Terms of Reference

Project Title: Linking Policy and Advocacy with Practical Action at the International and National levels to Protect Internet Freedom

Project Manager: Mehwish Abid Ansari - Head of Article 19 Digital

Date published: June 3rd 2020

1. Introduction

ARTICLE 19 is a global organization promoting and defending freedom of expression and information. The realisation of our vision and mission is underpinned not only by freedom of expression and information, but through other rights including belief, privacy, participation, assembly and association and more. With offices in London, Bangladesh, Brazil, Kenya, Mexico, Senegal, and Tunisia, and in collaboration with partners across the world, we strengthen national and capacities, and build or reform institutions and policies.

With support from the US Dept. of State's Department for Rights and Labor (DRL), ARTICLE 19 has implemented a project titled: *Linking Policy and Advocacy with Practical Action at the International and National levels to Protect Internet Freedom (IF from hereafter)*. This project has worked to protect human rights online at a structural level by incorporating human rights standards, especially the right to freedom of expression, access to information and the right to association, in internet technical and standard setting bodies.

IF has been a long-standing 'flagship' project for ARTICLE 19's digital programme. The action started in 2015 and is set to end on June 30th 2020. IF is considered both internally and with donors to be relatively successful, and was awarded cost extensions in 2016 and 2018. It should be noted that its goals were revised on both those occasions.

IF's overall objective is to: **Support internet freedom at a structural level by incorporating freedom of expression and information rights in internet technical and standard setting bodies.**

To advance this goal the project conducts the following[1]

Objective 1: Mainstream human rights standards in targeted Internet governance and technical standards bodies.
• Activity 1.1: Build a framework for an Informational Internet Standard (RFC) for human rights considerations in the IETF and IRTF.
• Activity 1.2: Operationalize the Human Rights bylaws of ICANN that stipulate its social and corporate responsibility to respect human rights (in line with the UN guiding principles on business and human rights).
• Activity 1.3 Participate in Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) standards process to raise awareness about the IEEE's responsibility to respect human rights.

---

[1] Objectives at its latest extension approved by DRL in 2018. ARTICLE 19 will provide the consultant with original results when contracted.

• Activity 1.4: Promote Internet freedom and combat online censorship with a multi-tiered international advocacy campaign to raise public awareness of the extent of the blocking and filtering challenge through a campaign to promote the use of Error Code 451.

Objective 2: Improve scrutiny mechanisms and mechanisms for enhanced multi-stakeholder collaboration for Internet governance in the ITU.
• Activity 2.1: Participate in International Telecommunication Union (ITU) standards and policy process to raise awareness of the human rights implications of ITU standards and policies among decision-makers

Objective 3: Increase the effectiveness of civil society participation and advocacy in key international fora to promote positive policy developments on human rights online.
• Activity 3.1 Support civil society engagement and participation in key international technical and standard setting bodies.

The project is implemented by ARTICLE 19 Global Digital Programme with the assistance of Asociación por los Derechos Civiles (ADC), The Centre for Internet and Society (CIS) India, the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR), Derechos Digitales, and Global Partners Digital (GPD).

2. Evaluation Objectives:

Whilst this evaluation aims to assess progress made against results specified above, this evaluation is not required by the donor for accountability reasons. As such, this evaluation has a strong learning focus, and the evaluator is asked to provide lessons and recommendations that will contribute to the future development of ARTICLE 19 digital programme's work in internet technical and standard setting bodies.

To this end, the evaluator should prioritise the following key evaluation questions (they may add additional questions they consider relevant in consultation with the project team).

PART A: Project results:
• To what extent are project activities and outcomes a) relevant to internet governance issues as a whole, and b) adapted to changing issues in internet technical and standard setting bodies over the past five years?
• What were both the **direct** and **unintended** outcomes achieved as a result of the project, how do they compare to the original project proposal[2]?
• What external and internal forces supported / impeded the project and why?
• To what extent has this project contributed to ARTICLE 19's global strategy, the Expression Agenda (XpA) in terms of impact?

PART B: What lessons can be learned?
In this section, we would like the consultant to consider the findings of Part A and answer the following:
• What lessons can Team Digital learn for future projects targeted at internet technical and standard setting bodies?
• What interventions were most/least impactful, why and what lessons can be learned?
• Are there any lessons for Team Digital regarding a) gauging the effectiveness of future project strategy/theory of change, and b) knowing when to adapt activities when found to be not working?
• Following an analysis of Team Digital's interventions and theory of change, we would like the consultant to provide suggestions for future evaluation methodologies for the project. As part of this, we would like the consultant to consider ways to implement said methods within the organisation.

