1. Background

The African Children’s Charter Project (ACCP) bridge period project is a 21 months cost extension to bridge the period between ACCP Phase one and ACCP Phase two which is expected to start in 2017. The bridge period project is aimed to enable the expansion and consolidation of the achievements as well as the continued implementation of some of the activities under the African Children’s Charter Project (ACCP 2011-2014) from 2015 to 2016. Sida funded the implementation of ACCP 2011-2014, from 2010 to 2014. This bridge project was presented to Sida by Plan Sweden (main applicant) and Save the Children Sweden – both Sida framework organisations – in close collaboration with the African Child Policy Forum (ACPF), the Community Law Centre (CLC) of the University of Western Cape and the Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa (IHRDA).

The project is funded by Sida through its representation in the Swedish Embassy in Addis-Ababa, whose support is contributing to the AU institutional commitment to promote and protect children’s rights and welfare in Africa, while enabling the implementing organization involved scaling up the existing child rights programmes. The project is also designed to contribute to the implementation of strategic frameworks adopted by the African Union Commission (AUC), the ACERWC and Sida.

1.1. The project logic:

Project Goal: Children’s lives in Africa are improved by the fulfilment of their rights.

Project Purpose: To facilitate the promotion and implementation of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) through: a strengthened African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACERWC); and increased engagement of African civil society organisations with the Committee.

Project’s objectives:

Objective 1: Strengthen the capacity of the Committee of Experts to implement its strategic plan.

Objective 2: Promote children’s rights and welfare in African Union institutions, bodies and mechanisms

Objective 3: Strengthen civil society to use AU mechanisms, and especially the ACERWC’s mechanisms, to promote children’s rights and welfare in Africa

1.2. The main partners:
The main partners of the project were determined during the project design phase in 2010 and have been involved in the delivery of different activities of the project. They include:

1. The African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, and its secretariat at the AUC
2. Project target groups and beneficiaries:
The direct beneficiary groups are the ACERWC and through it the AU institutions, bodies and mechanisms that play a role in fulfilling child rights in Africa. By supporting the ACERWC, the project will raise the profile of the ACRWC and the ACERWC, giving the realization of children’s rights a higher importance in pan-African and regional political discussions. The African civil society are also beneficiary of this project, which are strengthened to monitor, through their own means, the way children’s rights are protected promoted and fulfilled. This will improve children’s living conditions and the implementation of the African Children’s Charter.

2. Need for the evaluation

2.1 Intervention target of the evaluation:
The final external review/evaluation will target the objectives of the project “African Children’s Charter” implemented by a consortium of five Pan Africa partners under the leadership of Plan International from April 2015-December 2016.

2.2 Justification of the evaluation:
The final evaluation is required for three (3) reasons namely:

- The final evaluation is part of Sida’s requirements for the ACCP bridge period with a budget of over SEK 9,586,038 or Approximately USD 1,160,770.
- The final evaluation will allow for identification and analysis of the results of the ACCP interventions in the three main areas as noted above;
- The evaluation will provide an opportunity to identify key areas and factors for success in this project (consortia) and reflect towards improvement of the action in the future including capturing lessons learnt and good practices for up scaling and replication during the second phase of the ACCP.

2.3 General objectives of the evaluation:
The purpose of the evaluation will be both accountability and learning across all activities and outputs, with a specific emphasis on learning.

- Accountability: The evaluation will seek to show the extent to which the program has been effective, i.e. producing the benefits anticipated, and efficient, i.e. using the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the benefits.
• **Learning:** The evaluation will identify program and non-program related explanations for success and failure that could be ‘translated’ into more effective, efficient and sustainable program interventions. This learning should be presented in ways that will help to inform future program design and donor partner funding decisions.

Moreover, the final evaluation will provide SIDA, the implementing partners and the ACERWC with the following:

- An overall independent assessment of the project performance;
- A judgment on the success of the intervention, the appropriateness of the design and strategies used, including its degree of flexibility and ability to adapt to an ever-changing reality, its effectiveness and efficiency, adaptation of the management and monitoring mechanisms in relation to the results and impact achieved.
- Identification of key lessons and good practices
- Recommendations for follow-up actions in a subsequent phase and/or similar intervention.

2.4 **Expected use and users of the evaluation:**
The evaluation results will be used by different stakeholders involved in the project according to the different components implemented. The ACCP consortium, the ACERWC and the Secretariat of the ACERWC may use the recommendations to inform the design of any future engagements related to the monitoring of the implementation of the ACRWC.

