



action/2015: Ending poverty, inequalities and climate change

Terms of Reference Action/2015 Campaign Evaluation

This document describes the proposed approach for the evaluation of the action/2015 campaign, that is to say the purpose and scope of the evaluation as well as the evaluation methodology, timeframe and budget.

Type of evaluation	Final evaluation
Expected evaluation methodologies	Quantitative and qualitative methodologies
Number of evaluators	One lead evaluator with (optional) one assistant <i>(one person can apply for the position, or a team of two persons can apply together for both positions)</i>
Expected start/end dates, number of work days	Expected start date: 16 November 2015 Expected work days for lead evaluator: 35 days Expected end date: 16 February 2016
Deadline for receiving applications	16 October 2015, 11:59PM EST

1. Description of the campaign to be evaluated

1.1. Background and objectives of the action/2015 campaign

In 2015, world leaders have had the opportunity to make historic progress on the greatest challenges of our time. Two global processes – defining a new UN development framework and climate agreement – culminated within months of each other at the end of 2015, to decide – for good or for bad – the future for people and the planet.

Action/2015 was created to ensure world leaders would feel the pressure of millions and millions of people calling on them to take ambitious action to secure a better future for people and planet.

Nowadays, action/2015 has grown to become a movement of 2000 organizations, networks and coalitions from over 150 countries united by the belief that 2015 is a critical year for progress in the fight against climate change, poverty and inequality.

Campaign goal and objectives:

Vision: To ensure world leaders feel the pressure to raise their ambition in 2015 and held to account in the years to come by a stronger civil society.



Goal: To inform the public about the opportunities and risks at stake in 2015, inspire the public that change is possible through engagement in action/2015, and engage/mobilize the public around action/2015 to collectively tackle the root causes of inequality, injustice, poverty and climate change.

Objectives:

More specifically, action/2015 works towards the following objectives:

1) **Increase public awareness** of the opportunity of 2015

Key outcomes to meet this objective:

- Increased campaign public visibility
- Increased awareness about the opportunities and risks at stake in 2015
- Increased endorsement of action/2015's objectives

2) **Inspire the public** to take action in support of action/2015.

Key outcomes to meet this objective:

- Engaged public through online actions (online petitions, social media activities, etc.)
- Engaged public through in-person activities
- Decision-makers¹ highly engaged around action/2015

3) **Build a bigger, stronger movement** to put pressure on world leaders to deliver truly ambitious outcomes needed to end climate change, poverty and inequality in 2015, and hold them to account in the years to come

Key outcomes to meet this objective:

- Increased campaign reach among CSOs
- Increased network engagement & collaboration to put pressure on world leaders to deliver truly ambitious outcomes needed to end climate change, poverty and inequality in 2015
- Stronger movement ready to work on holding leaders to account in the years to come

Core principles of the campaign:

The campaign draws on the strengths and resources of its partner organizations through the following core principles:

- **Inclusive** – open to anyone that supports the campaign's vision and would like to join this flotilla movement.
- **Enabling** – action/2015 has a set of opt-in ideas and global moments which will enable all organisations to increase their impact by linking to a global movement.
- **Light touch** – there is no centralised sign off process or heavy decision making structure for activities.
- **Open source** - The campaign signifier and campaign products assets are open for everyone to use.
- Focus on **popular mobilization and public engagement**.

1.2. Scope and reach of the action/2015 campaign to date:

Since the beginning of the campaign, the action/2015 movement has grown enormously, proving the breadth and depth of concern for the issues at stake in 2015. There are now **2000+ organizations from 150+ countries**

¹ *Decision-makers are defined as the "leaders who can influence the outcomes of the international development and climate negotiations" (Heads of State, post-2015 negotiators, etc.)*



that have officially registered to the campaign, **with over 80% based in the Global South** (49% from Sub-Saharan Africa, 11.5% from Asia, 17% from LAC; 1% from the Pacific; 2% from MENA; 13% from Europe; and 6.5% from North America).

