Terms of Reference

for an Independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of our

**Framework Agreement 2019-2023**

# General background

* **Friendship Luxembourg ASBL**

Friendship Luxembourg (FLux) is a Luxembourgish not for profit association, created at the initiative of Mrs. Runa Khan, founder and executive director of Friendship Bangladesh (FB). Incorporated in 2006, FLux’s corporate object is « to mobilize financial and non-financial resources in order to provide support to Friendship, an NGO founded in Bangladesh in 1998, or to act alongside the latter for the benefit of the poorest through action taken in the sectors of health, education and training, income generation, emergency relief, rehabilitation and disaster preparedness, as well a cultural preservation and promotion ». Besides, « by acting as an intermediary, while promoting direct contacts between Friendship Bangladesh and those who provide support to the latter's action, the association aims at creating a better understanding and stronger relationships between donors and beneficiaries » (Art. 2 of the articles of association).

FLux is duly recognized as a “Development NGO” by the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (MAEE) on the basis of the law of January 6, 1996 “*sur la coopération au développement*”, as amended since then.

The link between FLux and FB is both statutory and contractual, as, beside its articles of association mentioned above, FLux and FB are also linked by a framework partnership agreement.

As such, the two organisations work in a rather unique south-north partnership model that has proven its effectiveness over the years.

FLux is presently in the process of getting registered as an international NGO in Bangladesh.

* **Friendship International ASBL**

Since the incorporation of FLux in 2006, a truly international platform has emerged with the incorporation of, successively, Friendship Netherlands, Friendship UK, Friendship France, and Friendship Belgium.

In 2013, an additional not for profit organisation has been incorporated in Luxembourg under the name "Friendship International" in order to bring the various Friendship entities together in an international network. Runa Khan and Marc Elvinger, Chairman of FLux, are the joint Chairs of Friendship International (FI), the board of which is composed of the Chairs of the different national entities.

The FI network was built on the belief that development is best served by organisations which are locally grown and strongly rooted in the countries and areas in which they operate, and therefore make projects/programs that work effectively. However, all entities are pursuing their mandate as legally independent entities, under the responsibility and within the discretion of their respective boards, subject to a number of common principles and rules of conduct defined in common at FI level. In particular, FLux decides independently which specific projects/programs it provides support to, while maintaining a continuous dialogue with FB regarding the funding, implementation, monitoring and reporting in respect of such projects/programmes.

* **Friendship Bangladesh – our single partner**

Friendship, a social purpose organization[[1]](#footnote-1) organized under the laws of Bangladesh, has been working for the last 19 years to help address the needs of remote and marginalized communities in Bangladesh, i.e. mostly those people living in the northern river islands (called *chars*) and southern coastal belt locations. Friendship delivers on its four commitments on Saving Lives, Poverty Alleviation, Climate Adaptation, and Empowerment by providing effective services in six sectors interacting with each other: Health, Education, Climate Action, Inclusive Citizenship, Sustainable Economic Development, and Cultural Preservation. The organization, which started in 2002 with just a floating hospital serving only ten thousand patients, is now providing healthcare and other development solutions to more than 3.5 million people a year.

With an integrated development approach, Friendship nurtures opportunity, dignity and hope by strengthening communities and allowing their members to reach their full potential. Different combinations of programs from the six sectors are implemented in the targeted areas, with the long-term intention to develop an ecosystem where all these interventions are mutually integrated for holistic development of each community that Friendship serves.

Whereas FB is an independent legal entity with its own (Bangladeshi) members and board members[[2]](#footnote-2), many of the FI board members are also actively involved at different levels with the operations of FB. All in all Friendship, through its various entities, operates as a global team.

