

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

Evaluation of Mines Advisory Group's *2020-2024 Mine Action and Cluster Munitions Programme II* multi-country programme

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the evaluation

Mines Advisory Group (MAG) are seeking bids from independent experts and external evaluators to undertake an evaluation of projects delivered under the '*2020-2024 Mine Action and Cluster Munitions Programme II*' (MACM II) funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA).¹

The multi-country programme is being implemented between 1st September 2020 and 31st August 2024, with activities conducted by MAG in three core countries (Iraq, Lebanon and South Sudan) and six additional countries using the Contingency Fund (Somalia, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Guinea Bissau, Ukraine and Bosnia-Herzegovina).

The evaluation is to be undertaken before 30th November 2024 with the final report to be submitted to MAG no later than 31st December 2024.

1.2 The MACM II multi-country programme

The Kingdom of the Netherlands, henceforth "the Netherlands", is a State Party to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC), the Convention on Cluster Muniton (CCM) and a High Contracting Party of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) including its Protocols IIa and V.

As a major donor of humanitarian mine action, the Netherlands invests on average €15-20 million per year for mine action and has been a leading advocate for mine action in the international arena. In 2021, the Netherlands held the Presidency of the APMBC, hosting the 19th MSP virtually in The Hague with a focus on capacity building and localisation, innovation and inclusivity.

The Mine Action and Cluster Munitions (MACM) II programme is part of the security and rule of law policy of the MFA for the catalytic and enabling contributions to human security having direct and significant impacts on lives and livelihoods.

Specifically, the Netherlands leverages the MACM II programme to support SDG 16.1, which focuses on reducing all forms of violence and related fatalities.

2 Scope of MAG implementation under the MACM II programme

2.1 MAG countries of operation

The **Mine Action and Cluster Munitions II programme** is a four-year multi-country **Humanitarian Mine Action programme**, generously supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government

¹ <https://www.government.nl/topics/grant-programmes/mine-action-and-cluster-munitions-programme-2020-2024>.

of the Netherlands, and awarded to four mine action operators and the Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining.²

MAG's part of the MACM II programme has been **implemented in nine countries**: Iraq, Lebanon and South Sudan were originally contracted in September 2020; under Dutch contingency funding Nigeria and Somalia have been contracted since August 2021 and November 2022 respectively; and Bosnia & Herzegovina, Guinea Bissau, Ukraine and Zimbabwe programmes started during 2023.

2.2 Period of the grant

1st September 2020 – 31st August 2024

2.3 Total value of the grant

The MACM II programme has an overall budget of over €55 million, spanning a four-year period. Of this total budget, €40 million was earmarked for the support of country programmes, facilitated through collaborations with selected INGOs that successfully entered a collaboration with the MFA Department for Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid (DSH) as part of MACM II, referred to as the **main funding**³.

Additionally, MACM II initially made €10 million available for **contingency funding** (CF) and in 2023 topped it up with €6 million exclusively for Ukraine. CF was allocated based on proposals by MACM II partners, with the intention to supplement efforts of other donors (e.g., the EU). Proposals for CF were assessed based on how well they tied in with ministerial policy priorities.

2.4 Objectives of the grant

MACM II aims to contribute to:

- 1 The promotion of human security and reduce the risk of physical violence against civilians through the implementation of the following activities:
 - Clearance (i.e., surveying, mapping, marking and clearing) of mines and other explosive ordnance including cluster munitions.
 - Destruction of stockpiled mines, cluster munitions and other stockpiled explosive ordnance including dismantling production and storage facilities.
 - Assistance to victims and their families, including rehabilitation and reintegration.
 - Awareness raising and education of local populations about the risks of mines, and other explosive ordnance⁴ [EO risk education (EORE)].
- 2 Capacity development of national and local mine action organisations/authorities to effectively address EO/IED-related concerns.⁵
- 3 Strengthening the position of women as actors in reconstruction, peace processes, and socioeconomic development.

2.5 Main funding allocation

MAG accessed main funding for the following projects:

² Ibid.

³ Additionally, €1 million was allocated to GICHD to facilitate global capacity-building efforts and serve as a knowledge hub dedicated to the field of humanitarian demining.

