**A. TERMINOLOGIES USED IN TOR**

1. **Efficiency**

***Efficiency*** measures if time, human resources and funds have been well used for the intended actions with a minimum amount or quantity of waste, or unnecessary effort to run the activities. Points to be taken into consideration:

* Is management structure adequate to run the action smoothly and report in time?
* Was the coordination mechanism devised in a way to bring rapid solution to issues identified by the field team?
* Can the ratio project cost / beneficiaries be improved for the next phase and if yes how?

1. **Effectiveness**

***Effectiveness*** measures the extent to which the activities funded under the project have achieved their purpose. Therefore, effectiveness should indicate the real difference made in practice by the activities funded and look at how far the intended beneficiaries really benefited from the products or services it made available. Points to be taken into consideration:

* Whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries, but also taking account of the views of donor management, the responsible national government authorities, and other interested parties (NGOs, local organisations, etc);
* Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was correct?
* Whether the project has been implemented efficiently to achieve stated objects of the program?

1. **Relevance**

***Relevance*** is concerned with assessing whether the project correctly identified problems and real needs and whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities as well as with donor policy. The evaluation will assess the ***relevance*** of the program, related to:

* How well the reality of problems and needs, as well as target beneficiaries were identified and incorporated into the action plan?
* Whether prior consultations were undertaken with appropriate people on the spot, i.e. national and local authorities, intended beneficiaries and other donors and aid organisations (the latter being particularly important to ensure complementarities and avoid overlap)?
* How the programme complements and enhances, rather than duplicates and hinders, related activities carried out by other organisations, governments and donors.

1. **Potential Impact**

***Impact*** looks at the wider effects of the action. Impact can be short or long-term, intended or unintended, positive or negative, macro (region / country) or micro (community). This section should therefore show:

* Whether there were any unplanned impacts (e.g., creation of dependency on projects activities), and how they affected the overall impact;
* Whether vulnerable groups (Dalit women, women with disabilities and single women) with specific needs benefit from the action and how the action affects them;
* To which extent results can be scaled up from micro level (community), to macro level (region or country)? Are any of the results already a scaling up from previous advocacy action? Analyze what elements of the program have made scaling up possible, and which elements have prevented it?

1. **Replicability**

***Replicability*** measures to which extent the action can be replicate in another area of the region without significant changes in the methods, investment, resources and equipment involved.

This section should therefore show:

* Whether the action is adapted to socio-cultural context and can be deployed in other districts of Karnali using local resources and local expertise;
* Is the action well documented so that guideline and materials can be available at the time of replication?
* Are any of the results already a replication from previous advocacy action?
* Analyze what elements of the program have made replication possible, and which elements have prevented it?

1. **Sustainability**

***Sustainability*** is concerned with measuring whether activities implemented during the program are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn and also whether it’s longer-term impact on the wider development process can also be sustained at the level of the district, region or country**.**

The evaluation will assess the ***sustainability***, related to:

* Ownership of achievements, e.g. how far districts and community stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and remained in agreement throughout the duration of the project;
* What was the level of support from governmental, public and civil society organizations; whether national bodies provided resources;
* Institutional capacity, e.g. the degree of commitment of all parties involved, such as Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support), implementing partner (e.g. through contribution and resources that complement the CISU financial support); the extent to which the project is integrated in local institutional structures; whether counterparts were properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
* Financial sustainability, e.g. whether the products or services provided were affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding ended; whether funds were available to cover all costs (including capacity building and advocacy initiatives), and continue to be so after funding ended;
* Technical issues, e.g. whether knowledge, skill, process or service provided fitted in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge;
* Wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as gender and inclusion, special needs, etc. addressed.

1. **Good Practice**

***The good practices*** that evaluator should identify will be the actions that have demonstrated all of the above criteria (efficiency, relevancy, replicability, impact and sustainability) together. This may also include good practices in project management and project processes.

In particular, the consultant will revise the GP report collected during the project and verify the quality of GP collected.