To date, more than 30 million people have taken action in over 100 countries, demonstrating the **scale and diversity** of the public demand for **transformative action**. This has included action at key moments including the Financing for Development Summit, International Women's Day, the G7 meeting in Germany, the AU Summit in Cape Town, in line with key negotiations in New York and World Economic Forum meetings. Moreover during the month of May, the action/2015 global movement engaged in a month of diverse, worldwide and truly grassroots mobilization- from rallies to flash mobs to online activity.

For more information about action/2015, please visit the action/2015 website at www.action2015.org. For more information on the action/2015 campaign content and internal resources for partners, please visit the action/2015 campaign's online drive at <http://bit.ly/1JHR2O7> and Google Group at <http://bit.ly/1KzY1MR>.

1.3. Structure of the campaign

Structurally, action/2015 works through four government structures, as outlined below:

1. Campaign Assembly: The Assembly is open to all campaign participants. It is the main decision making body of the campaign.

Its remit includes: agree the narrative, key messages and goals of the campaign; decide on the campaign's communications, opt-in signifier and identity; decide on the campaign's structure and governance; agree plans for the campaign's collective peak moments; Review effectiveness of campaign's communications and governance, based on the experience of campaign participants; encourage engagement/provide initiation for new campaign participants; ensure linking, learning and strengthening global civil society; activate Action Teams as needed as well as holding them to account on key deliverables along the lines of the individual team's terms of reference.

The Assembly is accountable to campaign participants and has to be mindful of the full range of actors and perspectives in the campaign. The Assembly is not representative of the organisations/individual attending; it acts on behalf of the whole campaign. Decisions made by participants of the campaign at the assembly (physically or virtually) can't be overturned by non-attending participants or by the Reference Group. In between assemblies, on occasions and in extremis, the Reference Group might if necessary take decisions that weren't mandated by the assemblies in order to ensure the campaign is being politically astute and tactically strategic.



2. Reference Group: Through a light touch approach, the reference group performs a predominantly advisory role to the campaign Global Hub and Action Teams, providing light touch steer to ensure strategies stay on track.

The group is made up of 14 geographically representative places (one woman and one man from each of Asia, Europe, Latin America & Caribbean, Middle East & North Africa, North America, Oceania, Sub Saharan Africa) elected in July 2014, and 3 additional advisers from networks that are leading on large-scale public engagement work around post 2015 and UNFCC and were not yet included in the Reference Group through the election process.

Its remit includes: keep an overview of strategies to help ensure decisions agreed by the Assembly are implemented; advise/support the Global Hub and Action Teams (by request) on their priorities and engagement strategies – identifying linkages and any conflicts, to help ensure coherence; actively seek and spot opportunities for campaign engagement in external events and platforms to build the campaign profile – including horizon scanning for opportunities coming up during the life span of the campaign; sign off ‘campaign only’ communications products (open source creative commons) – those that are made for the use of the whole campaign by all participants, not co-branded products (when timelines don’t allow for assembly decisions).

3. Global Hub: The Global Hub provide logistical support to the campaign, facilitate flow of information and support participating organisations and other governance elements in the effective implementation/coordination of the campaign. The Global Hub facilitates the campaign and helps build and maintain its momentum through devolved capacity but decentralized management, service-oriented support structure to help enable maximum coordination and impact of campaign, clear accountability lines and transparent decision-making.

Its remit includes: facilitate internal campaign communications (help organize calls, maintain campaign participants email lists, shared calendars and other possible tools, centralize and disseminate info, share creative idea, etc.); manage online presence to ensure information is up-to-date and develop creative commons for open source use by all participating organisations; advise and support Action Teams in the implementation of strategies; facilitate delivery against the campaign strategy and against decisions made at the assembly - chase and support participating organisations in the carrying out of agreed tasks; disseminate materials to participating organisations where relevant; make sure the materials are translated where possible; be primary point of contact and direct requests to relevant groups; work with the Reference Group to ensure strategies are aligned where possible and assist in spotting any conflicts; be accountable to the campaign assembly.

4. Action Teams: Action Teams develop and deliver specific activities for the campaign on expert campaign areas (communications, outreach, Assembly planning, etc.), planning around key campaign moments (May mobilization, September action/team, etc.) as well as thematic areas (climate change, youth, women, faith, mutual accountability & transparency, etc.). These groups are action-oriented with clear terms of reference to deliver specific campaign activities and strategies. Action teams are inclusive, opt-in, consultative, consensus-seeking, representative, accessible and work to the principles of the campaign.