⁴ EO as per IMAS is the term that includes landmines (incl. improvised landmines), ERW, and IEDs that are victim-activated.

⁵ Victim-activated IEDs are AP-mines as per the APMBC. All types of IEDs are part of CCW Prot. IIa. This objective was particularly relevant for South Sudan (mines and cluster munitions and for Iraq (mines, ERW, improvised mines, other IEDs).

| Country | Outcomes | Outputs | Date of project |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| Iraq | <p>Outcome 1: Risk of harm reduced through safer behaviour, and land release</p> <p>Outcome 2: Productive land use improves livelihoods and access to basic services for men and women</p> <p>Outcome 3: Mine Action is better managed, regulated, coordination increasing transition of sector national/local ownership</p> | <p>Output 1.1 Suspected confirmed and contaminated land is released</p> <p>Output 1.2 People affected by mines & ERW and humanitarian workers receive Risk Education messaging</p> <p>Output 2.1 sqm of released land classified by type</p> <p>Output 3.1 Enhanced plans, systems, procedures and practices, and improved management skills & knowledge of national mine action authorities and national staff</p> | 1 st September 2020 – 31 st August 2024 |
| Lebanon | <p>Outcome 1: Risk of harm reduced through safer behaviour and land release</p> <p>Outcome 2: Productive land use improves livelihoods and access to basic services for men and women</p> <p>Outcome 3: Mine Action is better managed, regulated, coordination increasing transition of sector to national/local ownership</p> | <p>Output 1.1 Suspected confirmed and contaminated land is released</p> <p>Output 1.2 People affected by mines & ERW and humanitarian workers receive Risk Education messaging</p> <p>Output 2.1 sqm of released land classified by type</p> <p>Output 3.1 Enhanced plans, systems procedures and improved management skills & knowledge of national staff</p> | 1 st September 2020 – 31 st August 2024 |
| South Sudan | <p>Outcome 1: Risk of harm reduced through safer behaviour, and land release</p> <p>Outcome 2: Productive land use improves livelihoods and access to basic services for men and women</p> <p>Outcome 3: Mine action is better managed, regulated, coordination increasing transition of sector to national/local ownership</p> | <p>Output 1.1 People affected by mines & ERW and humanitarian workers receive Risk Education messaging</p> <p>Output 1.2 South Sudanese refugees and/or returnees residing in Uganda receive EORE and contribute to the understanding of the extent of contamination in their areas of origin</p> <p>Output 1.3 South Sudanese sub-national authorities are</p> | 1 st September 2020 – 31 st December 2023 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>aware of risks associated with ERW as well as Article 5 obligations under the Ottawa Treaty</p> <p>Output 1.4 ERW removed through spot tasks</p> <p>Output 2.1 sqm of released land classified by land use type</p> <p>Output 3.1 Enhanced plans, systems, procedures and practices, and improved management skills & knowledge of national mine action authorities and national staff</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

2.6 Contingency funding allocation

MAG accessed CF funding for the following projects:

| Country/Other | Outcomes | Outputs | Date of project |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| Nigeria | <p>Outcome 1: Increased awareness on the risks of contamination and increased safe behaviour</p> <p>Outcome 2: Reduced potential risk of mine/ERW related death and injury</p> <p>Outcome 3: Increased national capacity to address contamination through technical support/training to local authorities</p> | <p>Output 1.1 Women, men, girls and boys affected by mines & ERW and humanitarian support receive Risk Education messaging</p> <p>Output 1.2 Expanded community networks of Community Focal Points are trained to deliver and sustain EORE messages and report EO incidents</p> <p>Output 2.1 Information on the presence and impact of mines/ERW is mapped</p> <p>Output 3.1 Baseline assessment of Police EOD capacity is completed</p> <p>Output 3.2 EOD trainings delivered to police</p> <p>Output 3.3 NTS and EORE trainings delivered to CJTF</p> <p>Output 3.4 Internal conflict sensitivity assessment is conducted</p> | 1 st August 2021 - 31 st December 2023 |

| | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | Output 3.5 MAG positioning towards CJTF and Police is formalised | |
| Somalia | <p>Outcome 1: Risk of harm reduced through safer behaviour</p> <p>Outcome 2: Mine Action response capacity is built in Somaliland and Jubaland, with increasing transition</p> | <p>Output 1.1 People affected by mines & ERW and humanitarian workers receive Risk Education messaging</p> <p>Output 2.1 Increase in the number of trained EOD officers</p> <p>Output 2.2 Previously trained officers receive refresher training to conduct activities safely, effectively</p> <p>Output 2.3 Enhanced plans, systems, procedures and practices, & knowledge of national mine action authorities and national staff</p> <p>Output 2.4 ERW removed through spot tasks</p> | 1 st November 2022 – 31 st December 2023 |
| Guinea Bissau | Outcome 3: Reduced risk of EO related death and injury through clearance and EORE | <p>Output 1.2 Gender and diversity analysis conducted</p> <p>Output 1.3 Senior CAAMI personnel are trained</p> <p>Output 1.4 National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) are developed and provided to CAAMI (and CNDHD) for validation</p> <p>Output 1.5 Information Management System (IMS) is set-up</p> <p>Output 1.1 Capacity development plan developed and delivered</p> <p>Output 2.1 NTS reports generated and approved according to NMAS</p> <p>Output 2.2 Hotline is reactivated</p> <p>Output 3.1 Personnel of HUMAID received technical trainings in accordance with</p> | 1 st January 2023 – 31 st August 2024 |

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>their role and in line with IMAS and NMAS</p> <p>Output 3.2 EORE sessions delivered</p> <p>Output 3.3 Beneficiaries reached</p> <p>Output 3.4 Digital EORE campaigns deployed</p> <p>Output 3.5 CAAMI and/or Community Focal points trained</p> <p>Output 3.6 Hazardous Areas identified are marked</p> <p>Output 3.7 Spot tasks tasked to MAG are cleared</p> | |
| Zimbabwe | <p>Outcome 1: Risk of harm reduced through safer behaviour and land release</p> <p>Outcome 2: Productive land use improves livelihoods and access to basic services for men and women</p> | <p>Output 1.1 Suspected confirmed and contaminated land is released</p> <p>Output 1.2 People affected by Explosive Ordnance receive Explosive Ordnance Risk Education</p> <p>Output 1.3 ERW removed through spot tasks</p> <p>Output 2.1 m² of land released (classified by type)</p> | 1 st January 2023 – 31 st December 2023 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | <p>Outcome 1: Safe land is handed back to local authorities and communities</p> <p>Outcome 2: Community perceptions are included in a gender-, age- and conflict-sensitive manner</p> | <p>Output 1.1 At least 63,000m² of land released through technical survey and clearance</p> <p>Output 2.1 Impact assessment conducted on at least one task following land release</p> | 1 st January 2023 – 31 st December 2023 |
| Ukraine | <p>Outcome 1: The capacity of the national authorities and national partners is strengthened through the join projects and training</p> <p>Outcome 2: The number of landmine/ERW accidents and victims is reduced through behavioural change activity (EORE)</p> <p>Outcome 3: The scale and nature of landmine and ERW</p> | <p>Output 1.1 To build the capacity of Ukrainian Deminers Association and Special Service of Transport in Ukraine in clearance operations according to international standards</p> <p>Output 2.1 EORE session conducted in Kyiv, Chernigivska and Sumska oblasts to ensure vulnerable women, girls, boys and men</p> | 1 st May 2023 – 31 st July 2024 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | contamination is better understood in Kyivska, Chernigovska and Sumska oblasts through NTS and cleared lands improves access to livelihoods and basic services for civilians | who are living in, or returning to, EO contaminated areas are aware of the risks from landmines and other explosive items and are able to adopt safe behaviours to reduce the risk of accidents | |
| <i>Conflict Sensitivity Project</i> | <p>Outcome 1: Increased integration of conflict sensitivity into country strategies across MAG's five regional programme portfolios</p> <p>Outcome 2: MAG accesses further funding from other donors for the purpose of improving conflict sensitivity practice</p> | <p>Output 1.1 Key staff in each of MAG's Regional Programmes have an improved understanding of conflict sensitivity based on MAG's Conflict Sensitivity Framework</p> <p>Output 1.2 Functional Needs Analysis of conflict sensitivity practice</p> <p>Output 1.3 Conflict Sensitivity Action Plan</p> <p>Output 1.4 MAG's Conflict Sensitivity Framework updated based on learning from the project</p> <p>Output 2.1 Conflict sensitivity needs incorporated into new proposal development</p> | 1st June 2023 – 31st August 2024 |

A table summarising the key activities conducted in each of the target countries in this programme is attached as an annex to this ToR.

