Call for Tenders - Mid-Term Evaluation Burundi

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, VILVOORDE, JULY 2019

For our DGD-funded five year program, Tearfund is looking for a consultant to execute the required external mid-term evaluation, in order to comply with the Royal Decree Concerning the Non-Governmental Cooperation of September 11, 2016, chapter 6, section 1.

Please find attached the draft Terms of Reference for this evaluation. In this document, we have outlined the desired scope and objectives for the evaluation. We look forward to receiving your tender for the scope and objectives as written. However, considering we want a proper alignment of the expectations, timeframe and budget, we consider this document a “work in progress” and are prepared to negotiate the expectations in order to fit the budget.

Candidates are requested to submit their application to RN@tearfund.be before August 22nd, 2019, detailing:

- Relevant experience (CV)
- Proposed methodology & timeline
- Financial tender

Feel free to forward this call to anyone who might be qualified and interested to respond. Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Best Regards,

Ruth Nivelle
Head of Programme Department

ATTACHMENTS:
Terms of Reference Mid-Term Evaluation, draft July 2019

ATTACHMENTS TO THE TOR AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, TO BE FOUND AT https://drive.google.com/open?id=1OPAjYyYwa7 - TYJfp1kVZ9QrKzBuvHP

1. Analyse de Contexte Conjointe Burundi, 2015
2. Cadre Stratégique Commun Burundi, Actualisation 2018
3. Fiche de programme: La prise en charge intégrée des maladies des enfants de moins de cinq ans au niveau de la communauté au Burundi, 2017 (+ attachments)
4. Baseline Survey Report, 2018
5. For interest: Evaluation Report Final Evaluation Unicef, 2017
6. Additional Information on PCIME/ICCM
NOTES ON USE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Terms of Reference document should be used as a guide for designing, planning and discussing an evaluation. They can be used for real-time, mid-term and end of project/programme evaluations in both emergency and development contexts. Tearfund monitoring and evaluation requirements are set out in the M&E guidelines (currently being updated). Institutionally funded programmes/projects should take into consideration any specific donor requirements.

This document provides both guidance and a suggested outline that can be used by both internal and externally led evaluators. The ToR should be adapted according to the programme/project being assessed. The shaded boxes are for guidance for the evaluation manager/coordinaor to use in developing the ToR with other key stakeholders. The blank boxes are to be filled in according to the specific evaluation.

The ToR is drawn up by Tearfund as lead agency, but will be shared in advance with all partners as well as the donor for possible contributions.

For finalization of this ToR, take note of the checklist provided in ‘Beknopte gids over externe evaluaties’, by NGO-Federatie/Acodev.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name:</th>
<th>La prise en charge intégrée des maladies des enfants de moins de cinq ans au niveau de la communauté au Burundi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project code:</td>
<td>41DUBIBI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/region:</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Evaluation type: | Internal/external  
Mid-term/End of Program                                                                                     |
| Date of evaluation: | October 7-11, 2019                                                                                               |
| Lead agency of the programme: | Tearfund                                                                                                         |
| Evaluation coordinator: | Ruth Nivelle                                                                                                     |
| Implementing organization(s): | World Relief, COPED, Dutabarane                                                                                   |
| Country Representative/Programme Director: | Francois Niyitegeka                                                                                              |
| Other members of evaluation team: | t.b.a.                                                                                                             |
| External Evaluator: | t.b.a.                                                                                                             |
2. THE DIRECTION OF THE EVALUATION

2.1. BACKGROUND OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of this section:
Provide sufficient information in this section to enable readers to understand the context of the evaluation. Write concise information about the pertinent project/program to be investigated, the nature of the problem being pursued, historical, and environmental information as well as the organizational context in which the evaluation will occur.
Situate the important stakeholders, including donors, partners, implementing agencies and organizations. Describe what has been done before in terms of reports and evaluations and why the evaluation is required.

The evaluation will investigate the multi-year program “La prise en charge intégrée des maladies des enfants de moins de cinq ans au niveau de la communauté au Burundi”, a program carried out by Tearfund (lead agency), World Relief, COPED and Dutabarane (implementing partners) in Burundi, in 2017-2021. For the specifics of the program itself we refer to the documents in the attachment:
- Attachment 1: Analyse de Context Conjointe, 2015;
- Attachment 2: Cadre Statégique Commun, Actualisation 2018;
- Attachment 3: Fiche de Programme, 2016;

This ToR concerns a mid-term evaluation, which means the program is halfway through this year. The program is funded by the Belgian Directorate General for Development (DGD), and an external mid-term evaluation is one of the requirements of the donor.
The evaluation is commissioned by Tearfund (BE) as lead agency. This ToR is drawn up by Tearfund in consultation with the implementing partners, and with DGD. The external evaluator is invited to participate in finalizing this document as well, in particular chapter 3 and 4.
The requirements for reporting and evaluations have been set out in the general Terms of Reference between Tearfund and the implementing partners. To date, all reporting requirements have been met, and the reports to date can be made available to the evaluator.

