

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONSULTANTS

1. Context

End-Term Evaluation – Terms of Reference and Call for Expressions of Interest

This programme seeks to undertake an integrated effort in supporting human rights and their defenders where they are most at risk so as to eradicate any abuses, and to provide comprehensive psychosocial rehabilitative support available for those at risk as well as support the human rights mechanisms in the adoption of the UPR recommendations. It achieves this through providing quality legal assistance, psychosocial support, innovative legal advocacy work, awareness campaigns, increasing overall knowledge of national and international standards through workshops, and conducting high-level discussion round tables to increase dialogue and collaboration to solve issues within the criminal justice system.

This evaluation is to be made on a progressive basis up to the end-term evaluation (i.e. the evaluation is to be made progressively up to the end of the project) and the evaluation work will take place every after 7 months for the first 21 months and after 9 month for a cumulated report covering the whole project including the 9 months. Four (4) evaluation reports shall be drafted in total of which the final report shall be drafted and submitted to RBJ no later than the 1st of August 2022. After receiving the input of Rwanda Bridges to Justice (RBJ) and other stakeholders, the finalized report should be submitted to the EU on or before the 30th of November 2024.

We would expect that the evaluator selected to have extensive knowledge and experience of human rights issues, experience in working on access and control of resources for victims of different crimes, a strong track record of working in and knowledge of Rwanda, experience regarding gender issues, experience in advocacy strategies and experience in influencing decision makers. The person or team selected would also be expected to have a strong track record of evaluations carried out on similar or analogous projects and will need a working knowledge of spoken and written English (English is the working language for some in Rwanda and the report will be drafted in English).

The evaluator will need to work within somewhat intense timeline. S/he will need to be able to gain the trust of programme participants, authorities and third parties and will need to be able convince all those approached that the information they provide will remain secure and confidential. The evaluator will also need to be aware of, and be able to use, ways of working that do not increase security risks to any party involved in the program or the evaluation. Experience in training, capacity building and working with smaller NGOs in difficult contexts would also be helpful.

The results originally foreseen are to be discussed with only the selected evaluation company.

Key evaluation questions:

Referring to the full logical framework, have we, so far, completed all of the **activities** as planned at a reasonably high quality?

What problems were encountered during the implementation of the project?

How did changes on the ground in Districts of Rwanda affect our plans and was our reaction and changes to those plans appropriate and timely?

How have any problems affected the activities and to what extent have they been overcome?

Outcome level

Where completed as planned, have activities contributed to the planned **results**? Where this was so, refer to evidence. Where not so, what factors intervened and explain how they impacted.

Mention instances when RBJ has tried to overcome problems and describe how successful this has been (or not).

Document any changes in the external environment that helped or hindered the project.

If there have been any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.

Impact level

If at all possible, assess whether the results achieved are likely, over the longer term, to achieve or contribute to the achievement of the overall **purpose** of the project:

If it is unlikely that all or part of the purpose will be achieved, why is this and is this something that could have been foreseen/can be overcome? As this is an interim evaluation, it is likely that the report will focus more than usual on the outcome level and it is likely that less will be able to be said with any great certainty on likely impacts.

Additional evaluation questions:

1. To what extent did the project succeed in the promotion and realization of human rights for the victims of injustices? Have we struck the right balance between grassroots capacity building, legal cases and local/national/regional advocacy? Was it too ambitious to aim to achieve all these objectives in one program? Have there been any conflicts between these objectives and the strategies needed to achieve them?
2. What effect has the project had (if any) on the capacities of those trained and supported to represent the rights and interests of their communities through advocacy campaigns? Detail progress made and gaps or constraints that are still impeding progress. What input have other organizations or individuals had in supporting and developing partners' capacities in addition to or alongside the project's input? Assess the project's contribution to any capacity gains vis a vis the work of others. Assess to what extent the project has made good decisions in deciding which aspects of capacity building to prioritize. Which capacity building methods have worked best and why? Which capacity building methods have been less effective and why? Are any gains in capacity sustainable over the longer term? To what extent have any improvements in capacity translated into benefits for the community on the ground?
3. Has the legal cases strategy been effective in finding legal solutions to human rights violations and resource control issues? Do vulnerable communities have improved capacity to use national and international legal mechanisms to safeguard their rights, particularly in relation to access to resources and services. Legal representation is provided to poor and vulnerable people accused, as early as possible in the criminal proceedings?
4. In relation to advocacy work, has the programme strengthened the voice of marginalized minority communities and civil society organizations to influence policy and its implementation, at local national and international levels? Were the project objectives realistic given the time frame and the context at the point that the programme was designed? Has the programme achieved commitments from local, national and international decision-makers to protect minority rights in the long-term?
5. What sort of partnership relationship has developed between EU and the organizations that received support through the programme? What aspects of this have been more or less helpful?
6. To what extent have grassroots communities benefited from the project? Have the benefits been reasonably balanced between different areas and groups e.g. women, men, young and older people? Has the project contributed to or detracted from cooperation and harmony within vulnerable communities? Has the project improved or proved negative for relationships between different communities (including some who benefitted more and some who benefitted less or not at all)? Has the project in any way contributed to encouraging representatives of minorities to collaborate and identify common agendas and strategies? Could we have done things differently and better?
7. Has the project, and all those involved, incorporated women's issues and gender in the way envisaged? If not, why not? If yes, how was this achieved? What can the project learn from this in the future in similar programmes?
8. It would be useful to have comments on how the project and partners have monitored, kept track of and reacted to changes in circumstances? Have the reactions and changes in project implementation been based on a sound analysis and agreements reached? Have they proven to be good decisions? Have any critical external context changes slipped under the radar or been picked up too late and, if so, has this impacted the effectiveness of the work?
9. Do partners of the project plans to continue to work on these issues in Rwanda, so it would be helpful if the evaluator could share feedback and comments on this and give any advice to the team on strategic directions or choices that could be made.
10. How would participants like to see the project working in Rwanda? What kind of support would they like to receive and what are the gaps they perceive in the project program? Are there any activities they would have implemented differently?