3 Scope of the Evaluation

3.1 Objective of the evaluation

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to **assess the quality and achievements of MAG's delivery under the MACM II programme**. This will cover what worked well, the challenges that were faced and lessons learned from this programme to take into future programming and include case studies of implementation in two countries.

This will support MAG to understand the extent to which our work is contributing to the outcomes we expect (or not) and why this is the case. The evaluation should also provide a useful and relevant reference document for future programme implementation.

3.2 Evaluation criteria

MAG envisages that the evaluation will respond to the criteria below. All criteria will be applied to assess the projects delivered in nine countries where MACM II funding has been used and applied in greater depth in the three countries under general funding: Iraq, Lebanon and South Sudan.⁶

⁶ Iraq had an external impact evaluation on two districts during the first half of 2024, funded under MACM II but looking at the broader impact of all mine action activities by MAG across all donors since 2015. The data from this assessment will be available to the evaluator/ evaluation team and so primary data collection will not be required in Iraq. However, evaluation questions specific to the MACM II grant not sufficiently addressed by this impact evaluation need further exploration.

| Criteria | Evaluation questions |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Relevance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To which extent did targeting strategies, selection processes and project implementation approaches respond to the needs and priorities of different groups of people, particularly women and girls? • To what extent are affected populations satisfied with the interventions? • To what extent were projects adapted in response to the conditions in which they were delivered? |
| Coherence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were MAG interventions coordinated with, or complementary to, those of other stakeholders within the mine action sector and in other sectors (e.g., humanitarian, development, peacebuilding, environment)? • To what extent did the projects undertaken by MAG contribute to the capacity development of national and local mine action organisations/ authorities to effectively address EO/IED-related concerns? |
| Effectiveness | <p>To what extent did the programme, at an individual country level and taken as a whole, achieve the intended outcomes and output targets in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearance (i.e., surveying, mapping, marking and clearing) of mines and other explosive ordnance)? • Destruction of stockpiled mines, cluster munitions and other EO including dismantling production and storage facilities? • Assistance to victims and their families, including rehabilitation and reintegration? • Awareness raising and education of local populations about the risks of mines and other EO? <p>What evidence is there that the programme, at an individual country level and taken as a whole, contributed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promotion of human security and reducing the risk of physical violence against civilians? • The capacity development of national and local mine action organisations/ authorities to effectively address mine/EO/IED-related concerns? • Strengthening the position of women as actors in reconstruction, peace processes, and socioeconomic development? |
| Efficiency⁷ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the projects deliver results that ensured good Value for Money? • To what extent were projects delivered in a timely and successful manner given the resources available? • How were projects adapted to ensure that the programme achieved its intended results? |
| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To which extent are the outcomes achieved likely to continue after the programme ends? |

⁷ To be discussed with MAG staff only.

| Criteria | Evaluation questions |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project ensured that partners are able to continue working with the target groups after the project ends? |
| Gender and inclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence is there that actions taken by MAG have improved the participation of women, girls and marginalised groups in operational delivery, in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation or leadership in community decision-making Participation or leadership in the mine action sector Participation or leadership within MAG or our partners To what extent were the benefits of the programme experienced by different groups of people, particularly women and girls? |

During the evaluation, further consideration of the following elements is expected:

- Lessons learned from the implementation of this project, both at the global and individual country levels.
- Integration of cross-cutting principles into programme delivery, specifically gender, inclusion and conflict sensitivity.
- The use of the contingency fund by MAG and the extent to which projects delivered under the fund a) responded to a humanitarian crisis; b) funded innovative activities; c) expanded existing activities or met a clearly defined gap in funding.
- Adaptation and response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

4 Methodology

It is expected that the evaluator/evaluation team **propose and present a methodology** for the evaluation as part of this tender, to be finalised with MAG during inception. The proposed methodology should be designed to effectively respond to the questions raised above.