3. The main stakeholders for this review are:

INTERNAL:

ARTICLE 19 Digital Team
Mehwish Ansari, Head of Global Digital Programme
Quinn McKew, Chief Executive of ARTICLE 19
George Morris, Senior MEL officer

EXTERNAL:

Niels ten Oever, Former Head of Digital Programme
Mallory Knodel, Former head of Digital Programme
Corinne Cath-Speth, Former Programme Officer, Digital Programme
Amelia Andersdotter, Former Senior Programme Officer, Digital Programme
Valeria Milanes, Executive Director, ADC
Jeannette Torres, Programme Officer, ADC
Gurshabad Grover, Programme Manager, CIS India
Cathrine Bloch-Veiberg, Programme Manager, DIHR
Emil Lindblad Kernell, Human Rights and Business Adviser, DIHR
Charles Bradley, Executive Director, GPD
Lea Kaspar, Executive Director, GPD
Deborah Brown, Former Global Policy Lead, Association for Progressive Communications
Daniel Kahn Gilmor, Senior Technologist, American Civil Liberties Union
Bruna Santos, Senior Strategist, Coding Rights

4. Methodology: A basic explanation of the consultant's methodology should be mapped out in the proposal. Given the wide array of actors who engage with international digital rights fora, the methodology should include a strong emphasis on contribution analysis approaches. The successful bidder is expected to further elaborate their proposals in consultation with ARTICLE 19 project staff.

5.   Minimum requirements for an evaluator

The successful consultant should have extensive evaluation experience and will be able to demonstrate experience of conducting evaluations of a similar type to a good standard. This should include evaluating projects implemented by international organisations, whose scope includes engaging stakeholders at a range of international institutions/bodies.

The successful consultant should have experience of working within the human rights, advocacy and/or policy change arenas. An understanding of the internet governance arena/digital rights is also desirable.

The successful consultant should be able to speak and write in English to a professional standard.

The evaluator must provide references or demonstrable proof of competence in relation to criteria stated above.

6.   Timeframe, planning and budget

The evaluator will be managed by **Mehwish Abid Ansari, ARTICLE 19 Digital team head,** as designated evaluation manager.

The evaluation is expected to start on July 10th. The draft report should be completed by **Sept 1st,** so that a final report will be completed by Sept 15th.

The evaluator is asked to provide a budget including the estimated time needed (per project phase) and hour/day rate and other expected expenses. Budget available for the evaluation is a maximum of **$20,000** (including tax and travel expenses).

Interested applicants should send their expression of interest and budget to George Morris, Senior Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Officer (george@article19.org).

COVID 19: The current pandemic means the consultant is expected to conduct deliverables remotely, making use of online communication and data gathering tools where applicable. However, travel may be requested / possible, but decisions will be made on a case by case basis and contingent on WHO guidelines and national travel restrictions.

7. Consultation outputs

7.1. The evaluation report:

The main report is to be presented in English, should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes, and be presented in Calibri Font 12. The executive summary should not exceed 2 pages. The structure can be adapted from what is set out below in consultation with the Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Officer but must include findings, analysis, conclusion and recommendations.

- *Executive summary*: this should summarise the main findings and recommendations in a concise manner.
- *Introduction:* The first part should describe the background and context (summary of overall project concept and design) as a basis for the analytical and evaluative sections that follow. The introduction includes a short explanation of the purpose and objective(s) and the evaluation methodology
- *Analysis and major findings:* This section focuses on the findings related to the questions listed above under 'Evaluation Objective'. The section not only lists the findings, but also contains an analysis of the evaluator regarding these findings.
- *Conclusions.* The conclusions follow logically from the main findings but should provide answers to the main evaluation questions. Please use table 1 below for the assessment of the different criteria.
- *Recommendations.* The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions. They should be actionable, ideally within a one-year timeframe, and prioritised to help develop ARTICLE's work.
- *Annexes*
    - Terms of reference
    - List of organisations and persons interviewed and documents reviews

We would also like the consultant to provide a small stand alone report regarding potential evaluation methodologies (refer to section 2, part b), that will be for internal use only.

Table 1 Project review rating
Please use the following table for scoring the project's performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, etc.

Criteria	Scoring*	Explanation/Comments

Relevance		
Effectiveness		
Impact		
Sustainability		

* Scoring:

Highly Successful

Successful

Partially Successful

Unsuccessful

6.2. Debriefing session

The consultant is required to schedule a debriefing session to discuss findings with ARTICLE 19. At the very least, this session should include the project manager and project team.

The debriefing session should take place ideally within 30 days of the report's submission. It can be conducted remotely by mutual consent of both parties.

Management Response: ARTICLE 19's policy is to draft a management response to all evaluations undertaken on its projects. This will take place ideally within 60 days of its submission by the consultant.

Transparency: It is ARTICLE 19's policy that external evaluations contribute to its aims of becoming a transparent and accountable organisation. Evaluation reports may be published on its website and shared with external stakeholders unless there are clear security, safeguarding, etc risks to doing so. The consultant is asked to inform us of any such risks.