

## SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Final Evaluation of The HALO Trust's mine action programme from 2020-2024 as funded by The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Contracting Authority: The HALO Trust

<b>1. Background</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1. Relevant project background .....	2
1.2. The Action to be evaluated .....	2
1.3. Stakeholders of the Action.....	2
1.4. Other available information.....	2
<b>2. Description of the evaluation assignment</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1. Objectives of the evaluation .....	3
2.2. Requested services .....	3
2.2.1. Scope of the evaluation and the impact assessment .....	3
2.2.2. Indicative issues to be addressed .....	3
2.2.3. Main areas of analysis.....	3
2.2.4. Evaluation criteria .....	3
2.2.5. Phases of the evaluation and required outputs .....	5
2.2.6. Synoptic table.....	5
<b>3. Scope of the impact assessment</b> .....	<b>6</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	6
3.3. Ukraine research questions .....	6
<b>4. Expertise required</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>5. Location and duration</b> .....	<b>6</b>
5.1. Starting period .....	6
5.2. Foreseen duration of the assignment.....	6
5.3. Planning.....	7
5.4. Location(s) of assignment .....	7
<b>6. Fees</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>7. Reporting</b> .....	<b>77</b>
7.1. Content, timing and submission .....	77
7.2. Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.....	88
7.3. Language .....	99
<b>ANNEX I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>ANNEX II: Information that will be provided to the evaluator(s)</b> .....	<b>111</b>
<b>ANNEX III: Quality assessment grid</b> .....	<b>122</b>

## 1. Background

### 1.1. Relevant project background

The HALO Trust (HALO) received a grant from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands (hereafter: the Ministry) for the period September 2020 – August 2024, under the Mine Action and Cluster Munitions Programme II, to implement mine action programming in the number of countries inter alia Ukraine.

As part of the contract requirements, an external evaluation has to be conducted of the programme's effects with regard to the overarching goal of the Netherlands Mine Action and Cluster Munitions Programme II 2020-2024. Apart from the contractual obligations, the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will provide guidance for the delivery of future programme funding and will contribute to organisational learning at the global and country levels of the organisation.

As part of the evaluation, HALO would like the evaluator/evaluation team (hereafter: evaluator(s)) to conduct specific case study visit to Ukraine programme. The findings of the case study will be used to inform HALO's programming in Ukraine and shared with other HALO countries. The findings will also be shared with the Ministry.

### 1.2. The Action to be evaluated

<b>Title of the Action to be evaluated</b>	HALO Trust grant 2020-2024 from the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<b>Dates of the Action to be evaluated</b>	1 September 2020 – 31 December 2024

### 1.3. Stakeholders of the Action

The main stakeholders for this action are:

- a) HALO Trust Ukraine programme and HQ
- b) National Mine Action Centres or equivalent local authorities for mine action
- c) Beneficiaries (men, women, boys and girls)
- d) The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs representatives (in the Netherland and in countries where projects were implemented)

### 1.4. Other available information

The Action is supported by a framework of output and outcome indicators as jointly agreed by the Ministry and the four selected implementing partners (The HALO Trust, Danish Refugee Council, Humanity & Inclusion, and Mines Advisory Group) in 2020. Baseline assessments have been conducted at the start of each country project. All results have been reported quarterly in IATI (HALO IATI Organisation Identifier: GB-CHC-1001813). A mid-term evaluation commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs was conducted in 2023.

## 2. Description of the evaluation assignment

## 2.1. Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is twofold:

- a) to conduct an overall independent assessment of the past performance of HALO's mine action project in Ukraine under the grant by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands 2020-2024, paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives;
- b) to conduct an assessment in Ukraine to investigate the specific research questions.

## 2.2. Requested services

### **2.2.1. Scope of the evaluation and the impact assessment**

#### Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluator(s) shall furthermore consider the integration in the programme design and implementation of gender, inclusion and conflict sensitivity, and if the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified.

### **2.2.2. Indicative issues to be addressed**

The specific issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluator(s) will discuss them with HALO and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

### **2.2.3. Main areas of analysis**

The evaluation questions will be identified in the first instance by the evaluator(s) during the Inception phase. The questions should include in their coverage the following main areas of analysis:

- a) Relevance of the programme to overarching goal of the Netherlands Mine Action and Cluster Munitions Programme 2020-2024;
- b) Quality of the programme's design, including: i) Stakeholder and beneficiary identification, including how effective gender and diversity based, inclusive approaches have been and incorporation of conflict-sensitive approaches; ii) Institutional set-up and management arrangements, including how localisation and partnerships with local and national stakeholders have been sought and implemented; iii) management competencies and processes;
- c) Robustness of its components, including their intervention logic and causal relationships between inputs, activities, expected outputs (against project objectives) and validity of indicators. Suggestions for revision may be made if appropriate;
- d) Validity of assumptions and risks as initially identified in the proposal and whether unforeseen issues are negatively affecting projects implementation and progress towards objectives.