4.1 Inception period

Once the contract is signed, the evaluator/evaluation team will be expected to start the desk review to adjust their proposal. An **inception report** including the final plan for the evaluation (methodology, outlined tools including online sessions, timeline, etc.) will be expected about 20-30 days after the signature of the contract.

4.2 Desk review of secondary data and sources

We are expecting that the evaluator/evaluation team will take an outcome-focussed approach to identify changes, map and assess how these changes happened and identify what MAG's contribution was to achieve these changes. This will be based largely on a **thorough desk review** (but also on the below presented primary data collection methods).

The project documentation to be shared with the consultant include:

- Original proposals, including results frameworks (in English)
- Annual Reports for 2022, 2023 and 2024 (in English)
- MACM II Programme Mid-Term Evaluation 2021 (in English)
- Work Plans and Budgets for 2020-2023 (in English)
- Iraq HMA impact evaluation post ISIS
- Evaluator/Evaluation team can also request additional documentation.*

Note that this list is not exhaustive, and it will be possible to access further documentation.

4.3 Primary data collection

MAG encourages applications that **propose primary data methodologies focused on gathering outcome data**. Activities are expected to include, but are not be limited to:

- Data gathering through methods that may include, but are not limited to, household surveys, focus group discussions, case studies (to be conducted along the surveys and FGDs), semi-structured interviews and key informant interviews (KIIs).
- Primary data collection from staff teams, project participants, partners and key stakeholders in two Case Study countries: Lebanon and South Sudan.
- Remote data collection from staff teams and key stakeholders in all other MACM II programme countries as well as in MAG central functions (e.g., Programmes Department, Policy and Strategic Partnerships Department).
- Review and discussion of initial findings with MAG evaluation steering group.
- Submission of draft and final report.

| Tool proposed | Objectives of the tool ⁸ | Sample size |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Key Informant Interviews within MAG | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All evaluation objectives / questions - Case studies | 10-15 |
| Key Informant Interviews with external actors (partners, donor, national authorities) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verification of outcomes achieved and of the contribution of the project - Relevant evaluation questions (all criteria should be covered - to some extent - except the efficiency) | 10-15 |
| Community Focus Group Discussions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verification of outcomes achieved and of the contribution of the project - Relevant evaluation questions (all criteria should be covered - to some extent - except the efficiency) | 4-6 per case study country |
| Household Surveys | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verification of outcomes achieved and of the contribution of the project - Relevant evaluation questions (all criteria should be covered - to some extent - except the efficiency) | 30-40 hhs per case study country |

4.4 Timeframe

The evaluation should be **initiated by 1st July 2024 and completed no later than 30th November 2024**, with the final report to be submitted to MAG no later than 31st December 2024. It is expected that the evaluator/evaluation team propose and present a comprehensive timeline for the evaluation as part of this tender, to be finalised with MAG during inception.

- The evaluation is to be undertaken over five months between July and November 2024. An inception phase working with MAG is expected to finalise the timeframe and methodology.
- It is anticipated that the evaluation will include at least 20 days of fieldwork in at least 02 selected countries where possible based on the current global context and travel restrictions.

⁸ To be agreed upon with the evaluator/evaluation team.

- MAG expect to convene regular meetings with the evaluator/evaluation team over the course of the evaluation to monitor its implementation and make adjustments, when necessary.
- The final report is to be submitted to MAG no later than 31st December 2024 and following agreement with the evaluator/evaluation team this will be preceded by a formal presentation of initial results to the evaluation steering group as well as to senior members of staff in relevant programmes.
- Potentially a meeting in the Netherlands with will be convened with the donor, TBC.