2. Scope of work and deliverables

The international and national consultants will work on the following Terms of Reference:

2.1. Purpose

1. Develop for the project an M&E plan that defines the appropriate evidence-based approaches, which could lead to an understanding of the project achievements at end of the project in 2024

2.2. Specific tasks of the evaluator

2. Read all project materials and review feedback from project partners.
3. Travel and visit implementing partners and talk with at least 50% potential beneficiaries: At least 40% of the potential beneficiaries contacted on each project should be identified and spoken to independently from the partner organization.
4. Speak with all other partners on the project (e.g., those located in Districts) to gain their opinions on the project progress and feedback from EU.
5. Speak to RBJ project staff in Kigali (if necessary, some of the conversations with Kigali staff could take place via Skype).
6. Report with an assessment of the current effectiveness and potential impact of the programme and on lessons emerging and recommendations that RBJ, partners and others can take forward throughout the duration of the programme. This should include an executive summary of approximately 2 pages.

2.3. Working conditions:

7. The consultant will be based in Rwanda during the consulting period and will work under the supervision of the project manager and receive the technical advice of the entire team.
8. The project manager will provide to the consultant any available documents and data related to the EU project.
9. The duration of the consultation is 30 months.
10. The Project end-line survey document will be developed in English.

3. Duration of the contract and Payment

The consultancy will run for 30 Months from the date the contract is signed. Based on the needs and the interests of the consultant, the contract may be extended for an additional week after the dissemination of the report in order to finalize the final document and transmit it to RBJ.

The payment is to be disbursed as follows: 25% to be advanced every after 7 months of delivering the report (for the first 21 months) and 25% to be advanced upon completion of the project, dependent on approval of the final deliverables.

4. Supervision

The consultancy will be supervised by RBJ. Results of the final evaluation will be shared and discussed with partners to consider whether the evaluation's findings suggest that changes in programme design or ways of working would be beneficial. Results will also be shared with RBJ staff, Trustees and the general public via RBJ's website and e-bulletin. Generally, applicable lessons emerging from the evaluation will be extracted and discussed with all RBJ staff.

There is no pre-set format for this evaluation although RBJ is particularly interested in lessons that we can apply to remaining and future programme activities. It is essential that the evaluation also assess how well gender has been mainstreamed in the work throughout. The evaluator will need to be independent of RBJ and its donors, and it will need to be demonstrated that no perceived or actual conflict of interests would arise during the evaluation. The evaluator will need to work within the timeframes outlined above.

Please note that a final evaluation will be due on this project in 2022 and we may consider appointing the evaluator who completes this final evaluation in the interests of continuity, comparisons and cost saving.

If you are interested in being considered for this opportunity, please send your CV and a cover letter setting out your relevant experience and your suggested methodology of tackling this evaluation, including a work plan and budget, to rjb.procurementteam@gmail.com by 12.00 midday (Greenwich Mean Time) on May 27th 2022.

Rwanda Bridges to Justice will endeavour to shortlist potentially strong candidates on or by May of 2022 and hopes to have made an appointment by the end of business that day.

* NB: Kindly note that the period of coverage and payments may be adjusted based on the start date and any flexibility in relation to the project implementation that will be discussed upon after selecting the suitable company to conduct the evaluation of the project.

5. Composition of the offer

- Application letter addressed to RBJ
- Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Cost of the consultancy and proposed workplan, timeline and budget
- Photocopies of academic credentials
- The names, addresses and phone numbers of 3 references.

Kigali, 09/05/2022