### **2.2.4. Evaluation criteria**

The analysis should assess HALO's performance towards the identified five results areas. When undertaking the evaluation, the experts should address the following evaluation criteria:

a. Relevance

Assess the extent to which projects' designs based on the original proposals were consistent with The Netherlands' priorities. Also assess the coherence of the projects with due consideration to: i) Overall objectives; ii) Programme purposes; iii) Expected Results; iv) Activities; v) Assumptions / preconditions; vi) Theory of Change<sup>1</sup>.

b. Coherence

Assess if the intervention is compatible with other interventions in the country, sector or institution, including the internal coherence of the various HALO-activities in the intervention.

b. Efficiency

Evaluate the efficiency with which the activities in the Programme have been undertaken in order to yield planned results. The following aspects should be considered: i) Organisation and management, analyses of the organisational arrangements (funding, structures, human resources, responsibilities and contractual arrangements) relating to the Programme (grant contracts, etc.); ii) Assess the value-for-money; iii) Assess the management capacities of the coordination structures in place and the mechanisms put in place to monitor and manage activities (plans of operations and timetables, financial management and budgeting, terms and conditions, phasing of activities, internal monitoring arrangements, institutional capacity support provided).

c. Effectiveness

Analyse the extent to which the programme's objectives are being achieved. The following questions should assist with the assessment of the effectiveness of the projects: i) extent of achievement of projects' objectives and purposes; ii) unforeseen beneficiaries or unintended consequences, and if yes, explain the extent, impact and implications for relevant stakeholders; iii) realism of assumptions required to translate projects' results into the projects' purposes; iv) relation between projects' resources (personnel, equipment, training, research etc.) with main targeted results;

d. Impact

Analyse the foreseen and unforeseen programme' impacts, whether they are positive or negative. Compare the scenario immediately prior to the implementation of the projects with the achievements of the projects. Among the points to consider is if given the desired outcome of the programme were there alternative ways of achieving it which might have been more cost effective (e.g. design alternatives, use of different materials).

e. Sustainability

In terms of sustainability particular emphasis should be given to: i) acceptance and ownership; ii) appropriate technology; and iii) institutional and management capacity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that during the course of the contract, the Netherlands adopted the Global Theory of Change for Mine Action produced by Itad, but that the original tender documents contained a different ToC, which is what the HALO programme responds to.

## 2.2.5. Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

- Inception
- Desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

## 2.2.6. Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with HALO and the evaluator(s).

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial document/data collection</li> <li>• Background analysis</li> <li>• Inception interviews</li> <li>• Stakeholder analysis</li> <li>• Review of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)</li> <li>• Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kick-off meeting with HALO and the evaluator/evaluator(s)</li> <li>• Inception report</li> <li>• Presentation of the Inception Report</li> </ul>
<u>Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)</li> <li>• Interviews Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase</li> <li>• Methodological design of the Field Phase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Note</li> <li>• Presentation of key findings of the desk phase</li> </ul>
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews, focus groups, storytelling sessions, surveys etc.</li> <li>• Data collection and analysis (linked to the hypotheses to be tested in the field and in view of filling the gaps, if defined during a desk phase)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings at country level</li> <li>• Presentation of key findings of the field phase</li> </ul>

<b>Synthesis Phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)</li> <li>• Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Report [mandatory]</li> <li>• Presentation</li> </ul>
------------------------	--	--

### 3. Scope of the impact assessment

#### 3.1. Introduction

Next to the evaluation, HALO would like the evaluator(s) to conduct a more in-depth impact assessment for specific topics in Ukraine as detailed below.

#### 3.2. Ukraine research questions

Ukraine received four-years of core grant funding. Following the full-scale invasion of Ukraine additional funding was made available in the form of a budget uplift in 2022, a budget uplift in 2023 and an uplift in 2024.

- The effectiveness of re-programmed expenditure, budget uplifts and programme re-design following February 2022. In particular, were the outcomes of re-programming clear and measurable and to what extent have they been achieved?
- The impact of the programme’s expansion on its impact and deliverables.
- The effectiveness and impact of new and elements/activities incorporated into the grants, including the Explosive Ordnance Risk Education training of trainers programme and R&D in Ukraine.