2.2. INTENDED USER AND PURPOSE

Purpose of this section:
Provide a clear description of the aims and intentions of this evaluation. It is important to provide a clearly focused purpose; one of the most common causes of weaknesses in an evaluation is a lack of clarity or focus in the purpose.

In this section, specify the intended user(s) and use(s) of the evaluation. From beginning to end, the evaluation process is designed and carried out around the needs of the primary intended users. They have the responsibility to do things differently (e.g., make decisions, change strategies, take action, change policies, etc.) because of their engagement in the evaluation process or with the evaluation findings.

Articulate the uses of both the evaluation findings and the processes:
- Using the findings of an evaluation can entail: making judgments of merit or worth; facilitating improvements, or generating knowledge.
- Process use(s) occur as a result of the learning that happens during the evaluation process. It is evidenced by changes in procedures and culture.

If carried out well, an evaluation should increase transparency and allow all stakeholders to be able to influence the direction and emphasis of the project. An evaluation therefore has three main functions: to strengthen accountability, to increase learning and to facilitate decision-making. The balance between these three functions may vary depending on the purpose and intention of the evaluation. The three purposes of the evaluation are however not mutually exclusive. Do not differentiate between the three functions in an all too sterile manner.

Specify how the commissioning agency (Tearfund) will communicate about the results of the evaluation.
The purpose of this evaluation is threefold:
- Considering this is a Mid-Term evaluation, the main purpose is learning. The findings of the evaluation can help determine whether the program is on the right track or needs to be adapted in terms of priorities or activities. It is thus in the first place Tearfund and her partners that will use the evaluation as a learning tool. However, the lessons learned from the evaluation might also be relevant to other agencies working in the same context or with similar approaches, and the donor. The findings of the evaluation will therefore also be shared with the other members of the Cadre Stratégique Commun. The findings of the evaluation may also be used in developing future program proposals.
- The second purpose of the evaluation is to comply with donor requirements, strengthen accountability and increase transparency. The most important intended user, with this purpose in mind, is the donor, DGD. However, the results may also be shared with our wider constituency to increase general transparency.
- The third function is very much intertwined with the first two. The findings of the evaluation can be a means to facilitate decision making. The evaluation offers objective information which can inform decisions.

2.3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of this section:
This refers to the boundaries, scale and/or limits of the evaluation. Write concise information (as relevant) about: the activities, or aspects of activities, that are to be evaluated; the time period covered; geographical focus; target groups. Also indicate items/issues that are outside of the scope of the evaluation (if any). Specify if the evaluation regards all outcomes or only a number.

The reporting shows that the activities related to OC1 are on track, and the indicators for that outcome are being reached. We would be interested to know if this also results in the expected impact on the communities. Hence, we want to do a comparison of certain elements of our baseline study, to see if there is already a measurable improvement in the circumstances of the households after two years of implementation. The baseline was conducted in Mwaro and Bujumbura Rural; the evaluation should focus on one of these districts. Another interesting focus could be the district of Gitega. Previous ICCM programs have showed that the implementation of the whole package leads to results of which the sum is bigger than the parts. In Gitega we have now implemented the final part of the program, following a previous WR program there. It would be good to know if we find the same increased result there. (Learning purpose.)

The reporting also shows that the activities relating to OC2 have met with some problems. 1) There have been delays of activities due to government policies. 2) Some budget cuts had to be done before approval of the program, which means certain parts of the original program are not being implemented and 3) The Red Cross started implementing a similar program in one of the districts we were targeting (Mwaro), and the synergy did not go very well. With these questions/issues in mind, the evaluation should focus on the efficiency, effectiveness and complementarity/synergy related to OC2. For OC2, we are looking for recommendations from the evaluator, if it would show that the program needs to be adapted in order to reach our set goals. (Learning purpose and decision-making.)

2.4. OBJECTIVES/RATIONALE OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of this section:
Provide a clear and succinct response to the question: What are the specific objectives of the evaluation?

