

ToR for Final Independent Evaluation of ‘DWGB’ Project

Centre for Education and Communication (CEC) seeks independent consultants to do an end of the project evaluation of ‘*Empowering CSOs for Decent Work and Green Bricks in India’s Brick Kilns (DWGB)*’ to assess the project achievements vis-a-vis its stated goals, objectives and indicators, and to derive learning for CEC and its partners

Interested consultants are invited to submit a detailed CV and Expression of Interest (EOI) marked “Final Evaluation - DWGB” to CEC, 173-A, Khirki Village, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110017 or e-mail application to cec@cec-india.org on or before 18 October 2020.

Table of Contents

[1. Background Information](#)

[2. Purpose of the Final Evaluation](#)

[3. Specific Objectives](#)

[4. Scope](#)

[5. Final Evaluation - Key Questions](#)

[6. Methodology for Evaluation](#)

[7. Deliverables](#)

[8. Roles and Responsibilities](#)

[9. Time Frame and Reporting](#)

[10. Remuneration](#)

[11. Evaluation Ethics](#)

[12. Qualification and Experience](#)

[13. Competencies](#)

[14. Submission of Applications](#)

Annex 2 : List of the Documents to be Consulted

Annex 3 : List of Key Project Informants

Annex 04: Risk Assessment Matrix

Annex 5: Achievement Rating Scale

Annex 06: Format for the Evaluation Report

1. Background Information

The European Union, represented by the European Commission and Centre for Education and Communication, with its office at Khirki Village, 173 A, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi 110017, India, signed the contract for implementation of the project '*Empowering CSOs for Decent Work and Green Bricks in India's Brick Kilns*' on Date 01/01/2016.

The Project is implemented by Centre for Education and Communication (CEC) along with Prayas and Terre des Hommes (TDH), (Germany) India Programme, for a period of five years from 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2020. In India, the project is being implemented in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tripura (destination states) and Orissa, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand (source states). TDH is the monitoring partner in the project.

The overall objective of the project is to usher sustainable change through decent work and green technology in India's brick kilns. In particular, it seeks to increase the capacity of CSOs including human rights groups, labour organisations, child rights organisations, CSOs working on green technology, brick kiln manufacturers associations, workers' associations and local authorities to perform their roles more effectively to ensure inclusive 'decent work' in brick kilns and produce 'green' bricks.

The project intends to reach 10,000 brick kiln workers in the source & destination states; 50 human/child/labour rights CSOs; 25 environmental CSOs and 100 brick kiln owners. The project engages with workers' association, labour collectives and civil society organisations working with brick kiln workers, bodies and associations of brick kiln owners, local, state and national authorities and institutions and the private sector.

The project follows four key approaches: (i) ensuring better understanding of the factors that perpetuate slavery like conditions of work in Indian brick kilns through evidence based research (ii) capacity building of CSOs, brick kiln workers in source and destination states by providing them trainings (viz. safe migration, decent work, freedom of choice, right to represent, gender rights, safe working conditions and social security) to ensure inclusive decent work in brick kilns (iii) building constructive interface between decent work and sustainable green brick production using appropriate technology innovations, through exposure visits and ToT of brick makers to kilns producing safe, green bricks and building of Workers' Skill Development Centre (iv) advocacy with local/state/national authorities to facilitate non-discriminatory recruitment & labour relations and production of green bricks, through establishment of Model Employment Exchange and a series of National and Regional Consultations.

The project is in the final year of its implementation to be concluded on 31 December, 2020. A final evaluation is due.

The project logframe is included in *Annex 01*.

2. Purpose of the Final Evaluation

This is an independent end of project evaluation to assess the project achievements against its stated goals, objectives and indicators, and to derive learning for CEC and its partners. It will

examine the project from a framework which responds to the following aspects: (i) Relevance, (ii) Effectiveness, (iii) Efficiency, (iv) Impact and (v) Sustainability.

3. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess achievement of project results (impact, outcome and outputs) and institutional arrangements for their sustainability
- Assess project targeting effectiveness, especially with respect to women, social inclusion and youth participation
- Assess project responsiveness to the issues which emerged during implementation, and strategies adopted for readjusting the activities in line with the objective/s
- Draw key lessons learned to contribute to the organisational learning of CEC and its partners
- Assess project design and strategy in light of the learnings and make recommendations for the way forward

4. Scope

The independent evaluation commissioned by CEC is expected to cover project staff in CEC, Prayas and TDH; the labour collectives, CSOs and workers' associations trained by the project in UP, Rajasthan and Tripura; brick kiln owners who have converted their brick kilns to green technology; organisations and associations of brick kiln owners; the local, state and national authorities and institutions, and other relevant stakeholders.