**B. DETAILS OF THE PROJECT**

The project has been prepared based on the experience of previous CISU funded project “I HAVE A VOICE”. The previous phase has established the foundation by establishing women’s groups, capacitating them and it has initiated advocacy campaigns at local level. The relation of project partners with the local authorities and trust of local communities especially women towards the project has increased. The current project uses this already built foundation to take the intervention to the next level as per plan. It also incorporates additional elements that were identified in the current project during monitoring and discussion with stakeholders:

* The previous project focused on women with limited consideration to other social actors (like male counterparts, social leaders), who are responsible for the creation of the existing situation and vulnerability of women. Given these facts, it was found that the women could not achieve the expected support from their male counterparts and other social actors to address social discrimination and ensuring their social rights. For this purpose, we have mainstreamed gender balance and involvement of male counterparts and other social actors in this proposed phase. Daily, women are overloaded with domestic work and when the project takes additional time for learning and capacity building through literacy classes, it is very hard for them to manage their time. If such time constraints are not discussed among the entire family prior to the action, family members put pressure on them to first deliver their daily tasks (cleaning, cooking, taking care of children, fetching water and wood, keep livestock in field, harvesting, etc...) and do not encourage them for their learning. This is particularly crucial among young women and such pressure can affect their motivation, courage and dedication which was shown at the initial phase with increased drop out of classes observed. A better planning and tasks sharing with other members of the families must be negotiated at the beginning of the action.
* During the previous project, KIRDARC also realized that all the women were targeted with a blanket approach for literacy, leadership, advocacy and other activities. By doing so, staff missed the identification of the individual potentialities of women for different purposes (literacy, leadership, advocacy) that could be used to ascertain them as role models for the others and create inter-disciplinary groups having multiple and specified challenges to have more impact. The blanket approach consumed too much time and resources to bring all the women at the same level of literacy, leadership capacity and advocacy skills. In this context, the proposed project was supposed to use ‘Gradual Graduation Approach1’ to provide effective support to groups/individuals based on their performance. It has aimed that the women will be empowered for claiming their rights in HHs, community and societal level through the next-phase of literacy programme and some adolescent groups will be identified from the same community to join hands with the WDAGs for social awareness and other social campaigns supporting women.
* Additionally, the new phase was prepared with more attention to international conventions on women and people with disabilities’ rights. Recently the Government of Nepal (GoN) has issued the National Action Plan (NAP) for UNSCR 1820 & 1325 for the promotion, participation, protection and support of women in all peace building interventions. Such mechanisms at local level i.e. district NAP coordination committee (DNAPCC) and village NAP coordination committee (VNAPCC) are not yet formed in project area and will be addressed in this new phase. In addition, the Government of Nepal has ratified various international human rights instruments and more importantly, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). But the implementation of the provisions under both UNCRPD and CEDAW is not effective in the remote districts of Karnali and in our target area and their implementation will also be an issue addressed in this new phase.

As identified in the previous phase, the main problem this project intends to address is the weak position of women to advocate for their rights and to participate in decision making processes in their communities, which is worsened by the lack of capacity of civil society and state actors regarding the inclusion of women and gender issues in development planning. The causes can be broadly categorized into: i) lack of capacity and confidence among women and girls individually & groups to claim their rights at family and societal level; ii) deep-rooted gender discriminating socio-cultural practices, iii) inadequate forward accountability of local government to promote and protect women’s rights at local level, and iv) limited capacity of civil society to influence the process. Among them, the limited capacity of civil society is important to address as it can act as mediator, watch-dog and/or bridge between right-holders and the state’s service providers and to hold the local government accountable towards rights-holders.

In this context, Karnali Integrated Rural Development And Research Centre (KIRDARC Nepal) and Women Welfare Service (WWS), with technical support of Mission East, have been implementing the project with the financial support of CISU with the aim to empower women and civil society organisations for better inclusion and development in the Karnali Zone, Nepal via creation of conducive and inclusive environment for women and girls in the region to be able to participate in, contribute to and benefit from development efforts at local level.

The project aims to reach a total number of 14,620 people in 6 target VDCs (7,287 male and 7,333 female). The project is focused on one of the most marginalized and poor areas of Nepal, all population is poor and vulnerable and the special focus is given to women and most vulnerable, but to reach them effectively, other groups, especially government service providers, civil society organizations will be targeted.

The project target groups:

* 4000 women and 54 women groups (paralegal committee), among which: 1,000 Adolescent girls; 3000 women including (100 Single women, 2,000 Dalit women, 250 women with disabilities); And 1,000 children (indirect)
* 70 Social leaders/ Teachers : (5 social leaders+5 teachers) per VDC and 5 in district
* Family Members (especially male partners)
* 30 Political leaders: approx. 5 leaders per VDC
* 40 Police Office staffs: 20 in VDCs and 20 in districts
* 90 VDC body members: 15 persons per VDC
* 60 Local CBOs/local groups: 10 groups per VDC
* 54 FCHVs: 9 FCHV per VDC
* 10 Civil Society Organisations: 5 CSOs per district