Provide a clear description of the aims and intentions of this evaluation and the main lines on inquiry that will be followed. For Tearfund evaluations it is expected that the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria will form the main lines of inquiry, along with the other priorities set by the Belgian government. However, there
may be occasions where different criteria may be more relevant. Where this is the case the reason for choosing these criteria must be clearly stated and the criteria explained.

The evaluation objectives should again be short, succinct statements that break down the overall evaluation goal and contribute to it. They can be phrased as questions the answers to which will satisfy the evaluation goal. Try to avoid having more than 5 questions or objectives; three is better. Too many objectives can lead to an evaluation that lacks focus.

The specific objectives of this evaluation are:

**Related to OC1:**
1. To measure the (preliminary) impact of ICCM on the communities. The evaluation is intended to gather information which will inform future ICCM interventions.

**Related to OC2:**
2. To measure the effectiveness of the implementation of the activities related to OC2 and advise on any adaptations that need to be made to the current framework in order to attain the objectives.
3. To measure the efficiency of the activities related to OC2, keeping in mind the budgetary restrictions for these activities following the adaptation of the program in 2017. Advise on any adaptations that need to be made.
4. To research the complementarity and synergy in the field, and measure the impact of the harmonisation or lack thereof on the program. Specifically keep the implementation of the Red Cross in Mwaro in mind, and advise on if and how we should adapt our implementation in order to have maximum results, avoid gaps and duplication.

2.5. PRINCIPLES AND APPROACH THAT WILL GUIDE THE EVALUATION

**Purpose of this section:**
The principles and approach that will guide the evaluation (e.g., transparency, partnership, openness, cost-effectiveness, etc.), should be articulated. Given the nature of international development, addressing gender awareness and cultural sensitivity should be incorporated into this section. Also include a statement on the need for the evaluator to follow appropriate ethical procedures.

1. **Transparency and Openness**
   - The evaluation will be conducted in line with these Terms of Reference and formalized in a contract.
   - The evaluation will be carried out in bilateral transparency: the commissioning agency and partners will provide the evaluator with all necessary information, and the evaluator will be open in advance about the methodology and implementation. Both parties will be open about costs and needs.
   - The evaluator will inform all concerned parties of the particulars he has collected, how this data has been used and the results of the evaluation. When the gathered information or the results are taken outside of the evaluated NGO, the evaluator will respect confidentiality.

2. **Ethics**
   - This evaluation is considered part of Tearfund’s operations. Therefore all parties should adhere to Tearfund’s code of conduct, as well as her values and ethics.
   - The parties involved in this evaluation respect human rights and show gender awareness and cultural sensitivity.
   - The external evaluator involved in this evaluation shows respect for the practices of the partners under evaluation, as far as possible within the ethical principles. He/she cannot put personal interest before the interest of the project or its beneficiaries.
   - As a matter of ethics, all activities related to this evaluation will be carried out in the most efficient and cost-effective way and with respect for the natural environment and resources.
3. THE CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION

3.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Purpose of this section:
The issue to be studied in the evaluation and the questions to be answered should be clearly detailed (e.g., what is it you want to find out through this evaluation?). You cannot evaluate everything so you will need to make strategic choices about what warrants in-depth study. There are many interesting and important questions that could be asked, but they need to be prioritized based on the primary intended uses of the evaluation and the specific objectives. The questions should be as specific as possible, because vague questions usually yield vague answers. The key questions can be further unpacked into sub-questions.

Specific Objective: OC1: Impact:

1. Is the implementation of ICCM having the expected impact on the communities?
   ▶ Compared to the baseline, after two years of implementation, what are noticeable changes in these communities, related to health?;
   ▶ Is there a discernible difference when the final phase (post-natal) is implemented?;
   ▶ Are there unintended results for the intervention, and is so what are they?;
   ▶ Are there negative changes that have been produced by the intervention, and if so, what are they?;
   ▶ If we reach the results set out by the indicators, are we fulfilling the objectives? In other words, if reached, do the objectives lead to the desired change/effect/impact?

Specific Objective: OC2: Effectiveness:

2. Are the activities related to OC2 being implemented effectively? Has the intervention produced the intended results so far?
   ▶ What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?;
   ▶ What are the conclusions and results (positive and negative) out of the operation;
   ▶ Have there been unintended results of the activities and is so, what are they?;
   ▶ What have been barriers and enablers to explain the results; what made the difference between successful and disappointing intervention implementation and results?
3. Does the intervention require further adaptation in order to reach the indicators by the end of the program?