* **Friendship overall: an International Social Purpose Organisation**

Friendship’s role in beneficiary communities is that of an instigator and facilitator of lasting and meaningful change in a way that ensures dignity, opportunity and hope for the people, and that is permanent and sustainable. The variety of needs to be addressed for this purpose has lead Friendship to, over time, set up several separate legal entities best suited, at a given point of time[[3]](#footnote-3), to perform the required activity:

* Nodi, a Bangladeshi Private Limited Company owned jointly by Friendship Bangladesh and Friendship International on a 50/50 basis, is dedicated to the production and marketing of textile products in order to provide dignified jobs to (mainly) women from the char communities;
* Mushti (Strem), a Bangladeshi social welfare organisation set up (and controlled) by Friendship, holds a micro-finance license issued by the Bangladeshi Microfinance Regulatory Authority and provides tailor-made microfinance products to farmers, fishermen and micro-entrepreneurs participating in Friendship’s Sustainable Economic Development programs;
* The very recently incorporated Friendship Colours of the Chars Luxembourg SARL will be in charge of marketing in Luxembourg (and Europe) the textile and other artisanal products produced by Nodi in Bangladesh.

But irrespective the legal form under which these different entities operate (in order to comply with existing legal, regulatory and governance requirements), each of them concurs to the realization of Friendship’s overall mission as an International Social Purpose Organisation. by always prioritising the interests of the communities Friendship serves over some organizational self-interest.

* **FLux’s Framework Agreement 2019-2023**

Bangladesh has achieved rapid and spectacular improvements in many social development indicators during the last two decades or so. However, extreme poverty remains a structural problem in this country where the poorest populations, especially those living in the coastal area of the Bay of Bengal and in the alluvial islands (called *chars*) of the Brahmaputra river in the north of the country are also the most exposed to natural disasters and to the impacts of climate change, which are affecting the food security and livelihoods of these already very precarious populations.

It is within these communities, among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in the country, that Friendship implements its **integrated rural development programme**, developed and fine-tuned over the years to always better serve its beneficiaries and meet their needs.

The 2019-2023 Framework Agreement (FA), signed on 30 January 2019 with the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, allows FLux to support this holistic rural development programme as a whole and, in doing so, to deliver on Friendship's four commitments: Saving Lives, Poverty Alleviation, Empowerment and Climate Adaptation.

Like Friendship’s activities in the field, and thanks to the flexibility offered by the FA, the support provided by FLux adapts to changing needs and circumstances - such as the coronavirus pandemic - but never strays from its core objective of empowering and building resilience in marginalised communities.

True to its holistic and resolutely integrated approach, FLux’s FA objectives and expected results are as follows:

* **Overall goal**

To strengthen the autonomy and resilience of marginalised communities and empower people in the remotest areas of Bangladesh to reach their full potential so that they can take control of their future and emerge from extreme poverty.

* **Specific goals**
1. To improve access to quality and affordable basic social services, i.e. health, hygiene, sanitation and education for the targeted communities.
2. To improve the livelihood, food security, resilience and income opportunities of the targeted marginalised communities.
3. To create an enabling environment where citizens are aware of their rights and have unhindered access to justice and to the services of local and national Government institutions, thereby gaining social and economic independence
* **Expected results**

**R1.** Community members have access to dependable quality health care services [awareness, preventive and curative] through our 3-tier health care model.

**R2.** Community members have access to dependable quality primary, secondary and adult education.

**R3.** Community members have access to diversified livelihood, better income, improved food security and affordable electricity.

**R4.** Community members are aware of their rights and obligations and have access to public services and social safety net.

**R5.** Community members are more resilient and better prepared to face climate change impact.

**Implementation**

Much more than an "implementing partner", FB is the "project manager" of the programme, in close interaction with FLux and other FI entities. With over 3,000 employees – a majority of whom come from the communities in which they work and many of which are beneficiaries of the programs as much as they are implementers of the same – FB has the know-how and experience to identify and respond to the needs of the beneficiaries it intends to serve and support them in accordance with its values in the best possible way.

**Budget**

The overall budget of this FA is EUR 13,750,000 over 5 years, i.e. a ministerial contribution of EUR 11,000,000 (EUR 2,200,000/year), subject to FLux mobilising its 20% contribution, i.e. EUR 2,750,000 (EUR 550,000/year) of private funds from Luxembourg sources.

Further details on the Framework Agreement and Friendship’s activities and strategic plan are provided in Annexes 2 and 3. All other relevant reports/documents will be provided to the successful candidate in due time.

General information about our activities can be found on our [website](https://friendship.ngo/).