Its remit includes: To develop strategies and tactics, implement and deliver exciting, engaging impactful campaign moments, campaign activities (launches, events, etc.); To deliver the specific campaign activities per their terms of reference; To ensure that the Action Team has the right set of capacity, skills and expertise to

action/2015

deliver all the elements they are tasked with; To ensure that all outputs reflect the requirements, challenges and opportunities of joint activity across local, national, regional, global scales as appropriate (including recognising time needed for participants to operationalise plans, recognising cultural sensitivities and different political contexts); To ensure that their part of the campaign has/maintains momentum, remains joined up (as relevant and appropriate), communicates appropriately and equitably across the Action Team and any of its component parts (e.g. if it has drawn on other Action Teams to deliver its task), and to ensure excellent communication and dissemination across the campaign including with all other parts of the governance structure.

Action teams are accountable to the Campaign Assembly, and accountable for delivering to their terms of reference

National/Regional Action Teams: Recognising that the one of the most significant level of work of campaign implementation is at local, regional and national level, and that it may not be possible for many national level people/activists/agencies to participate in campaign assemblies on global level, there is a need for National/Regional Action Teams which have a slightly different focus/purpose to Action Teams as described above. Its responsibilities are: To reach out to all relevant national/regional actors including the usual suspects; To develop coordination mechanisms at national/regional level ; To ensure the flow of information at national/regional level across the campaign, and equally importantly to and from the global level; To ensure as appropriate, national/regional coordination and implementation of globally agreed activities; To co-ordinate and share national/regional campaign messages (where suitable/appropriate); To create opportunities to work together with other nations/regions; To ensure that representatives from the nations/region are active in global processes and working groups.

2. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the action/2015 campaign and to offer recommendations that could inform the design and delivery of similar themed projects in the future.

2.2. Objectives of the evaluation

- Assess and describe the results and effectiveness of the action/2015 campaign – intended and unintended, positive and negative, as well as the major factors that influenced results
- Draw lessons learned and provide recommendations for future campaigns and CSO coordination mechanisms

2.3. Audience of the evaluation

The main audience of the evaluation includes action/2015 Global Hub staff and participating organizations, donors, partners and future lead of similar campaigns/coordination mechanisms.

2.4. Coverage of the evaluation

The evaluation is intended to cover all completed activities in all targeted geographic areas.

2.5. Evaluation criteria and questions

The following non exhaustive criteria will be used in the evaluation. The main questions to be considered are detailed for each criteria. A further explanation of the criteria to be used and the methodology to assess the action/2015 campaign will be required in the evaluation proposal.

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Effectiveness	1. How well have campaign activities been planned and implemented?	1.1. How well have activities been planned? Have the planning mechanism and procedures been effective for the future delivery of campaign activities? 1.2. Have activities been implemented as planned? Have unforeseen activities been implemented? 1.3. Have the implementation mechanism and procedures been effective to deliver the intended campaign activities? If not, what are the gaps? 1.4. Were the campaign principles and procedures or protocols in place and were they followed in the implementation of activities? 1.5. How effective were the structures at regional and national level, what drove participation at these levels, and is it sustainable?
Outcomes	2. Has the campaign achieved its intended outcomes?	2.1. Has the campaign achieved its key objectives and intended outcomes? (see page 2 for details) 2.2. Do the beneficiary population perceive that the expected results have been achieved? Do the participating organizations perceive that the expected results have been achieved? 2.3. Has there been coordination and increased collaboration between the different actors involved in the implementation of the campaign? Has the coalition strengthened civil society capacity, especially in the Global South? 2.4. Has the campaign contributed to any important unintended outcomes, either positive or negative? 2.5. Have the interventions/campaigns amplified local issues at regional or global level? 2.6. Can we link any relevant policy change with active citizen participation/campaigning? 2.7. How far has it helped achieve your individual organisational outcomes?