3. **Scope of the evaluation and stakeholders**

3.1. **Scope of the evaluation**

The scope of the final evaluation will focus on;

i. Aggregating results and assessments on the effectiveness of the project as well as the level of achievement of the key recommendations from the final evaluation of the first phase;

ii. A comprehensive analysis on goal attainment with specific reference to the gaps from phase one that called for further intervention from the bridging period and;

iii. Documentation of lessons learned.

iv. Sharing key recommendations for future consideration in the initiative

The evaluation is planned to take place between 3-6 weeks starting by mid October 2016 and getting finalised by December 2016. The evaluation will focus on the project intervention for 21 months i.e. between April 2015 and December 2016. The final evaluation of the ACCP bridge period will be coordinated by the Plan Pan Africa and Advocacy office in Addis Ababa.

3.2. **Sources of information**

A list of proposed documents to be used is attached in annex 1.

3.3. **Participation**

With respect to the time, resources available, the scope and or sources of information the evaluation should rely on a participatory approach to increase ownership, empowerment and usability of the results.
The reference group to be involved for the evaluation is made up of the Project Steering Committee, Project Management Committee, and the Secretariat of the ACERWC, Plan Sweden and the Project Coordinator as listed below:

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ACPF</td>
<td>Dr Lucyline Nkatha</td>
<td><a href="mailto:murungi@africanchildforum.org">murungi@africanchildforum.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DOI</td>
<td>Maria Assim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:usassim@gmail.com">usassim@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 IHRDA</td>
<td>Nicole Zarifis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nizarifis@ihrda.org">nizarifis@ihrda.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SCI</td>
<td>Farida Bascha</td>
<td><a href="mailto:farida.bascha@savethechildren.org">farida.bascha@savethechildren.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Plan International (representing both RESA and WARO)</td>
<td>Issa Kipera</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Issa.Kipera@plan-international.org">Issa.Kipera@plan-international.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ACERWC secretariat</td>
<td>Mme Cisse Mariama</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CISSEM@africa-union.org">CISSEM@africa-union.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayalew Getachew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ayalewg@africa-union.org">Ayalewg@africa-union.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Plan Sweden</td>
<td>Gisela Ivarsson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gisela.Ivarsson@plansverige.org">Gisela.Ivarsson@plansverige.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The ACC Project Manager</td>
<td>Anteneh Bizuayehu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Anteneh.Bizuayehu@plan-international.org">Anteneh.Bizuayehu@plan-international.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mandate of the reference is to coordinate the evaluation process including making available the required information, reviewing the inception and final evaluation report.

3.4. Stakeholders
A list of the key stakeholders involved in the intervention and to be consulted during the evaluation is in annex 2.

4. Evaluation questions and level of analysis

4.1. Proposed evaluation questions and level of analysis

The questions proposed below are to guide the evaluation. They are to be the basis for development of sub-questions for the analysis in the methodology and tools, so as to ensure it covers all criteria. By analysing the different evaluation questions, the evaluation will go through an evaluation criterion of development cooperation with a particular focus given to relevance, effectiveness³, impact⁴ and sustainability⁵. In addition to these criteria, the evaluation is expected to pay particular attention to participation and ownership; Implementation Arrangement, Governance, Management and Partnership and Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement. Other evaluation criteria such as coherence, coverage of target groups, gender and alignment in particular related to local institution could be addressed as per relevance and feasibility.

The evaluator should imagine sub-questions to breakdown the analysis when building his/her methodology and tools, to ensure it covers all criteria. See example below on the first evaluative question:

To what extent did the ACCP contribute to the realisation of the project in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness impact and sustainability?

In particular, the evaluation should analyse the following:

³ A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.
⁴ The positive and negative changes produced by this project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main effects resulting from the activity on the target groups and beneficiaries. To be complete, the examination should be concerned with the positive and negative impact of external factors.
⁵ Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.
In what ways did the project address issues relevant to the project context including donor and partner priorities? How far has the process and methods used in the implementation of the ACCP been adapted to institutional context? (relevance)

Were the resources used to deliver the ACCP results efficient according to the local context? (efficiency)

How far did the project implementation contribute to the stated objectives? (effectiveness)

To what extent the investment under the ACCP produced long-term and sustainable results? (Impact and sustainability).

How well did the ACCP consortium partnerships, implementation, governance and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time? (Implementation Arrangement, Governance, Management and Partnership)

What are the key lessons learned from the implementation of ACCP during the bridge phase period that can feed into possible second phase (future) of the project? (Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement)

5. Methodology and work plan

5.1. Typology and methods:

Type of evaluation required:
- External evaluation

Possible methods for data collection would include:
- Document review
- Interviews with stakeholders
- Collection of case stories
- Participatory approach during data collection as highlighted under 3.3 above.

5.2. Proposed work plan and expected deliverables

The work plan below is merely illustrative and may be tailored by the consultant according to the technical offer made.

