**Final Evaluation**

**Terms of Reference and Call for Expressions of Interest**

**Name of the project**
Minority Empowerment for Democracy and Pluralism in Sri Lanka

**Deadline for applications\***
Deadline for applications: 15/06/2025 at 17:00 GMT

# 1. Project background information

This European Union-funded programme seeks to protect human rights and democracy in Sri Lanka by achieving full inclusion of minorities, particularly women and youth, in electoral processes. It aims to empower communities to influence electoral reform, enhance public debate on political participation, and build capacities for inclusive governance.

Implemented across six districts—Batticaloa and Trincomalee (Eastern Province), Nuwara Eliya (Central Province), Puttalam (Northwestern Province), Monaragala (Uva Province), and Mannar (Northern Province)—the programme engaged directly with 150 minority women and 150 minority youth from these provinces. It also targeted 30 election commission and government officials, 50 politicians, and 50 journalists, including 20 from minority women and youth backgrounds, to ensure a broad-based and inclusive approach.

We support national and local civil society actors and their initiatives designed to improve electoral inclusion, counter discrimination, and expand political participation. More specifically, we:

- Strengthen grassroots and regional minority networks to advocate for electoral inclusion, monitor discriminatory practices, and campaign for policy reform.
- Provide capacity-building trainings for women, youth, and persons with disabilities to increase their confidence and ability to participate in electoral and political processes.
- Engage in sustained advocacy with political parties, election officials, and government representatives, while amplifying community-led narratives for electoral reform through research, media products, and public campaigns.
- Facilitate partnerships and provide subgrants to community-based organisations (CBOs) to lead outreach campaigns, voter education, and policy dialogue. **The overall and specific objectives were as follows:**

**Overall objective:** To protect human rights and democracy in Sri Lanka by achieving full inclusion of minorities, particularly women and youth, in electoral processes.

**Specific objective:** To strengthen the inclusion of minorities, particularly women and youth, in electoral and political processes in Sri Lanka.

**The project's three results were as follows:**

- Increased capacity of minorities to participate in electoral processes, conduct community-based research, and influence electoral frameworks and practices.
- Increased trust, confidence, and collaboration among minority communities and civil society actors, leading to collective action and peer solidarity for inclusive governance.
- Increased awareness and engagement of local, national, and international stakeholders in promoting the rights of minorities and advancing their role in Sri Lanka's democratic processes.

**Duration of the project:** 1 February 2024 – 31 January 2026.

**Doner:** This programme is funded by the European Union.

**Implementing partners:**

Oxford Brooks University (OBU)

Eastern Social Development Foundation (ESDF)

Human Development Organization (HDO)

Sri Lanka Development Journalist Forum (SDJF)

**Final beneficiaries:**

Final beneficiaries are: 2.5 million Sri Lankan Tamils, 2.5 million Sri Lankan Moors, 37000 Burghers, 1 million Indian Tamils, 40000 Malays, 4000 Telugu, 2000 indigenous persons, 1 million people facing caste- discrimination. Target groups are 150 minority women, 150 minority youths in 5 provinces (6 districts) in Sri Lanka; 30 Election Commission/ government officials, 50 politicians, 50 journalists (including 20 minority women/ youth). The action will be implemented in the following districts: Batticaloa and Trincomalee (Eastern Province), Nuwara Eliya (Central Province), Puttalam (North Western Province), Monargala (Uva Province), and Mannar (Northern Province). These districts have been selected because they include a range of minority groups and indigenous communities who face similar issues of voter rights, political representation and exclusion.

# 2. Purpose and users of the evaluation

## 2.1 Purpose

This evaluation is intended to evaluate the project's results in relation to its stated objectives, its effective implementation, and to assess the sustainability and potential scalability of the project's outcomes, and to generate new insights and learning to strengthen future projects interventions by

partners. . The final evaluation will be shared with the project's donor as part of its final reporting obligations and will form an important part of partner's transparency in regards to their respective stakeholders.

## 2.2 Intended users and uses

The evaluation will serve as a secondary verification tool for the project donor regarding the reported outcomes. It will assist project partners in strengthening their project management and intervention strategies. Evaluation will inform future project design and monitor the ongoing intervention. it will offer feedback and transparency to stakeholders, including local partners, decision-makers, and other entities involved in the implementation.

# 3. Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation should encompass a relevant cross-section of the project's activities, necessary to effectively assessing its achievements against its original log frame objectives and outputs. In order to achieve this, it should select a range of activities to assess from local, national and international targeted activities and a cross section of the project's results.

The evaluation will encompass results and outputs achieved during the implementation period but can also provide guidance and insight into potential long-term impacts that could follow the project's completion (January 31st 2026).