### 4. Expertise required

It is up to the evaluator(s) to decide about the size of the team. The profile below provides the minimum requirements.

#### Minimum requirements of evaluator:

- Master's Degree in political sciences, international development or other relevant field to this sector or equivalent professional years of experience in the field (minimum 2 additional years to the number of years of experience requested below)
- 5 years of experience in the field of mine action, including monitoring and evaluation;
- Demonstrable experience in conducting impact assessments;
- 6 years of experience in evaluation;
- Ability to manage a team and ensure quality of a team output.

### 5. Location and duration

#### 5.1. Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is beginning of January 2024.

#### 5.2. Foreseen duration of the assignment

It is up to the evaluator(s) to plan the activities of the assignment. However, the deadline for the final report is 30 May 2025.

### 5.3. Planning

As part of the technical offer, the evaluator(s) must provide a timetable detailing the time allocated to each phase and the planned activities.

It is recommended to plan the field visits taking into account the climate conditions in Ukraine (in particular, winter shutdown).

### 5.4. Location(s) of assignment

The assignment of the evaluator(s) will be homebased. HALO can support all field visits with transport and arranging meetings. Travel costs, including costs like hotels, meals and per diems have to be covered by the budget in the technical offer.

## 6. Fees

As per the Ministry's guidance<sup>2</sup>:

*The cost of consultants and advisers is based on the contractually agreed hourly rate and number of hours, including office costs if applicable. Contracting must be preceded by an appraisal of offers stating rates and number of hours. The maximum hourly rate is €212 excluding VAT. The rates of local consultants and advisers must be in line with local price levels.*

*The following website provides an indication of local price levels: <https://www.numbeo.com/cost-of-living/>*

## 7. Reporting

### 7.1. Content, timing and submission

The final report of the evaluation should at least consist of the following paragraphs.

#### Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and practical recommendations.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

#### Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant county/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

#### Answered questions / Findings

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.government.nl/topics/grant-programmes/documents/forms/2020/03/23/annexe-7a-format-concept-note-operational> Explanatory notes on individual cost types, 3.1.1.

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

#### Overall assessment (optional)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

#### Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Lessons learnt should be primarily directed to HALO and the Ministry.

#### Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to HALO and/or the Ministry, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

#### Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle. Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, practical, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels.

#### Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Theories of Change
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

#### Impact assessment

The impact assessment will be presented separately from the evaluation.

### 7.2. Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by HALO using the Quality Assessment Grid as provided in Annex III. The Contractor is given the

possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by HALO. The Quality Assessment Grid will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

### 7.3. Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

## ANNEX I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

### 1. Technical Evaluation Criteria

HALO selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<b><i>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</i></b>	<b>50</b>
• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the evaluator(s)	5
• Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
<b><i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i></b>	<b>50</b>
<b><i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i></b>	<b>100</b>

### 2. Technical Threshold

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

### 3. Interviews during the evaluation of the offers

During the evaluation process of the offers received HALO reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluator(s).

## **ANNEX II: Information that will be provided to the evaluator(s)**

- Donor tender documents 2020-2024
- Agreed framework of output and outcome indicators
- Baseline studies
- Quarterly metrics tables and annual progress reports / final reports
- Evaluation report of the Netherlands Tender as conducted by the Ministry
- Project reports and data for case study programmes
- Historic pre- and post-clearance household surveys
- Previous assessments by other external evaluations
- HALO's GIS-team will support with providing GIS-maps detailing land use over time

Note: The evaluator(s) has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

## ANNEX III: Quality assessment grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the HALO (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid. The grid will be shared with the evaluator(s), which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action Evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report and Executive Summary		
<b>Evaluation data</b>		
Evaluation title		
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation
Evaluation budget		
HALO Evaluation Manager		
Evaluation dates	Start:	End:
Date of draft final report		
Comments		
<b>Project data</b>		
Main project evaluated		
NL MFA contract code		
<b>Contractor's details</b>		
Evaluator(s) Leader		
Evaluation expert(s)		

### Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

## The evaluation report is assessed as follows:

### 1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

### 2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EII and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

### 3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
- When assessing the effect of the Dutch intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

### 4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

### 5. Usefulness of recommendations

<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions</li> <li>• Are concrete, achievable and realistic</li> <li>• Are targeted to specific addressees</li> <li>• Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound</li> <li>• (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Contractor's comments</b>	<b>Contractor's comments</b>	
<b>6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)</b>		
<p>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons are identified</li> <li>• When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Contractor's comments</b>	<b>Contractor's comments</b>	
<b>Final comments on the overall quality of the report</b>		<b>Overall score</b>