* **Previous/ongoing/planned evaluation missions**

The following independent evaluations have been/will be commissioned by FLux in the context of its FA:

* An external evaluation of the Education Program (Primary and Secondary) took place in 2019-2020. The full report and executive summary can be found [here](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1m4B29-1XXzvuOIAQn6ImRZMCO8fZUbA6);
* An external evaluation of the mHealth program was carried out in 2020. The report will be provided to the successful candidate;
* An evaluation of the Inclusive Citizenship program is planned to take place in 2021 (still on hold due to the pandemic situation in Bangladesh);
* *Friendship Health Data Management Project* was launched in January 2021. The project’s Workstreams (WS) 3A & 3B aim at developing analytics to demonstrate the impact of Friendship’s integrated model (WS 3A) and obtaining actionable analysis focused on specific areas of interest (WS 3B). Results should be available by the end of 2021;
* An external evaluation of the Health Program in the northern working areas of Friendship (riverine islands on Jamuna River) is in preparation;
* An assessment of and guidance on Friendship’s “Protection policies, processes and practices” is also being considered and should be launched in 2021.

In 2015, the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs commissioned an external evaluation of Friendship Luxembourg’s framework agreement 2013-2015 signed at the time in consortium with another Luxembourgish NGO. According to the terms of reference issued by the MAEE, the general objective of that evaluation was to verify the NGO’s capacity to ensure the efficient and effective implementation of development projects as well as the sustainable impact of the projects in terms of fighting poverty. Since then, most of the recommendations made in the report (available on request) have been implemented.

# Mid-Term Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The main objective of the mission is to carry out an interim evaluation of our Framework Agreement 2019-2023 **through a sample of projects/programmes** to assess its implementation status, in accordance with the DAC criteria of 2019.

In this context, the mission will:

## Analyse/assess the management and monitoring of the FA

Particular attention should be paid to:

* Principles of harmonisation and alignment
* Monitoring of the different levels of the projects/programmes (specific objectives, means, tasks, results)
* Analyse/assess the risks and assumptions identified in the logical framework, and the monitoring done.

## Analyse/assess the results and specific objectives achieved at the time of the evaluation in relation to what was foreseen in the FA

* Provide an analysis of the situation, the target indicators foreseen at mid-term and an analysis of whether the results can be achieved at the end of Framework Agreement;
* Report possible deviations from what was aimed for in the FA.

## Analyse the FA implementation according to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria[[4]](#footnote-4), also taking into account the cross-cutting themes

The criteria should be adapted according to what is useful to analyse for the MTE and are based on the [OECD/DAC criteria](https://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm) of December 2019. In the context of this MTE, the assessment will focus on the following criteria: **relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency,** while taking into account the **cross-cutting themes**, i.e. human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability.[[5]](#footnote-5)

## Assess the quality of the program documentation

A substantial amount of work is invested – both in Bangladesh and in Luxembourg - in preparing reports intended to be thorough and informative. The evaluator shall, during the Desk Review:

* Assess the quality of the program documentation – ranging from program overviews, annual reports, FA reports, policies, …);
* Make recommendations for further improvement where adequate.

## Give particular attention to the following specific issues

* The additional value, if any, arising from the close interaction of the various programs conducted and its impact on the sustainability of the results achieved;
* As per MAEE’s general conditions “the evaluations will have to include the verification of the correspondence between the CRS sector indicated in the logical framework and the activities actually implemented on the ground. In addition, evaluations should focus on the achievement of the results indicated in the logical framework”;
* Covid-19 focus: The mission should assess the consequences/impact of the Covid context on the implementation of the projects/programmes[[6]](#footnote-6);
* Based on (i) the initial Desk Review and (ii) the sample selection in view of the Field Visit, more specific issues may be identified for further analyses.

## Identify lessons learned, good practices and propose recommendations for the future

* In terms of knowledge management and sharing, assess the achievements of the projects/programmes in terms of innovations and/or good practices.
* What are the main lessons for Friendship to learn from these interventions in terms of organisation, management and coordination, with a view to the continuation of the projects/programmes?
* What are the main lessons learned in term of Covid adaptation?

# Methodology and Tasks

Considering the wide scope of this assignment and the number of projects/programs covered by our FA, the evaluation, which will have to include both quantitative and qualitative elements, will be carried out in two separate phases, each of which will result in a proper report:

1. a comprehensive desk review of key program documents;
2. a selective field-based evaluation.