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
<p>Relevance</p>	<p>3. How appropriate was the campaign design?</p>	<p>3.1. Was the design of campaign interventions the most appropriate way to achieve intended outcomes? Were there other, more efficient or cost effective ways in which similar outcomes could have been achieved?</p> <p>3.2. How relevant were the overall campaign goal and objectives given the campaign's structure & capacity at the moment of project design and implementation?</p> <p>3.3. How appropriate was the campaign messaging to meet the project's goal and objectives?</p> <p>3.4. Were external factors properly considered? How flexibly the various levels of management adapted to ensure that the results would achieve their purpose?</p> <p>3.5. Are there recommendations and good practices in global campaigning identified by the project that would be useful for the beneficiary population and to the participating organizations and future CSO coordination mechanism?</p> <p>3.6. Should the coalition have looked at other campaign angles? E.g. a greater focus on targeted policy & advocacy was needed?</p>

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Efficiency	<p>4. How efficiently was the campaign structure at managing the project?</p>	<p>4.1. How efficiently and timely were campaign activities implemented by the campaign's government bodies and participating organizations per plan?</p> <p>4.2. Did the participating organizations and the local partners have enough capacity for the implementation of the action/2015 campaign? Or did they feel the campaign might have jeopardized their work?</p> <p>4.3. Do partners feel that they were given an equal voice in the planning and design of the campaign (per theme of focus, geographical representation, etc.)? Do partners feel that they had equal opportunities to engage?</p> <p>4.4. How successful was the campaign in building a bigger, stronger movement at global & national levels, uniting diverse movements and people around our shared opportunities in 2015? Was the planning and suggested activities calendar clear?</p> <p>4.5. How far the costs of the activities were justified by the benefits? - whether or not expressed in monetary terms - compared, mutatis mutandis, with similar projects, activities or approaches elsewhere.</p> <p>4.6. How was the quality of day-to-day management? (management of the budget, management of personnel, information, supplies, etc.) Were there any noticeable, verifiable instances of waste or inefficiency in the delivery of campaign activities in terms of resources and time?</p> <p>4.7. How efficiently were individual organizations' campaigns leveraged/promoted?</p> <p>4.8. Was the system of monitoring appropriate, accurate and followed up?</p>

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Partnership	5. What effect has the project had on the partnership between participating organizations?	5.1. Has the project contributed to strengthening the partnership among participating organizations? If so, how and if not, why? 5.2. Were the different governing bodies of the campaign clear on their roles and responsibilities? What should have been done further to strengthen this aspect? 5.3. What experience did partners have working with each other – both in terms of opportunities and challenges? 5.4. What approach would be the best to further promote partnership and strengthen the role of governing bodies in projects design and implementation? 5.5. To what extent were the governing bodies of the campaign planning and delivering the campaign activities in coordination with the other consortium members, and how could that coordination have been improved?
Coordination and Coverage	6. How well did the actual campaign coverage compare to expectations and identified needs?	6.1. Did the campaign reach the intended or targeted beneficiaries as per plan? 6.2. Did the campaign engage the intended partners and stakeholders? If not, why didn't all expected partners participate in the campaign? Did the process, implementation or other practices of the campaign contribute? 6.3. Were the monitoring and reporting mechanisms clear? 6.4. How well did participating organizations coordinate with each other to maximize resources and ensure coverage in the same geographic areas? 6.5. How did the coalition attempt to reach the most vulnerable? 6.6. How did the coalition tackle internal challenges (coordination, resourcing, divergence of interests, etc.)? And what learning mechanisms were set up to integrate lessons learned?
Beneficiary participation and satisfaction	7. How satisfied were beneficiaries and participating organizations with the campaign?	7.1. In what ways did partners participate in the design and implementation of the campaign? 7.2. In what ways did beneficiaries participate in the design and implementation of the campaign? (e.g. vulnerable populations, children & youth groups, etc.) 7.3. How satisfied were participating organizations and beneficiaries with project design, implementation and results? 7.4. How effectively has the coalition adapted its approach and activities to fragile contexts?