The report of the independent evaluation will be shared with all stakeholders mentioned above.

5. Final Evaluation - Key Questions

Independent Final Evaluator will examine (i) Relevance, (ii) Effectiveness, (iii) Efficiency, (iv) Impact and (v) Sustainability. The evaluator should write a short synopsis of key points from each section for inclusion in the executive summary.

The broad key questions to be answered by the evaluator against the project log frame include:

5.1 Quality and Relevance of Project Design

Given that the project context, assess the appropriateness and relevance of the project design and objective; what is the relevance of the project to the target group/s, and its alignment with state policies for green bricks and decent work. Specific questions include:

- To what extent did the project respond to the identified problems? What was the quality of the problem analysis and the project's logical framework?

- Have the problems originally identified changed? How flexible was the project to changes in circumstances?
- How relevant was the project to the needs of the different stakeholders?
- What else has changed in the external context? For example, what has been happening in the brick kiln sector in India and related economic and policy level changes? What impact has this had on our work / future work in this area? What else has supported / hindered our work in this area?
- How did the design of the project take other interventions into account? Were there synergies or duplications?

5.2 Effectiveness

Assess the achievements of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended outcomes/ results or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. This should be assessed against the final version of project logframe as agreed with the lead funder (see *Annex 01*). Data already provided by the project's monitoring and reporting systems should provide much of the basic information. Quantitative and qualitative data should be referred to.

- To what extent will the objectives of the intervention be (most likely) achieved?
- To what extent were the originally defined objectives of the intervention realistic? To what extent do they still meet the most recent standard of knowledge?
- Has the intervention contributed to sustainable capacity building of target groups
- What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives so far (indication of strengths and weaknesses)?
- What changes have been brought about in performance / behaviour of participating organisations and end beneficiaries?
- What is the scope or magnitude of the change achieved? What is the significance/ strategic importance of the achievements?
- What has not been achieved (failures, disappointments, missed opportunities, challenges) and why?
- What were the risks identified? Did these materialise? If so, how did the project deal with them and reduce the impact on the project? Please complete a risk assessment matrix for inclusion in the final report (see *Annex 04* for template)
- Are there any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted, e.g. case studies, stories, best practice.
- Please include a table of relevant figures showing achievement against the project indicators as stated in the project logframe included as *Annex 01*.

5.3 Efficiency of Planning and Implementation

Are the objectives achieved in a cost-efficient manner by the intervention? How big is the efficiency or utilisation ratio of the utilised resources? Specific questions include:

- Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable? What is the cost-benefit ratio?
- Which activities were undertaken in order to achieve project results? Were these conducted efficiently (in terms of expertise, time, costs, etc)? Were the activities of the expected quality?
- Were there any planned activities that did not happen? If so, why?

- Have the resources been allocated in the most strategic way among partners? Were the results/ outcomes appropriate to the costs incurred? Could the results have been achieved more economically?
- How successful were the roles that CEC and the partner(s) played in the project management? How could it be improved?
- To what extent have individual resources been used economically?
- Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?

5.4 Impact

Assess the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Specifically it will examine:

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?
- Does the development intervention contribute to the achievement of the objectives (tendentially, overall goal)? Please complete an Achievement Rating Scale for inclusion the final report (see *Annex 05*).
- What is or are the impact(s)/effects of the intervention compared to the total situation of the those affected:
 - positive and negative, intended and unintended effects
 - technical, economic, social effects
- Even though there may be no explicit outcomes relating to the environment and gender, please consider any impact on the environment and on women as a result of this project.
- Has there been any impact on people beyond the target groups (for example, in the wider geographical community or the sector as a whole) through learning shared by project participants or as a result of policy work.
- To what extent was the intervention exemplary, created structures and/or had a broad effect/impact in terms of leverage?
- What would the development have been like without the intervention?

5.5 Potential for sustainability and replication

The evaluator will examine the probability of continuation of benefits from the intervention after the project has been completed.