Specific Objective: OC2: Efficiency:

4. Has the intervention been adapted appropriately in accordance with the budget? Have the right choices been made?
   ▶ Was the budget sufficient to carry out activities as planned?;
   ▶ Will the retained activities still reach the expected results?;
5. Are the activities related to OC2 being carried out efficiently?
   ▶ Is there a good balance between the inputs and the (expected) output?
   ▶ To what extent did the intervention represent the best possible use of available resources to achieve results of the greatest possible value to participants and the community?

Specific Objective: OC2: Complementarity and synergy:

6. Was there coherence, complementarity and synergy with other actors?
   ▶ What were the particular political factors that led to coherence or its lack?;
   ▶ Was it necessary to have coherence?;
   ▶ Did the partner work cooperatively with other relief agencies to enhance impact and avoid duplication of efforts?;
   ▶ What is the resulting impact on the activities, the relationships with these agencies, and with the communities served?
7. In the current state of affairs, should adaptions be made to the intervention logic in order to avoid duplication, avoid gaps, and reach objectives?
3.2. METHODOLOGY

Purpose of this section:

This section should describe the approach to be taken by the evaluation and may include a framework evaluation plan. The methodology of the evaluation will be determined by the type and scope of the evaluation and any other requirements (e.g. donor specific requirements).

- The methodology should be developed by the evaluator(s) in collaboration/discussion with the programme team and should be appropriate and sensitive to the context and nature of the programme/project which is being assessed.
- Where possible both quantitative and qualitative data should be collected and considered. This may be collected through interviews, surveys, and primary research, but is not restricted to this.

Once the overall evaluation design has been selected, the methods of investigation should be articulated and should be consistent with answering the evaluation questions, the intended users/uses, the principles and approaches as well as the budget and timeline for the evaluation.

For an internal evaluation, the methodology section should specify as much detail as possible. For an external evaluation, the methodology section of this ToR may present the appropriate and possible methodology in broad strokes, while the technical tender of the evaluator will present more detail.

Information sources / data collection instruments, protocols and procedures:

Surveys among the beneficiaries (households and women in the HH, members of FFS)

Documents and data that must be made available to the evaluator:

- Formal policy documents, implementation plans and reports
- Terms of Reference and Partnership Agreement
- Program monitoring data, incl. interim reports (narrative and financial)
- Program plan, incl. logframe with indicators, activities work plan
- Financial records pertaining to the program
- Other: [name]

Methods used for collecting data from individuals or groups:

- Interviews
- Questionnaire or survey
- Specialized methods: [name]
- Other: [name]

A meeting with the following individuals will be arranged:

- Representative of Tearfund/consortium: [name]
- Representative, board or personnel of local partner: [name]
- Delegate of the Belgian embassy/attaché: [name]
- Community leaders, government officials: [name]
- External consultants/peer agencies: [name]
- Beneficiaries/project participants
- Other: directors of health centres

Sampling Procedures

[To be proposed by evaluator]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions to obtain needed permissions to collect and report data</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions to store and maintain security of collected information</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures for analysing quantitative and qualitative data</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion or not of response from those being evaluated</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should beneficiaries be involved in the evaluation? If so, for what objective, what is the added value of their involvement, how will they be involved and what will this cost?</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should other actors present in the same area be contacted to insure congruence on evaluation questions?</strong></td>
<td>[To be proposed by evaluator]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 4. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION

## 4.1. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES & LOGISTICS

### Purpose of this section:

By clearly delineating roles and responsibilities of all those involved in the evaluation process, you are more likely to avoid substantive, administration and communication problems. Consider whether we have enough internal competence or need external expertise or manpower. Make sure the evaluation team is composed of men and women. Consider the following and outline clearly who will do what:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who will collect and analyse data?</td>
<td>External evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will a translator be provided?</td>
<td>If necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will present/disseminate findings?</td>
<td>External evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will write the report?</td>
<td>External evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will participate in what meetings/workshops?</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will make logistical arrangements?</td>
<td>WR – Francois Niyitegeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will provide information and access to documents?</td>
<td>TF – Ruth Nivelle, WR – Francois Niyitegeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will approve the final products?</td>
<td>TF – Ruth Nivelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will arrange and participate in travel?</td>
<td>TF – Ruth Nivelle &amp; Annelyse Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will facilitate use?</td>
<td>TF – Ruth Nivelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an external evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is commissioning the evaluation?</td>
<td>Tearfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will manage the contract/evaluation process and serve as a liaison with the evaluator/evaluation team?</td>
<td>Tearfund (Ruth Nivelle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will an office space be made available?</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will any additional material be made available (car, laptop, tablets for data collection...)</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4.2. BUDGET