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Sustainability and Replicability	8. How sustainable and replicable is the project model?	<p>8.1. What has been the degree of participation and ownership of objectives and achievements of the campaign by participating organizations during the phases of identification, formulation and implementation?</p> <p>8.2. Has there been support and participation of the involved organizations? Was the intervention relevant to national and local partners, and their respective national and thematic agendas? And to what extent have interventions helped amplify local issues at regional and global levels?</p> <p>8.3. Did the project respect local socio-cultural factors? Have local resources been used properly?</p> <p>8.4. If there have been changes, whether intended or unintended, how well-accepted were the changes both by the target group and by others?</p> <p>8.5. Did the organizations have the capacity to assume their commitments to the project? Have there been institutional strengthening that could facilitate replicable initiatives? Will the organizations involved continue to engage in the processes?</p> <p>8.6. What were the main benefits to participate in the campaign? Do organisations/stakeholders value the need to pursue a similar coalition during the implementation of the SDGs?</p> <p>8.7. What are the coalition's follow-up plans?</p>
Lessons learned	9. What can we learn from this campaign that would help inform future campaigns and/or global CSO coordination mechanisms?	<p>9.1. What are the lessons learned in terms of campaign implementation, coordination, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring?</p> <p>9.2. What are the key challenges to successful campaign implementation and how can they be improved upon or adjusted moving forward?</p> <p>9.3. What are the best practices that can be incorporated in campaign implementation and CSO coordination mechanisms?</p>

3. Scope of work and Evaluation design

3.1. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted using a range of methodologies below which can be further refined on the basis of the outcomes of a briefing session hosted by the steering committee. The following is a list of methodologies that are considered applicable; the list, however, should not be considered definitive and contractors are free to propose other methodologies.

1. Desk review of key project documents

2. **Literature search and review of materials** on the environment in which the project operates, as well as from past campaigns for overall background information and comparison regarding how the campaign performed versus past similar efforts
3. **Review of existing data on the action/2015 campaign** (overall actions taken, monitoring reports of mobilization activities, registration & distribution lists, grant reports, etc.). The evaluation team should plan on utilizing the existing data being collected by action/2015 and triangulate the data gathered from various sources.
4. **Interviews with key campaign stakeholders** – including but not limited to: action/2015 Reference Group members, action/2015 Global Hub and regional coordinators, action/team co-chairs, participating organizations, organizations that were expected to engage in the campaign but did not, leads of national coalitions
5. **Focus group discussions with key campaign stakeholders** (e.g. national coalition participants or global action/team participants)
6. **Other participatory approaches**, such as case studies, “stories of change” or “most significant change”

3.2. Expected activities and key deliverables

Activities	Number of days	Expected timeline	Deliverables
1. Desk review and literature search	5	November 16-20	
2. Develop and finalize inception report, with feedback & approval of Evaluation Steering Committee	3	November 23-27	Inception report
3. Develop data collection tools	2	November 23-27	Finalized data collection tools
4. Planning interviews & field work	3	November 30 – December 4	
5. Interviews, potential site visits and field work (<i>*assessing the need and cost-effectiveness of field visits vs. skype interviews and surveys</i>)	10	December 7-23	
6. Preparation and presentation of preliminary findings to Evaluation Steering Committee	2	December 28- January 8	
7. Submission of 1 st draft report to Evaluation Steering Committee for comments	6	22 January 2015	Draft report
8. Submission of 2 nd draft report to Evaluation Steering Committee after incorporating comments	2	3 February 2015	Consolidated report
9. Submission of final report after incorporating final comments	2	16 February 2016	Final report (with properly filed/archived copies of transcripts of all work documents, e.g. field notes)
Total expected work days:	35 days		

3.3. Discussion of inception report

Prior to conducting the evaluation, the Lead Evaluator will prepare and submit an inception report to the Evaluation Steering Committee, detailing the methodologies and work plan of the evaluation. The inception report will be discussed with the Evaluation Steering Committee and will be subject to approval prior to the start of field activities.

3.4. Reporting and presentation of findings

The key deliverable will be the written report in English, along with a two-page summary of key evaluation results. The report will be no more than 50 pages, consisting of:

- **An executive summary:** A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main points of the analysis, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text.