Timetable (tentative, to be discussed)

| | June-23 | July-23 | Aug-24 | Sep-24 | Oct-24 | Nov-22 | Dec-22 |
|---|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Recruitment of research consultant | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholder consultations -> Evaluation framework | | | | | | | |
| Desktop research | | | | | | | |
| Training of enumerators, if required | | | | | | | |
| Country visit Lebanon | | | | | | | |
| Country visit South Sudan | | | | | | | |
| Data analysis | | | | | | | |
| Report writing | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholder workshop (TBC) | | | | | | | |
| Report review, sign-off, design | | | | | | | |
| Report launch | | | | | | | |

4.5 Evaluation deliverables

Inception report/Evaluation framework

Presentation of Preliminary Findings

A **final evaluation report** will be delivered as the product of this final evaluation and endline exercises. The report will be no more than 25 pages and is expected to broadly follow this structure:

- Executive summary - 2 pages
- Introduction (background and context) - 2 pages
- Methodology (tools used, sample, limitations) - 2 pages
- Findings (per criteria – including quotes, graphs and tables) - 15 pages
- Recommendations - 2 pages
- Conclusion - 1 page
- Annexes including:
 - 3 x case studies for ‘General Fund’ countries (Iraq, Lebanon, South Sudan)
 - Tools for data collection
 - Results framework comparing baseline / project monitoring / endline values

The entire set of **raw data** will be provided to MAG in an excel format and will be secured with a password in the project folder on SharePoint.

The **data analysis** spreadsheet will be shared and stored in the project folder on SharePoint as well.

Finally, a **PowerPoint presentation** will be developed and facilitated to share the findings of the Final Evaluation during a meeting. The power point presentation will present an overview of the findings

from the final evaluation looking at all different criteria (including the effectiveness and achievements of the project) as well as key recommendations for future projects.

4.6 Stakeholders

The evaluation will involve **interviews, either face to face or remotely, with a variety of stakeholders** in some countries of operation. These may include, but are not limited to:

- Project participants (beneficiaries) either in group or individually
- Representatives from relevant national authorities
- International programme staff
- National programme staff
- Management and support staff (UK and remote)
- Dutch MoFA representatives (in Netherlands and in-country)

The evaluator/evaluation team will be expected to identify a diverse and representative group of interviewees based on diversity factors in a given context to ensure a comprehensive analysis and assessment.

Most key informants will be English speakers (even if second language) but it might not be the case for project participants. In their proposal, the evaluator/evaluation team should present a solution to this challenge, either by proposing an international consultancy team or by budgeting translation work.

4.7 Intended use of the evaluation

MAG will use the findings of the evaluation to **inform and guide future planning and implementation** of similar projects/programming.

For the Dutch MoFA, the evaluation will provide an **external and independent report** on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the use of their funding.

5 Management

5.1 Budget

A total of EUR 45,000 is available for this evaluation. The evaluator/evaluation team are expected to propose a budget as part of their tender, to be finalised with the successful applicant before contracting.

MAG plan on making two payments linked to the main milestones:

- First payment equal to 20% for delivery of the inception report/evaluation framework.
- Payment of 60% against key milestones (TBD)
- A final payment equal to 20% upon delivery of the full and satisfactory findings/report.

The final report will be the property of MAG and the Dutch MFA and must not be circulated to other parties by the author or any other parties without prior consent by all actors.

5.2 Coordination

The evaluator/evaluation team will be expected to report regularly to the MAG evaluation steering group on the progress of the evaluation and any issues arising. They will be available to respond to questions and provide any appropriate practical support.

A timetable for reporting will be finalised following selection of the evaluator/evaluation team, the establishing of the work plan and the signing of a contract.

While visiting programmes, the evaluator/evaluation team will be under the responsibility of the MAG country programme team, which will ensure that visits to relevant sites are facilitated and supported, and that any necessary in-country information is made available for analysis.

The MAG programme team will also hold overall responsibility to assist the evaluator(s) in their work, for instance by setting up appropriate meetings with external stakeholders, where possible and if requested by the evaluator.