3.1. Comprehensive Desk Review

The first phase of the MTE shall include the following steps:

* Briefing with FLux office (face-to-face or virtual);
* In-depth desk study/analysis of all key documents related to FLux/Friendship in general (strategy, annual reports, policies,…) and to the FA in particular (project/program documents, baseline reports, progress reports, evaluation reports, etc.). **The Desk Review shall be the cornerstone of the MTE and represent the largest part of the mission, which will be complemented by a field-based evaluation to confirm/verify the status, as reflected in the project documentation and reports, on site**;
* Research of any other relevant documentation;
* Production of a comprehensive Desk Review Report (see below).

3.2 Field-based Evaluation

The second phase of the MTE shall include the following steps:

* Briefing with Friendship Bangladesh’s Head of Sectors at FB’s Head Office in Dhaka;
* Meetings with other stakeholders (relevant personnel from Government, other agencies,…) – if deemed necessary;
* Field visit of a sample of projects/programs[[7]](#footnote-7)

The field-based evaluation shall aim **primarily** at verifying whether program documentation/reports substantially reflect the reality (validation/confirmation) and **incidentally** at assessing in more depth certain aspects specifically identified during the Desk Review. The field-based evaluation will include interviews with both direct and indirect beneficiaries, Friendship (field) staff, community workers, relevant personnel from local government,…

The data may be gathered through different methods including, but not limited to, Focused Group Discussions (FGD), Key Informant Interview (KII), In Depth Interviews and Questionnaires,…

The field-based evaluation will be carried out in a participatory way, taking into consideration the different stakeholders at the different levels involved in the projects/programmes and ensuring that the particular interests and needs of men and women are taken into account and mentioned, for all actors involved;

* Debriefing at FB’s Head Office with Head of Sectors to share preliminary findings.

3.3. Debriefing(s)

A debriefing at FLux’s office will be organised after receiving the draft report. A debriefing with the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign Affairs might be organised after reception of the final MTE report.

# Deliverables

## Desk Review Report

Considering the focus given to the document analysis in this MTE, the Desk Review Report should already cover all the objectives of the evaluation as described above - subject to the field-based validation - as well as set the ground for the field-based evaluation.

The Desk Review Report shall also include a proposed schedule of tasks and activities for the field mission, identifying the sites visits and elaborating on the selection criteria for those selected sites.

**The Desk Review Report, in English, will be provided to FLux within one month after the start of the assignment. It will be presented and discussed with FLux before the start of the field-based mission**.

## Field-based Evaluation Report

The Field-based Report should validate the findings of the Desk Review or, as the case may be, report any significant inconsistencies or deficiencies, and describe in more depth certain aspects specifically identified during the Desk Review, based on the data collected in the field.

**The Field-based Evaluation Report, in English, will be sent to FLux by e-mail at least 5 working days before the debriefing**.

## Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report

The Final MTE Report will consolidate/compile the findings and results of the evaluation as a whole.

The Final MTE report will be in **English**. The executive summary should also be submitted in **French**.

The final report should be delivered to FLux within 10 days of the receipt of FLux’s comments, further to the debriefing.

The report should not exceed 35 pages excluding annexes. The suggested content is laid out in Annex 1D.

# Schedule and profile required

5.1. Schedule of the mission

The evaluation mission will take place according to the following indicative timetable:



5.2. Evaluation Team Qualification

The MTE should be conducted by a gender balanced consultancy team with considerable theoretical and practical experience of evaluation. All team members shall have an advanced academic degree, i.e. a minimum of a Master’s degree or equivalent, and possess relevant experience of evaluation in a development context.

The team should cover the following competences: experience of result-based management, in-depth knowledge of the consideration of cross-cutting themes (governance for development, gender equality, environment and climate change), and of the implementation of related tools (environmental assessment, gender analysis, OECD-DAC markers, etc.), language skills: excellent English and French.

**The candidates who have no offices in Bangladesh will need to enter into a joint venture with a local consultant/firm who will be in charge of carrying out the bulk of the work related to the field-based evaluation. The proposal must set out the modalities of said joint venture/ partnership.**

One person shall be assigned team leader with the overall responsibility for the evaluation. The team leader shall have extensive experience of leading evaluations assignments based on OECD/DAC criteria. Knowledge of the Luxembourg Cooperation context would be an asset.