The structure of the Executive Summary must be as follows:

- EVALUATED ACTION
- DATE OF THE EVALUATION
- CONSULTANT'S NAME
- PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY
- MAIN CONCLUSIONS: These conclusions should refer to the main evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues.
- LESSONS LEARNED
- RECOMMENDATIONS
- **Evaluation report.** The main body of the report should be as follows:
 - INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION: brief description of the project, objectives and results expected, duration, exact location.
 - BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION.
 - METHODOLOGIES used for the evaluation.
 - RESULTS of the evaluation.
 - CONCLUSIONS of the evaluation.
 - LESSONS LEARNED.
 - RECOMMENDATIONS (for each key conclusion there should be a recommendation). Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action, and of the resources available to implement it both locally and according to the donor objective and criteria.
- **Annexes** – including:
 - Terms of reference for the evaluation;
 - Names and contact details of the evaluator(s) along with a signed declaration of their independence from the project team;
 - Evaluation schedule;
 - List of the places visited and the people interviewed.
 - Documents consulted
 - Abbreviations.

All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex.

3.5. Reporting relationship

The lead evaluator will report to Marie L'Hostis, action/2015 Global Hub Coordinator. The key contact person for all technical evaluation issues is Zack Turk, Grant and M&E Officer of the action/2015 Global Hub.

3.6. Budget

The total budget for this evaluation project is of \$50,000 USD (all costs included).

3.7. International standards & Presentation of evidence

Standard evaluation and survey methodologies and good practices utilized in the international monitoring and evaluation community should be applied. Such resources should include but are not limited to those promulgated by the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. In particular, all findings and conclusions should be based on evidence which is presented in the evaluation report

3.8. Ethical Guidelines

It is expected that the evaluation will adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators. A summary of these guidelines is provided below, and a more detailed description can be found at www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp.

1. *Informed Consent*: All participants are expected to provide informed consent following standard and pre-agreed upon consent protocols.
2. *Systematic Inquiry*: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
3. *Competence*: Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
4. *Integrity/Honesty*: Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
5. *Respect for People*: Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, project participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. It is expected that the evaluator will obtain the informed consent of participants to ensure that they can decide in a conscious, deliberate way whether they want to participate.
6. *Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare*: Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

4. Obligations of key participants in the evaluation

4.1. Obligations of the Lead Evaluator

- a. Inform the evaluation manager in a timely fashion of progress made and of any problems encountered
- b. Implement the activities as expected, and if modifications are necessary, bring to the attention of the evaluation manager before enacting any changes
- c. Report on a timely basis any possible conflicts of interest

4.2. Obligations of the Evaluation Manager

- a. Assure that the contractors are provided with the specified human resources and logistical support, and answer any day-to-day enquiries
- b. Facilitate the work of the contractors with beneficiaries and other local stakeholders
- c. Provide key background information and documents, along with monitoring data on the project
- d. Monitor the daily work of the contractors and flag any concerns
- e. Receive and signoff on deliverables and authorize payment

4.3. Obligations of the Evaluation Steering Group

- a. Review and approve the inception report
- b. Review and comment on all other deliverables

5. Required qualifications

The following are the desired qualifications of the **Lead Evaluator**:

1. Masters degree in international development or relevant field from recognized university
2. Demonstrated experience in leading evaluations of global campaigns and/or projects/programs focusing on international development or climate change (past experience in conducting evaluations of global campaigns on international development/climate change related topics preferred)
3. Demonstrated professional experience in global campaigning and/or projects/programs focusing on international development or climate change
4. Demonstrated experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis
5. Demonstrated experience in leading focus group discussions and conducting interviews of wide range of stakeholders
6. Previous exposure to and solid understanding of the issues surrounding sustainable development, social justice and climate change
7. Experience of working in an organization/network with multi-country operations
8. Cultural sensitivity and ability to respect and work well with people from different backgrounds and disciplines
9. Political awareness and ability to handle sensitive issues with diplomacy in many different settings.
10. Strong analytical thinker and skilled writer in English
11. Additional fluency in Spanish and/or French highly recommended.

The following are the desired qualifications of the **Local Assistant** (if applying as a team):

1. Bachelor or Master degree in international development or relevant field from recognized university
2. Demonstrated past experience in working projects/programs focusing on international development or climate change or on campaigns with non-government organizations
3. Demonstrated experience in conducting rapid rural appraisals using focus group discussions, key informant interviews of beneficiaries, project staff and other stakeholders
4. Past experience in participating in independent external evaluations of projects focusing on international development or climate change highly desirable.
5. Additional fluency in Spanish and/or French highly recommended.