Research management/responsibilities

- **Full time research consultant or team** (to be recruited) to conduct the evaluation.
- **MAG lead: Head of Programme Performance & Learning (PPL)** to oversee the project and support the research consultant, field visit during research and PPL Coordinator
- **MAG support in countries:** to support field visit during research including for accommodations, transportation, facilitating meetings and workshops as required
- **Enumerators** to collect impact assessment data (*N.B. Could also ask for support of MAG’s CL teams + additional enumerators, to be discussed with MAG country teams + consultant at the start of the project*).
- **HQ Comms team** to support with report presentation and design.

5.3 Safeguarding

MAG has a Safeguarding Framework that includes a staff Policy on Personal Conduct and a Child Protection Policy which have been developed to ensure the maximum protection of programme participants and to clarify the responsibilities of MAG staff, visitors to programmes and partner organisations, and the standards of behaviour expected of them.

MAG has the responsibility to ensure that any persons hired, used or consulted during the process are made familiar with our safeguarding policies and commit to abide by them during execution of this work.

Any consultants offered a contract with MAG will be expected to sign our Policy on Personal Conduct as an appendix to their contract. By doing so, consultants acknowledge that they have understood the contents of policies and agree to conduct themselves in accordance with the provisions of this document.

6 Tender management

6.1 Assessment of proposals

MAG invites submissions of a technical proposal in response to this ToR. Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria:

| Criteria | Description |
|--|---|
| <p>Qualifications (30%) (Documented with the Supplier Registration Form and three examples of similar projects executed, including two samples)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General liability/capacity of the company • Previous relevant research projects executed (with focus on the set-up as required, with a consultant coordinating and supervising a team of researchers across several geographies) • Relevant sector experience and experience working with NGOs/ mine action |

| | |
|--|--|
| Proposed services (40%) (Documented with the technical proposal) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content of the proposal suitable for the requirements • Proposed methodology for the qualitative and/or quantitative research |
| Personnel qualifications (30%) (Documented with CVs of relevant staff involved in the project) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience of core people who will work on the project with similar projects and NGO experience |
| Interview to assess qualifications, proposed services, and personal qualifications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the top 3 candidates will be invited to the interview. • To cover the above topics |

6.2 Profile of the Evaluator/Evaluation team

Experts expressing an interest in doing this work should be able to demonstrate experience in the following areas:

Essential

- Experience of successfully undertaking similar evaluations for international NGOs in conflict/post conflict countries
- Experience of assessing outcomes
- Research skills and knowledge of good practice in evaluation
- Interpersonal skills that evoke trust and are gender and culturally sensitive
- Strong verbal and written English language skills
- A knowledge of the humanitarian disarmament sector and how it links with humanitarian action and socio-economic development

Desirable

- Professional experience in the mine action sector
- Experience of carrying out evaluations of multi-year, multi-country grants
- Experience of using different methodologies to assess outcomes, such as Outcome Harvesting, Stories of Change or similar

We welcome applications involving a team of evaluators, preferably with local language skills, knowledge/experience of the relevant countries/regions.

Applications need to include a cover letter, CV, and proposal how you would undertake this research/evaluation. Not more than 5 pages please, including a budget for the lead and the second person, cost for visa, international travel, hotel accommodation; in addition, CVs, track record, etc. MAG will support with local travel and cover the cost for convening the two seminars.

Consultants require HEAT within last 3 years for visits to Lebanon and South Sudan. Where an individual who is to visit either location does not have this training, MAG can arrange it for them, and the cost of the training will be deducted from the final payment to the consultant. MAG may support with additional insurance coverage if needed.

Please refer to the advert for details on how to submit an application.

7 Project breakdown by country

| Country | Explosive Ordnance Risk Education | Non-Technical Survey | Technical Survey | Explosive Ordnance Destruction | Clearance | Capacity Development | Implementing Partnerships |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Iraq | X | | | X | X | X | |
| Lebanon | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| South Sudan | X | | | X | X | X | |
| Nigeria | X | X | | | | X | |
| Somalia | X | | | | | X | |
| Guinea Bissau | X | X | X | | | X | X |
| Zimbabwe | X | | | X | X | | |
| Ukraine | X | | | | X | X | X |
| Bosnia & Herzegovina | | | | X | X | | |
| Conflict Sensitivity | | | | | | X | X |

[End]