Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute Foundation Incorporated PHILIPPINES

Terms of Reference

The Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute, Inc. (MPI) is requesting a proposal for the position of **Final Evaluation Consultant** for the "Enhancing Capacities of Grassroots Peacebuilding Mentors, Phase II" project funded by Misereor as outlined in this TOR.

I. Introduction

The present peace and conflict prevailing in the Philippines, along with several nations in South and Southeast Asia, highlights the critical need for continued and dedicated investment in local capacities to effectively advocate and advance peace efforts. In response to this imperative, the **Grassroots Peacebuilding Mentor's Training Program** has been envisaged as a project that prioritizes the development of local capacities to address conflict and violence in a diplomatic and constructive manner. The program is anchored to MPI's broader vision to foster peaceful and just communities in the Asia-Pacific region. Moreover, it seeks to address the need for a long-term engagement and ongoing commitment to sustainable peacebuilding by investing in local capacities that can effectively work towards conflict resolution and violence mitigation.

The program is the second phase of the "Enhancing Capacities of Grassroots Peacebuilding Mentors" that started in 2018. The pilot phase of the program was initially supported by DKA Austria in the first year and co-supported by Misereor starting in 2019 until its completion in August 2021. From the 45 intended participants, 37 grassroots peacebuilders in South and Southeast Asia directly benefited from the three-year pilot phase.

Similar to the pilot phase, the second phase of the program focuses on peacebuilding practitioners and individuals interested in mentoring with a peacebuilding lens from the Philippines and selected countries in South and Southeast Asia such as India, Indonesia, and Laos. The program is being implemented for three years from 2022 to 2024 and aims to address issues of conflict and violence by working with grassroots peacebuilders who are directly involved in conflict transformation. Each year, the program receives a minimum of 10 mentors who participate in a year-long mentoring program. These mentors undergo mentoring in a series of capacity-building workshops and accompaniment activities to enhance their professional and personal skills. This will enable them to deliver their work more efficiently, provide better support to their organizations and communities, and contribute to lasting peace and stability in the Philippines and the wider Asia-Pacific region. Currently, 71 mentees from the three batches and 20 collaborating organizations indirectly benefited from the program.

II. Purpose of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the Final Evaluation is to provide an independent assessment and third-party recommendations guided by the project objectives:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the mentoring skills training program for grassroots peacebuilders by determining the extent to which the direct beneficiaries of the program apply their newly acquired mentoring skills within a reflective practice framework in their local contexts.
- Assess peer support and collaboration among grassroots peacebuilding mentors and evaluate mutual engagement in their mentorship practice.
- Measure the extent to which collaborative organizations have improved their understanding of mentorship and reflective peacebuilding through this program.

MPI also hopes that this Final Evaluation will help the design and development of the proposal of the program's third phase.

III. Questions to be answered by the evaluation

Based on the DAC criteria adapted by Misereor, it is essential to consider the following factors:

Relevance: To what extent have the project objectives and design responded to the needs, priorities, and policies of the target group and the collaborating organizations? Were the outcomes and outputs appropriate to the context and did the activities adequately address the needs of the target groups? Did the project design and preparation allow for a logical and coherent project? Was the project logic adapted based on any learning during the project? To what extent are the initial objectives and the design of the project still appropriate?

Coherence: What synergies and links exist between the project and other interventions implemented by MPI and Misereor? In what respects is the project consistent with the interventions of other actors in the same context? Where appropriate, are activities harmonized and coordinated with those of other actors and do they complement each other? To what extent does the project create added value and at the same time avoid the duplication of work activities?

Efficiency: To what extent has the project delivered or is likely to deliver results in an economic and timely way? What evidence is there to indicate that the project was implemented with due regard to economic efficiency under the given circumstances? On what parameters is this assessment based (e.g. costs per project output: costs per training course or trainee, per beneficiary, etc.)? Are any benchmarks for these parameters available from other projects or institutions?

Effectiveness: To what extent has the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and outputs, including differential results across target groups? To what extent has the project contributed to its impact? Which activities and outputs made a particularly important contribution to the achievement of objectives, and which were not so important? How many people were reached through the project and how does this compare with the planned number? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and outputs? Were the initial objectives realistic? Based on the project achievements and challenges, what follow-up actions can be recommended/ considered necessary? To what extent were the project feedback and complaints mechanisms effective, and what were the key themes of feedback provided? What are the lessons learned related to gender-sensitive programming?

Effects (Outcomes and Impacts): What exactly has changed for the participants as a result of the project (considering social, economic, political, cultural, and environmental changes, plus gender aspects and other relevant social differentiations)? Which external factors contributed to the changes, and to what extent can the changes be attributed to the project activities? Did the project logic adopted in the project design prove effective? If not, where are there deviations? What are the key learning points to be taken forward by each organization? Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed because of the project's interventions?