# 4. Evaluation objectives, criteria, and questions

**Objectives of the evaluation are as follow**

- To assess the project against its stated objectives and results (log frame) and intervention logic.
- To provide co-implementing partners with an opportunity for learning from design and implementation process and guidance on opportunities for sustainability of the programme.
- To develop recommendations for stakeholders, including the donor, implementing partners, local partners, decision makers and other interested actors working in the field.

**Evaluation Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs):**

- Relevance (i.e., How well has the intervention responded to local needs? To what extent did the intervention benefit all target groups equally?)
- Effectiveness (i.e., Has the intervention achieved its outcomes and outputs? To what extent and how were the constraints foreseen and overcome? What unintended outcomes were achieved?)
- Efficiency (i.e., How well were the resources used? How well was the program budgeted for? What internal and external factors contributed to and/or hindered implementation efficiency?)
- Impact (i.e., What broad changes has the intervention contributed to generate?)
- Sustainability and participation (i.e., Will the benefits last? How effective were the exit strategies? To what extent did target groups and communities participate in the design,

delivery, monitoring and evaluation of the program? Did the intervention receive buy-in from the authorities?)

- Project design and delivery (i.e., Were all the activities delivered as planned? Was the Theory of Change valid and/or the Log frame solid?)
- Causality/Contribution/Correlation (i.e., To what extent has the intervention contributed to the results?)
- Monitoring Evaluation and Learning system (i.e., What was the quality of the MEL system, including MEL plan, data collection and storage tools? Were the reports informative?)
- Partnerships (i.e., What partnership relationships have developed between MRG and the partners and amongst the partners? How successful were they?)
- Deliverables (i.e., To what extent were the outputs produced timely and of reasonably high quality? How relevant were they to the target communities?)
- Donor-specified and MRG cross-cutting results (i.e., Did the intervention contribute to promote gender equality? Was a human rights-based approach used?)
- Inclusion (i.e., Did the intervention benefit all the relevant groups - e.g. young people, people with disabilities, stateless people etc.)
- Learning and recommendations (i.e., What are the main learned lessons and best practices from the program?)
- What was the quality of the intervention design (i.e. flow)?
- To what extent were the activities delivered as planned and to a reasonably high quality?
- To what extent did the intervention produce the intended results/changes in the short, medium, and long term? If so, for whom and in what circumstances?
- How well has the programme responded to the local context/needs? How valuable were the results to rights holders, service providers, clients, communities, and/or organisations involved?
- What were the enablers and barriers that made the difference between successful and non-successful implementation and results? To what extent were the barriers foreseen and overcome, and how?
- What unintended positive and negative results did the intervention produce? How did these occur?
- Are any positive results likely to be sustained? In what circumstances?
- What was the quality of the Monitoring Evaluation and Learning system (i.e., data collection, storage, and reporting?)

The evaluator(s) is expected to ensure compliance with donor's evaluation criteria:

 EU projects, evaluators should refer to the evaluation criteria illustrated in the EU 'Better Regulation toolbox', https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2023-09/BR%20toolbox%20-%20Jul%202023%20-%20FINAL.pdf  (pp. 404-414). [1]

---

[1] *The full EU policy 'Evaluation matters' is available here, https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2019-09/evaluation-matters_en.pdf For a technical overview and introduction to the EU evaluation process and methodology, please see 'Methodological bases for evaluation vol. 1' https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/47469160.pdf*

## 5. The principles that will guide the evaluation

The evaluation should be guided by the principles of transparency, partnership and openness and take into careful consideration the situation of the programme stakeholders whom the evaluator will target. Gender and cultural sensitivity therefore are essential to both the planned methodology and effective conduct of the evaluation, particular attention should be paid to ensure approaches that are inclusive of persons with disabilities, who are one of the programme's key stakeholder groups.

Data should be disaggregated by both gender and disability and ethical procedures in data collection and storage of information should be applied. The evaluator will need to provide a declaration of conflict of interest.

The evaluator should also consider security concerns that may arise during the conduct of the evaluation, not just for themselves but for stakeholders and interviewees. These should be addressed in any evaluation methodology.

## 6. Key deliverables

- An inception report and attached mandatory Annexes in English, following the initial review of programme documentation.

- Final Evaluation Report (15-20 pages, excluding Annexes), including an Executive Summary (2 pages) in an accessible, easy-to-read format in English language. The final evaluation report will be full and detailed for internal use and for submission to the donors, and will include lessons learned, recommendations, and suggestions for dissemination and utilization of findings.

- A public facing document to be uploaded on MRG's website in which key identifiers of individuals, organizations and locations will be removed where inclusion in a public document may result in additional security risks; and which will be supplied in both English and local languages.