- Are the positive effects sustainable? How is the sustainability or the continuity of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
- To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after donor intervention has ended?
- To what extent does the intervention reflect on and take into account factors which, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability like e.g. economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects?
- How self-supporting in particular are the entities part of or created during the implementation of the project
- To what extent did the programmes strengthen local ownership and leadership?
- How committed are participating organisations / partners / participants to continue utilising new skills, knowledge, techniques acquired during the project?

- Are there indications that elements of the project will be sustainable without further external support? What are these and what are the factors which will determine whether or not they will continue?
- Is there evidence to suggest that the project activities could be copied, up-scaled or replicated beyond the immediate project area? Why / why not?
- What is the social and political environment/ acceptance of this intervention
- Assess and make recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project, i.e exit, scale down, replication, scale-up, continuation, major modifications
- Comment on any existing plans
- Make recommendations in addition

5.6 Findings and Recommendations

- What were the main successes and failures of the project, and why?
- What are the challenges and how can they be addressed?
- Which changes/ actions are needed for appropriate and successful implementation?

6. Methodology for Evaluation

The evaluation should ensure that the perspectives of all stakeholders are considered in assessing the achievement of the project aim and specific objectives.

A Project Evaluation Group will be established to both inform and support the evaluation process. This will comprise key project staff from CEC, TDH and Prayas. The membership and responsibilities of this group are outlined in section 8.2 below.

It is envisaged the Methodology will include:

6.1 Desk Phase

- Planning meeting with the Project Evaluation Group (PEG) to develop guiding questions, elaborate and focus methodology and propose a work-plan.
- A desk review of existing project documents. (See *Annex 02* for a list of the documents to be consulted.)
- An analysis of existing quantitative and qualitative data which can shed light on some of the indicators of the logical framework.
- Identification of issues and questions still to be answered and review of methodology.
- Preparation of research/ data collection tools and their revision based on feedback from the PEG; develop a time schedule for the activities to be undertaken, in consultation with the PEG
- Agreement on final Table of Contents for the evaluation report, based on the draft (Annex 06)

6.2 Field Phase

Depending on the outcome of the desk phase, this might include:

- Surveys, direct field visits, interviews, focus group discussions with a small selection of project actors including: labour collectives, women's groups, CSOs, brick kiln owners, project staff (CEC, Prayas, TDH), industry bodies and government officials.

- Interacting with individuals/ organisations that are not part of this project but relevant to the work being reviewed.

See *Annex 03* for a list of key project informants.

6.3 Synthesis Phase

- Presentation of Preliminary findings to project partners. This would provide a key opportunity to draw out any lessons learned.
- The findings of the evaluation will be elaborated into a draft evaluation report, which is structured as per the required format for a final evaluation report (see *Annex 06*).
- The draft report will be assessed by the Project Evaluation Group according to quality standards, and feedback will be provided to the consultant.
- On the basis of comments received, the evaluator will revise and deliver the final evaluation report.
- Main findings presented at dissemination workshop with participating organisations, partners and key CEC staff.

7. Deliverables

7.1 Desk Phase

- Methodology design / key questions and timeline for approval.
- Feedback to the Project Evaluation Group on initial analysis from literature review and data analysis to identify initial findings, key gaps, review sampling criteria etc.

7.2 Field Phase

- Written feedback on preliminary findings and conclusions to the Project Evaluation Group.

7.3 Synthesis Phase

- The evaluator will provide a written Evaluation report. The required format for the evaluation report is attached as *Annex 06*. The draft report will be initially submitted to CEC for comment and review (CEC will then consult with the Project Evaluation Group). Any changes necessary will be made by the evaluator to produce the final report. CEC and its partners are interested to preserve the objectivity of the evaluator but reserve the right to ensure the Evaluation report is of the quality expected.
- The evaluator will present the final report at a dissemination workshop, where project partners and participating organisations will be present. The findings will be discussed and reviewed.

8. Roles and Responsibilities

8.1 Evaluator's Responsibility

- Undertake assignment as outlined in the ToR.
- Complete the tasks in ToR in the allocated time.
- Update project partners on a regular basis concerning progress.