The proposed steps for the evaluation are:
- Inception phase desk-based review and initial gathering of information. This should also cover the methodology, data gathering instruments, detailed work plan (indicating all the stages of the evaluation process), timeline, staffing. Based on the review of key project documents and discussion with key project informants (that can be also centred on members of the evaluation technical committee); an inception report and a budget forecast shall be prepared.
- The draft report which includes the data collection and analysis. Core data collection, done in each location of the project and centrally with key stakeholders based on a previously designed and agreed methodology
- Final Evaluation Report

6. Structure of the final report:
The final report should not exceed 40 pages (without annexes). The report will describe the evaluation, the evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations.

7. Evaluation team:
The evaluation team should consist of at least 2 persons representing the following skills:

- Post graduate degree in social science related to international development,
- Extensive and advanced evaluation skills and experience in project monitoring and evaluation in related fields.
- Familiar with quantitative and qualitative evaluation
- Understanding of main concepts of the project.
- Familiar with participatory and partnership approaches, empowerment and institutional capacity building strategies
- Advanced knowledge of English and French language,
- In-depth understanding of the child rights context in Africa

A team coordinator must be appointed. The team coordinator will be responsible for the whole work and all deliveries; s/he will also act as the contact person with the evaluation managing unit.

8. **Time frame and budget for the evaluation:**

The evaluation is expected to take place between **January 2017 and February 2017** (one month after the end of the project implementation) in accordance to donor requirements. The draft report is to be submitted to the reference group **Mid of February 2017** and the final report of the external evaluation will be due no later than **28th February 2017**.

The estimated budget for the evaluation should include:

- Fees
- Tax and any other relevant cost related to and required for the proper conducting of the evaluation as per all the objectives and requirements detailed in the present ToRs.

9. **Submission of the proposal**

The proposals for this evaluation will include two submissions; as electronic files (in Pdf format) with a heading 'Final Evaluation of Pan African’s Children’ Charter Project bridge period’ as follows:

i. **A technical proposal, containing:**

- The understanding of the ToR, the main goals and tasks of this evaluation and of, the proposed methodology, team, detailed timetable, and steps for the evaluation.
- The CV of the proposed evaluators (education background, expertise and experience in relation with the scope of the evaluation and the geographical location); with a description of why experience is relevant to the task and **using a matrix** indicate how the proposed team complements each other as well as how they correspond to the profile.
- The proposed structure of the final report and

ii. **A financial proposal for the provision of the services.**

For details, please refer to the consultant selection criteria for the ACCP evaluation.

All proposals must be submitted to the following address: **AULiaisonoffice@plan-international.org** no later than **December 10th 2016, 17:00hrs** Addis Time.

**ANNEX 1: proposition of documents to be reviewed**
• The ACERWC Strategy (2015 – 2019)
• Project Bridge Period proposal;
• Initial detailed annual project plans
• Annual review, planning, technical and financial reports
• Periodic technical and financial report
• Memorandum of Understanding with the ACCP consortium partners
• Correspondence with the ACCP consortium partners and secretariat of the ACERWC
• Training manuals, specific assessment reports, material and photos
• Awareness material: Flyers, booklets and brochures
• ACERWC annual action plans before and after project
• Annual project review and planning meeting reports

ANNEX 2: List of the key stakeholders involved in the intervention

- At Pan African level
  ✓ The ACERWC
  ✓ The ACCP consortium Partners which include to the Project steering committee, the Project Management Committee, and the Project Coordinator.
  ✓ Plan Sweden – the recipient of the grant for the ACCP
  ✓ Sida – the donor of the project

Annex 3: CONSULTANT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE ACCP EVALUATION

1. **Professional qualifications (25)**
   • Project manager and key team members are qualified to perform the work categories on the project (team with post graduate qualification in social science related to international development).
   • Consultant’s knowledge of standards and procedures (Familiarity with participatory and partnership approaches, empowerment and institutional capacity building strategies).

2. **Specialized experience, technical competence and contextual knowledge (30)**
   • Consultant has provided comparable projects they have been involved with.
   • Team composition, profile and experience with a description of why experience is relevant to the task
   • Using a matrix indicate how the proposed team complements each other as well as how they correspond to the profile.
   • Consultant has demonstrated understanding of key elements of the project (Knowledge of African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, and In-depth understanding of the child rights context in Africa).
   • Consultant has provided comparable projects they have been involved with. (Inception report clearly demonstrating a good understanding of main concepts of the project and Present report of similar work in previous assignments).
   • References, of past work have been performed by this consultant.
   • Computer capability of the consultant
   • Competency in the working knowledge of both English and French languages

3. **Approach to the project Methodology (25)**
   • Consultant has provided logical approach to tasks and issues of the project
   • Consultant has recognized and identified special circumstances on the project.

4. **A Realistic budget for delivery of the assignment (20)**