FLux, together with FB will coordinate the mission in Bangladesh, including facilitating the logistical requirements for consultants and setting up interviews and field visits based on the consultant sampling.

**Application Process**

# How to apply?

Interested candidates are requested to submit their application including both technical and financial proposals by **September 15, 2021** at the latest. The technical proposal – including a note on the methodology - should not exceed 8 pages and should clearly demonstrate their skills and experience for the review.

The candidates will also annex the CVs of the core team members who will lead and be actively involved in the mission, if awarded. The entire application pack must be sent to info-lux@friendship.ngo.

There will be no pre-bid meeting. Candidates may send their queries in regard to this ToR by September 6, 2021. Friendship will circulate the responses to the queries among all interested applicants at least seven days prior to the submission deadline. All the queries need to be sent to
info-lux@friendship.ngo.

Upon receipt of the proposals, FLux may invite shortlisted applicant(s) for further discussion. FLux may also request revision in the approach or methodology, in order to align the design with the context of the program.

# COVID-19 challenges and consequences

Like other regions, the locations covered by Friendship’s rural development program have been severely impacted by Covid-19 outbreak, with many consequences for the economy, children’s education, people’s rights and multiple other cross-cutting issues. In consideration of the complexities in all these aspects of life, support for prevention of Covid-19 also had to be delivered in an integrated and inclusive manner. In terms of program implementation modality, large group sessions and community gatherings have been discouraged and replaced by other alternatives.

Additionally, if any further lockdown or travel restrictions are imposed by the Government in the coming months, travels to and from the working locations of Friendship for the Evaluator can be complicated.

While assessing the application, particular attention will be given on how the applicant plans to address the impacts of Covid-19 related complications in the evaluation and how the applicant will tackle challenges related to any potential lockdown or travel restrictions.

# Confidentiality Agreement – Copyright

The Consultant shall maintain strict confidentiality of all Friendship information which the Consultant will become aware of in the context of the assignment.

FLux shall solely possess the copyright of all the works produced by the Consultant within this consultancy task and the consultant must not share any information, data, or analysis related to or borne from this task with anyone other than FLux, without FLux’s prior written consent.

# Annexes

1. A. Evaluation criteria

B. Consideration of cross-cutting themes

C. Analysis of the context and impact of COVID-19

D. Content of the Final Report

1. *Schéma de demande – Accord-cadre 2019-2023 + Annexes*
2. The Friendship Way – Direction of Travel 2021-2023
3. Indicative list of available documents

**Annex 1**

## **A. Evaluation criteria for this MTE**

Relevance – is the intervention doing the right things?

The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

* “Relevance" refers to the general and specific objective, while "appropriateness" refers to the activities and resources;
* Consideration of local absorptive and implementation capacities in the design of the project;
* What mechanisms have been put in place or arrangements made by the project to address poverty? Did the most vulnerable part of the population (M/F) benefit from the project? What risks exist that could exclude this group from benefiting from the intervention?
* Taking into account any recommendations from previous missions of this project or similar projects carried out by the NGO in the country concerned.

Coherence – how well does the intervention fit?

The extent to which the intervention is consistent/compatible with other interventions within a country, sector or institution.

Examine how other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention being evaluated, and vice versa. This includes internal and external coherence:

* Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/administration, as well as the coherence between the intervention and the relevant international norms and standards to which the institution/administration adheres.
* External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors’ interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

Effectiveness - is the intervention achieving its objectives?

The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.

Note: analysis of effectiveness involves taking into account the relative importance of objectives or results.

* Analyse the extent to which the results achieved have led to the specific objectives targeted by the project;
* Assessment of project management and quality of monitoring;
* Relevance of the OVIs and proposal, if any, of more appropriate OVIs;
* What positive or negative unintended effects have occurred? How can they be situated and assessed in the overall context? How have the project and the partner responded?

Efficiency – how well are resources being used?

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

Note: “Economic” is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. “Timely” delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).