Sustainability: To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue at various levels? What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project? What role do risks, potential conflicts of interest, and resilience (e.g. of target groups and consortium organizations) play in this context?

Quality of partnerships: What value has the MPI – collaborating organizations' partnership added to the project? How has the project impacted the partnership approach of each organization and how has the partnership approach of each organization impacted the project? How could each of the organizations have collaborated differently to better support the achievement of the expected results?

IV. Methodology

The Consultant(s) will be invited to present the methodology to be used. MPI and Misereor request that the following be considered in their proposal:

• The conduct of the evaluation must adhere to Misereor and MPI's ways of working, including responsible resource management and values. This will be presented during the orientation of the Consultant(s).

• The evaluation must include a good cross-section of target groups, collaborating organizations, and key staff, with attention to ensuring women are given opportunities to express their views.

• The evaluation must include a desk review of project information, including key documents (proposal, quarterly reports, annual reports, during the project period).

• The evaluation must include interviews with key MPI staff to understand the project's achievements and challenges.

• The Consultant(s) must indicate in their proposal how they intend to execute the field visits, how many communities they would visit, and the sample size to be used for the evaluation.

• The Consultant(s) must elaborate on the participatory methodologies they will employ in the evaluation, including but not limited to KIIs and FGDs, that will ensure an inclusive and equitable evaluation process.

• The Consultant(s) must enumerate the security and health protocols they will put in place during the conduct of the evaluation to protect their team, the MPI staff, and the people and communities involved in this project.

V. Primary Target Groups

Below is the informative summary of the primary participants/direct program beneficiaries for Phase II (2022-2024):

● Batch 1, (2022) - 10 grassroots peacebuilders in the Philippines

Country	**Location**
Philippines (10)	Quezon City, Marikina City, Davao City, Butuan City, Agusan del Sur, Iligan City, Cotabato City, Basilan City

● Batch 2, (2023) - four grassroots peacebuilders in the Philippines and six grassroots peacebuilders from selected countries in South and Southeast Asia per year, for a total of 10 mentors.

Country	**Location**
Philippines (4)	Davao City, Kabacan, Tagaytay City, Iligan City
India (2)	Assam, Nagaland (North East India)
Laos (2)	Vientiane
Indonesia (2)	South Sulawesi, Yogyakarta (2)

● Batch 3, (2024) - four grassroots peacebuilders in the Philippines and six grassroots peacebuilders from selected countries in South and Southeast Asia per year, for a total of 10 mentors.

Country	**Location**
Philippines (4)	Davao City, Kabacan,Cotabato City, Agusan del Sur
India (2)	Kolkata, West Bengal
Laos (2)	Vientiane
Indonesia (2)	South Sulawesi, Central Java

In addition, over the three years:

- Twenty (20) collaborating organizations in the Philippines and selected countries in South and Southeast Asia have entered into a partnership with MPI.
- At least five of the 30 mentors in this phase are mentees from the previous batches.

Secondary Target Groups

● At least 30 women and men, who have just started working in peacebuilding-related areas in the Philippines and selected countries in South and Southeast Asia, have been invited to be mentees in the project.

● At least five mentors from the pilot project have become resource persons and/or have accompanied the mentors of the second phase.

VI. Deliverables

The Consultant(s) is/are required to evaluate with a high level of rigor to ensure the production of valid and reliable information and recommendations based on thorough data and analysis. The evaluation should be participatory, involving project implementers and target beneficiaries in key tasks. Project documents and annual reports will be provided to the evaluator to support their work. The Consultant(s) is/are urged to collaborate with the MPI Team, comprising the Director, Finance Officer, and the Project Officer closely engaged with the project, to ensure a comprehensive evaluation aligned with the project objectives and activities.

Given the wide network of mentors from South and Southeast Asia, the Consultant(s) may opt to conduct face-to-face and/or virtual meetings whichever is deemed necessary to achieve a sound result of the evaluation outcome.

Proposed Timeline

The evaluation period contract will run from May 15 - June 30, 2024. Thus, MPI proposed the following schedule below.

Duration	**Details**
1st Day	Signing of contract and Project Orientation
2 days	Desk review
5th day	Submit the Evaluation Design and Schedule
May 31, 2024	Submission of draft Data Analysis and report
June 10, 2024 (1 day)	Presentation
3 days	Finalization of the Evaluation Report
June 30, 2024	Submission of the Final Report

VII. Report

Evaluation reports must comply with Misereor's requirements, ensuring that at least the minimum criteria are met. Important details, including good practices, will be provided during the orientation.