6. Application and selection details

6.1. Application schedule

Event	Date	Time
Terms of Reference (TOR) Issuance	September 23, 2015	Not Applicable
Offerors Submit Written Questions	October 2, 2015	12:00 p.m. Eastern Time
Answers to Questions Returned to Offerors	On or before October 9, 2015	Not Applicable
Proposals Due	October 16, 2015	11:59 p.m. Eastern Time
Follow-up Interviews with Perspective Candidates	October 22-30, 2015	Not Applicable
Contract Executed	No later than November 16, 2015	Not Applicable

6.2. Application materials

Each Proposal must clearly define the scope of services proposed by the Offeror in enough detail to allow the Evaluation Steering Committee to perform a proper evaluation of the TOR applicants. The proposal should include the following ten items. Please note that any proposal which does not contain all ten items will be rejected.

- A. **Understanding of Project Specifications.** This is a statement that the Offeror has examined and understands the specifications and requirements set forth in this TOR.
- B. **A One-page Summary of Experience.** This summary of experience should be no more than one page and aim at illustrating past work on programs that are comparable in character to the work required by this TOR.
- C. **A Project Proposal** that highlights the Offeror's detailed plan to conduct this evaluation, provides suggestions how the Offeror would proceed with this evaluation project, and stresses key considerations the Offeror would see arising from a project of this nature. (3 pages maximum)
- D. **Detailed CVs** of all professionals who will work on the evaluation. If there is more than one consultant on the proposed team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of hours) of each team member in each of the evaluation activities.
- E. **Work sample** exemplifying the consultant's expertise with similar evaluation projects, and providing recommendations for similar projects in similar fields. (provide 2-3 work samples)
- F. **Professional references.** Please provide two or three references of work accomplished by the Offeror that are comparable in character to the work required by this TOR. Each reference must include the following:



- Client/with address
 - Contact name and telephone number
 - Dates of contract
 - A brief narrative description of the contract (no more than one short paragraph).
- G. Pricing.** Each proposal must contain a pricing structure that offers the best value for this evaluation project.
- Firm Fixed Pricing
 - Cost estimates with itemization for large segments of work
 - Must list the proposed hourly rate to complete this project in USD.
- H. Availability, ability to meet fixed deadlines and expected number of hours** to complete the proposed scope of work.
- I. Validity of Proposal.** This is a statement that the Proposal will be valid for a minimum period of ninety (90) days following the Deadline.
- J. Offeror's Legal Status.** This is a statement describing the Offeror's legal status, e.g., sole proprietorship, partnership, or corporation, and state of incorporation.

Note that each Offeror must detail any assumptions it makes in preparing and providing the Proposal, including but not limited to the pricing.

Each Proposal received will be evaluated with respect to the proposed approach to the requirements, quality programs and backup production systems in place, experience, reliability, and reputation of the Offeror, price, and any other factor required.

6.3. Application procedures

Interested candidates should send their applications to Zack Turk at jobs@action2015.org **no later than 16 October 2015, 11:59PM EST**. Any interviews of perspective candidates will take place between October 22nd and October 30th 2015. Please put the following in the subject line: "Application for action/2015 -evaluation."

A complete application will be one with all materials listed above in one email through one zipped folder. The title of this folder should be the last name of the Lead Evaluator (e.g. if the Lead Evaluator is named Jon Snow, the title of the application document should be "Snow").

Application received after the deadline and incomplete applications will not be accepted.

6.4. Questions regarding these terms of Reference

Questions about this terms of Reference (TOR) must be submitted in accordance with the Schedule listed in 6.1 and by the method(s) defined here: by e-mail to Zack Turk at jobs@action2015.org on or before **October 2, 2015, at 12:00pm Eastern Time**. Action/2015 will return its responses to the questions on or before October 9, 2015. Questions and responses will be shared with all participating Offerors without reference to the originator.



6.5. Deadline for applications

All applications should be emailed to Zack Turk at jobs@action2015.org no later than **16 October 2015, 11:59PM EST.**