian

The proposal must include the following components provided below. Incomplete applications will not be considered. The weight of each award criteria is given below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Award criteria** | **Weight of award criteria in %** |
| 1. CV of a maximum of 4 pages for each person, highlighting relevant experience | 20% |
| 2. One sample of previous similar work (in English) | 10% |
| 3. The technical proposal with a description of the understanding of the assignment, the suggested expert/s, evaluation design, data collection, and analysis methods to be used, including risks and mitigation strategies, suggested work plan, division of work, and detailed timeframe. | 50% |
| 4. The financial proposal, with a detailed cost breakdown (ceiling amount – EUR 7,000 excluding VAT) | 20% |

Please send any questions as well as your complete offer (1. CVs in a separate PDF and 2. All other requested documentation) to the following email addresses:

[megi.gamtkitsulashvili@cenn.org](mailto:megi.gamtkitsulashvili@cenn.org%20) and [tamar.iakobidze@cenn.org](mailto:tamar.iakobidze@cenn.org%20) no later than **October 31, 18:00 Tbilisi time.**

1. Lanchkhuti, Ozurgeti in **Guria**; Gurjaani, Sagarejo, Akhmeta in **Kakheti**; Zestaponi, Tkibuli, Chiatura in **Imereti**; and Ambrolauri, Oni in **Racha-Lechkhumi** regions [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “The capacity of a population to safeguard sustainable access to adequate quantities of acceptable quality water for sustaining livelihoods, human well-being, and socio-economic development, for ensuring protection against water-borne pollution and water-related disasters, and for preserving ecosystems in a climate of peace and political stability”, UN-Water, 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)