## 7. Key tasks

Based on MRG's prior experience, we anticipate that the following tasks may be needed, but we are open to suggestions for alternative methodologies:

- Read all programme materials and review feedback from programme partners (including notes of meetings, publications, reports of campaigns, media coverage, training evaluations, capacity assessments, email correspondence, baseline and monitoring reports).
- Speak to MRG programme staff.
- Hold detailed discussions regarding programme implementation, results and impact with staff from each partner and sub-grantees.
- Meet with/speak to local partner organisations staff.
- Visit programme locations and speak to community members, local staff and officials. Visits should be arranged independently and should not rely on programme staff, nor should programme staff be present.
- Independently identify and get opinions from at least 5 additional experts/well informed sources.

- Please note: the evaluator is tasked with handling issues related to security, weather conditions, logistical challenges, limited access to resources, to obtaining permits to conduct research, and other relevant matters.

## 8. Evaluator(s) qualification and expertise required*

The Evaluator or Evaluation team needs to take into account the global scope of the programme's implementation, location of stakeholders and languages and accessibility of stakeholders.

Given this scope multi-disciplinary teams maybe appropriate. Given the wide scope and available budget for the evaluation, travel to meet with beneficiaries and stakeholders is not a requirement of the evaluation but where possible would be considered beneficial.

Required:

- Extensive knowledge and proven experience of working on human rights, gender, NGO capacity building, including knowledge of relevant debates and international standards.
- Experience of comparable evaluations and strong track record of evaluations carried out on civil society programme's targeting communities facing serious levels of marginalisation and exclusion.
- Evidence of the ability to develop remote interview and evidence gathering approaches for a wide range of stakeholders appropriate to the programme.
- Evidence of the ability to develop online and in person interview and evidence gathering approaches are inclusive of persons living with disabilities
- Ability to speak, read and write English fluently.
- The evaluator will need to be independent of MRG, its donors, partners, the programme targets and participants, and will need to state and demonstrate that no perceived or actual conflict of interests will arise during the evaluation.
- The evaluation team will all need to be able to demonstrate the ability to gain the trust of the partner organizations, individuals and the indigenous communities targeted in this programme.

**Desirable:**

- Extensive knowledge and proven experience of working on human rights, within the fields of economic, social and cultural rights, minority and indigenous rights and the rights of persons living with disabilities.
- Good knowledge of any or a range of the programme's target regions and countries, including political, social, legal, media context, particularly with regards to the situation of historically marginalized communities.
- Experience in engaging with any of the programme's key international stakeholders, such as UN agencies.
- Experience of carrying out or evaluating training, capacity building, influencing local govt decision making, if possible influencing budgets, advocacy and work with smaller NGOs in difficult contexts.
- Ability to speak, read in Tamil.

## 9. Budget [2]

The available budget for the evaluation within the range of 8050.00 Euro. The proposed budget cannot exceed this amount.

Candidates must supply a detailed estimation of the total cost of the evaluation.

Some budget headings to consider in the evaluation budget are:

- Personnel (e.g., evaluator(s), research assistant, support staff) per day or lump sum – if lump sum, the number of workdays will be agreed with MRG and reflected in the work plan and budget.
- Travel (e.g., transportation, per diem, travel mobilization expenses, class of travel).
- Supplies, equipment and direct communication costs such as phone, fax, email, internet, postage.
- Translation
- Copying and printing
- Workshops, FGDs, and other data collection costs (i.e., design, verification, utilization)
- Facilitation of use by intended users.

## 10. Timeframe and Submission

| Deliverable | Timeline | Remarks |
|---|---|---|
| Inception Report | Within 1 month of contract signing | Sets out methodology, tools, and workplan |
| Field Work | November 2025 and December 2025 | To be conducted between December and January |
| Draft Evaluation Report | By 30th January 2026 | Submitted to MRG and partners for comments |
| Feedback from MRG and Partners | Within 5working days of draft submission | Consolidated feedback provided by MRG |
| Final Evaluation Report (in English) | By 15th February 2026 | Must address all comments received |
| Public-Facing Summary (English + Local) | By 28th February 2026 | Prepared for external sharing and translation included |

If you are interested, please apply submitting the following by 15/06/2025 to vyshnavi.manogaran@minorityrights.org

- Team members' CVs (max 2 pages per person)
- Cover letter setting out how the evaluator team meets the requirements specified in Section 8.

---

[2] Consider the following options if ongoing evaluation input is needed such as for a Developmental Evaluation: retainer fee contracts; stepwise funding; or, speculate and allow for contingencies.
From https://www.betterevaluation.org/frameworks-guides/managers-guide-evaluation/scope-evaluation/identify-what-resources-are-available-for-evaluation-what-will-be-needed

- Brief statement (8 pages) including: evaluation approach and methodology, data collection strategy, data analysis plan, workplan, team composition, and budget.
- Examples of, or links to, evaluations completed by the team members with similar elements.

In case of any questions, please contact vyshnavi.manogaran@minorityrights.org