* Analysis of the adequacy of the means/inputs used and assessment of the costs of the project (in comparison with similar interventions);
* Could the same results have been achieved at lower costs?
* Was the duration of the project adequate or could the results be better with a different project duration?
* Assess the flexibility of the project (steering) to readjust project components to take account of the results of previous evaluations.

## **B. Consideration of cross-cutting themes**

To what extent did the project take into account the following cross-cutting themes?

Governance for Development

* Has the project put in place mechanisms that address governance for development? Have strategies for the participation of all target groups and in particular those traditionally excluded (e.g. women, socio-ethnic groups, rural population, etc.) been implemented? Were they relevant and successful?
* Think: information flow, organising associations, sharing responsibilities, human/women's rights groups, consultation with different groups, transparent decision-making and management processes, etc.

Gender equality

* Did the gender concept or national gender policies influence the design, implementation and results of the project?
* Was a gender analysis carried out at the time of project formulation/initiation? Did the project take into account the situations of gender inequality that may exist, their causes and influencing factors? Have inequalities in access to and control over resources, access to and control over project benefits been considered? Have strategies been adopted to reduce these inequalities? Has the project had a positive impact on these situations?

Climate Change Adaptation

* Are the programmes “fit” from a climate change adaptation perspective – sustainability in the face of climate change
* Are the programs strengthening the beneficiary communities’ resilience in the face of climate change.

Interdependence of cross-cutting themes

* To what extent is the interdependence of cross-cutting themes taken into account in the project (e.g. the effects of natural resource management measures on gender relations)?

## **C. Analysis of the context and impact of COVID-19**

*Relevance*

* How has COVID-19 affected the objectives and design of the intervention in relation to the needs, policies and priorities of beneficiaries?[[8]](#footnote-8) (How have systems been strengthened and lives protected?)

*Coherence*

* Internal: if there were direct responses to COVID-19 organised by the project, what synergies and interlinkages were created with other interventions led by the same institution/administration?
* External: responsiveness of development assistance - how have donors adapted to new realities and coordinated their assistance?

*Effectiveness*

* Analyse the extent to which the COVID-19 situation has had an impact on the achievement of results and objectives? Propose adjustments and recommendations if necessary.

*Efficiency*

* Analyse the extent to which COVID-19 has had an impact on the efficiency of the project, taking into account budgets, expertise, time, etc. What lessons can we learn about the flexibility of our systems in terms of strategic and operational reorientation?

*Sustainability*

* Did the COVID-19 context affect the sustainability of the project? Propose adjustments and recommendations if necessary.

*Learning*

* Explore how challenges have been met, what new opportunities have been potentially identified and what potential innovations. What opportunities or innovations have emerged that could improve interventions or implementation in the future?

## **D. Structure of the final MTE report**

The suggested content of the final report is as follows:

* Table of contents
* Acronyms
* Executive summary (3-4 pages) – French translation to be provided
* Description of the FA achievements at the time of the evaluation:
* Coverage (area and beneficiaries, M/F)
* Details of objectives, results achieved
* Description of the implementation:
* Programme management structure
* Measures taken to put capacity building at the heart of the programme
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Local input
* Evaluation of the programme:
* Relevance
* Coherence
* Effectiveness
* Efficiency
* Cross-cutting themes
* Specific issues (if any)
* Lessons learned and potential good practices
* Recommendations
* Conclusion

Annexes:

* Terms of reference of the MTE
* Programme of the evaluation mission and people met
* Budgets (Project Document budgets and actual budgets) and analysis of DAC markers
* Logical framework and indicators at the time of the evaluation
* Project timeline (planned and realised)
* List of documents reviewed
* Bibliography
* Maps, Photos, etc.
1. A SPO is an organisation that addresses social issues and always prioritises the interests of the communities it serves [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The law of Bangladesh does not allow non-Bangladeshis to be general members or board members of a Bangladeshi NGO/Social Welfare Organization [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Being the point of time where a certain activity reaches a critical scale such that it becomes difficult to run such activity within a legal structure not really meant to host this type of activity [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Annex 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annexes 1A & 1B for more details [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See Annex 1C for more details [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The evaluator will be responsible for selecting the *chars*/locations in consultation with Friendship’s team [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. That is, the individuals, groups or organisations that benefit from the development intervention, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally. Other terms may be used, such as 'rights holders' or 'affected people'. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)