### Purpose of this section:

An accurate and detailed estimation of the cost of the evaluation for the Fees or Expenses portion of the contract should be presented. The maximum budget and maximum of man hours should be clearly stated. Keep in mind budget, timeline, objective and methodology should be in line with each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>[To be determined]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (e.g. evaluator, research assistant, support staff) per day or lump sum</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (transportation, per diem/accommodation and meals, travel mobilization expenses, consider class of travel)</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, equipment and direct communication costs such as phone, fax, email, postage</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying and printing</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (design, findings verification, utilization, transportation to and fro, etc.)</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of use by intended user</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET FOR EVALUATION</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3. TIMELINE

**Purpose of this section:**
Detail the timeline and milestones that will need to be achieved.  
*Keep in mind budget, timeline, objective and methodology should be in line with each other.*  
You can break the phases into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>June-July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk-review time</td>
<td>August – September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and field visits</td>
<td>7-11 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection / collation</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and revision</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report to local partner for comments</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of use</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment schedule for fees/expenses if applicable</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. EXPECTED OUTPUT OF THE EVALUATION

**Purpose of this section:**
The reporting requirements should spell out the desired:
- Format (oral, written, video, etc.)
- Dissemination materials (summary, briefs, presentation materials, newsletter article, etc.)
- Intended audience(s)
- Content
- Length
- Decision on whether the evaluation report should/should not include recommendations
- Decision on whether you want the completed data sets returned (filled out questionnaires, surveys, interview notes and tapes, etc.)
- Method of delivery (All reports should be electronically delivered to Tearfund in addition to any other form of delivery)
- Restriction/permission to publish information from or based on the evaluation

[Minimal changes may be made after the scope has been determined and agreed upon with evaluator]

The expected outputs of the evaluation are:
- A stand-alone evaluation summary
- An evaluation report with the following sections:
  - Section 1 – Executive Summary (no more than four A4 sides)
  - Section 2 – Introduction
  - Section 3 – Methodology
  - Section 4 – Context Analysis
  - Section 5 – Project Overview
  - Section 6 – Key Findings
    - Relevance
    - Impact
    - Effectiveness
    - Efficiency
    - Sustainability
    - Coordination
  - Section 7 – Conclusions
  - Section 8 – Key Insights
  - Section 9 – Specific Actionable and Prioritised Recommendations
  - Section 10 – Annexes (indicative)

*Indicate which information will need to be provided in an annex, such as: details of any monitoring and evaluation frameworks that have direct relevance to the study; terms of reference for any management or reference groups overseeing the study; editorial requirements for consultants preparing evaluation reports; evaluation guidance notes such as on ethics, etc.*

[To be determined]
## 6. EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS (FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION)

### Purpose of this section:

Describe the profile and responsibilities of the evaluator. Distinguish between desired and mandatory competencies, as well as whether competencies are required by the whole team or by selected team members.

The required profile of the evaluator needs to be described and is in accordance with the methodological orientation, the purpose and the object of the evaluation. The context and sector of the intervention and possibly the language should be taken into account. In other words, the profile of the evaluator is determined by the methodological orientation.

Multidisciplinary teams are often appropriate – the qualification and skill areas to be specified could include: areas of technical competence, language proficiency, in-country or regional work experience, and process management skills such as facilitation skills, appropriate mix of male and female evaluators.

### 1. Independence

- The external evaluator has for at least one year not been part of a formal body of the evaluated NGO’s;
- The external evaluator has for at least one year not been in employment of the evaluated NGO’s;
- The external evaluator has for at least one year not been in employment of an agency supported by the evaluated NGO’s;
- The external evaluator always indicates all of his relations towards the evaluated NGO’s;
- The external evaluator never evaluates his own work or activities which he has supervised;
- The external evaluator cannot have any conflict of interest with the evaluated NGO’s (e.g. strong personal ties, financial interests).

### 2. Competence

- The external evaluator has the due knowledge of the context of the activities of the NGO’s;
- The external evaluator disposes over the due technical and methodological competences;
- The external evaluator has ample experience with regard to evaluations;
- The external evaluator is an experienced person in the matter of animating a dialogue;
- The external evaluator is open for criticism and remarks, is prepared to listen and is good in observation.

### 3. Specific Profile needed for this Evaluation

- The external evaluator is proficient in English and French and able to present the final report at an advanced level of either of those languages;
- The external evaluator has sufficient knowledge of the cultural context in Burundi;
- The external evaluator has experience in one or more of the following areas: health programming, ICCM, nutrition, community level approaches;
- …

*Are there any risks an external evaluator can encounter?*