8.2 Project Evaluation Group's responsibility

The Project Evaluation Group is comprised of:

This group's main functions are:

- To ensure that the evaluator has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents.
- To validate the evaluation framework, questions and methodology.
- To discuss and comment on reports delivered by the evaluator at each stage of the process.
- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- To ensure that the project deliverables meet the expected quality standards

8.3 Provision of logistical and other support

- CEC has nominated Mayur Chetia, (Project Manager), CEC, as the nodal person for this consultancy assignment; he will coordinate with the evaluators and the PEG and provide facilitative support, as required. He will be responsible for informing stakeholders of any interviews or focus groups, and for providing the documents, contacts of people to be interviewed, and finalization/ communication of the itinerary.

9. Time Frame and Reporting

The Final Evaluation will take place in the third week of October for a period covering 40 days.

Activity	Deadlines
Commencement of evaluation	October third week, 2020
Completion of desk phase	7 days from commencement of evaluation
Completion of field phase	21 days from commencement of evaluation
Presentation of initial findings and recommendations	23 days from commencement of evaluation
Completion of first draft of evaluation report	33 days from commencement of evaluation
Completion of final evaluation report	39 days from commencement of evaluation
Presentation of final report in dissemination workshop	40 days from commencement of evaluation

10. Remuneration

CEC is open to a competitive remuneration in line with NGO payment norms. The applicant should develop a budget for completing the evaluation as outlined in this ToR by clearly allocating expenses and daily rate.

11. Evaluation Ethics

The Evaluator will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key informants in the collection of data. The Evaluator will respect CEC's Code of Conduct for Evaluation. All data collected in the course of this consultancy shall be handed over to will be the property of CEC and shall be handed over to them at the end of the assignment.

12. Qualification and Experience

- Minimum of a Master's Degree with relevant experience in social sciences, or any other relevant discipline;
- At least 5 years proven understanding and practical experience of working in related projects in the context of brick kilns and decent work;
- Minimum 10 years working experience (Proven relevant experience (at least 5 years experience) in designing and conducting development sector projects or similar evaluations;

13. Competencies

- Demonstrated and excellent written and oral communication skills in English and Hindi;
- Strong negotiating skills and ability to work independently
- Cross-cultural management experience and sensitivity;
- High level planning, organisational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet changing deadlines;
- Well developed interpersonal skills, including the ability to liaise effectively at all levels;
- Knowledge of and experience with monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms;
- Demonstrated analytical and written skills and the ability to clearly present findings, drawing practical conclusions and recommendations;

14. Submission of Applications

Interested consultants are invited to submit detailed CV and Expression of Interest (EOI) marked "Final Evaluation - DWGB" to CEC, 173-A, Khirki Village, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110017 or e-mail application to mayur.c@cec-india.org on or before October 18, 2020.

Annex 02: List of the Documents to be Consulted

1. Project Proposal
2. Logframe
3. Budget for Action
4. Baseline Data
5. Interim Reports – Y I,II,III,IV
6. Quarterly Reports- Year V
7. Mid Term Review Report
8. ROM Report
9. Published Research Study Reports
10. No-Cost Extension Proposals
11. Output-Outcome Matrix
12. Database of BKO's and Labour Migration
13. CEC Website

Annex 3: List of Key Project Informants

Name	Designation & Organisation
Ms. Lokesh	Director, CEC
Mayur Chetia	Project Manager, CEC
Bhawna Salhotra	MIS, CEC
Madan Pal Singh	Project Officer, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh
Anima Debbarma	Project Officer, Tripura
Jagdish Chand Upadhyaya	Project Officer, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh
Meena Sharma	Admin Manager, CEC
Pawan Kumar	Accounts, CEC
Ruchika Sharda	Finance & Accounts Manager
Subramanian Pattabiraman	Senior programme Manager- development Co-operation, Delegation of the European Union to India
Ritu Mishra	Programme Co-ordinator, North Zone, TDH- Germany – IP,
Sudhir Katiyar	Project Director, Prayas Centre for Labour Research and Action
Madan Vaishnav	Coordinator, Prayas Centre for Labour Research and Action
Asha Verma	Field Officer, Prayas Centre for Labour Research and Action
Ratan Lal Bhil	Field Officer, Prayas Centre for Labour Research and Action
Ram Sanjeevan	General Secretary, BKENSU,CSO
Dr Devendra Pandey	Fatehpur Vikas Manch, CSO
O.P Badlani	Chairman, Prayag Brick Kilns
Sameer Maithel	Greentech Knowledge Solutions
Keshav Dev	Brick Kiln Owner, Uttam Brick Field
Tapesh Debnath	Brick Kiln Owner, Baba Loknath Industry
Tularam Sharma	UPGMS- Uttar Pradesh,CSO

Annex 04. Risk Assessment Matrix

Risk Identified	Did the risk materialize? Yes/No	If the risk materialized, how did the project deal with it and reduce the impact on the project?	If the risk didn't materialize, was this as a result of measures put in place by the project? If yes, please explain how
Activity 1: Research, Documentation and Dissemination			
Employers may not cooperate in studies as they do not encourage outsiders to enter their premises and would not like harmful impact to be revealed to outside world.			
Activity 2: Capacity Building of CSOs and Workers Organizations on Decent Work, Safe Migration, Social Protection and Collective Action			
Worker Representatives will find it difficult to take off time during the work season. There are not many CSOs currently active in brick kilns.			
Employers likely to resist formation of workers' collectives. The team may face a physical threat.			

Employers may deny employment to workers who join the collectives.			
Activity 3: Capacity Building of Brick Kiln Owners and Workers on Sustainable brick production and decent work			
The state policy may change leading to shifting out of brick kilns from around metro areas like NCR. Employers may not be interested in social security issues that they will see as increasing their costs.			
Difficulties in obtaining approval from brick kiln owners or training institute to conduct training at their locations.			
Workers may not be interested in training as they (i) lose out on income during the training period (ii) are not sure of getting jobs with higher remuneration.			
Activity 4: Policy Advocacy for Green Bricks and Decent Work in Brick Kilns			
The labour contractors are likely to resist creation of Exchange as they			

will see it as a direct threat.

Annex 05: Achievement Rating Scale

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings

2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings

3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced

4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings

5 = not achieved

	Achievement Rating score for whole project period	Logframe Indicators	Baseline Value for Indicators	Progress Against Indicators	Comments on changes over the whole project period, including unintended impacts
Purpose (state below, then rate and comment)					
Output (list the main outputs below, rate against each, then give an overall rating): 1.,2., 3.,					
Activities Please comment on the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the activities overall					

Annex 06: Format for Evaluation Report

The evaluation report should contain at most 30 40 pages without annexes.

Title page

Title of evaluation, date of completion of report, name of evaluator. Index, list of abbreviations, map

Executive Summary

The evaluation report starts with an executive summary of three to five pages. The Executive summary contains a brief overview of the purpose, objectives, scope, methods of the evaluation and refers to the most important recommendations, results and lessons learnt. The executive summary must be written as an independent document so that it can be forwarded to the third parties.

Background

In this chapter, the fundamental information on the project being evaluated are summarised, i.e. project and programme content (national, political, economic, social, cultural background), project and programme title, project and programme number, duration, name of project partners, location, costs, objectives, expected results and planned changes with regard to the target group (outcome), intervention logic or logframe respectively, details on the target groups.

Introduction

This chapter contains a brief description of the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation and briefly explains whether there have been any restrictions during the evaluation.

Methods

This section offers an overview of the quantitative and qualitative methods applied (including an overview and explanation on the number of the persons included per method, as well as criteria for selecting the project locations etc.). Techniques used during collection and processing of data and information (e.g. data triangulation) should be mentioned as well. The evaluation report also mentions possible restrictions (e.g. the non-availability of key informants) by using the methods as well as possible resulting effects on the evaluation, particularly its independence.

Evaluation findings

In this chapter, the evaluation findings are presented in detail. The evaluation report is structured according to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and

impact as they are listed in the ToR. Statements and conclusions must be comprehensible and be supported by data. Hypotheses must be verified and falsified

Conclusions

This section contains a summary of the results of all evaluation questions and furthermore, includes all information issues (e.g, assessment of the intervention logic) which were mentioned under the scope of the evaluation. The conclusions are based on the results and the analysis, and are comprehensible on this basis. In case information is only presented partially, the reasons should be stated in the evaluation report.

Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt result from the conclusions and can be subdivided e.g. in strategic, policy, sector, management, implementation, relevant lessons learnt and others.

Recommendations

In this chapter, recommendations are listed on the basis of the individual evaluation questions. It is important that the recommendations are feasible. It must also be clearly identifiable to who the recommendations are addressed to. It is recommended to present the recommendations in a matrix.

Annexes

Logframe, terms of reference and schedule of the evaluation, list of key informants, list of documents used, questionnaires or other instruments used in the evaluation; Reports prepared for the field study; Information regarding the evaluators.