

External evaluation of the project “Humanitarian demining activities in Balboa, Cauca, Colombia”

These terms of reference (ToR) have been designed to perform the final evaluation of the project “Humanitarian Demining Activities in Balboa, Cauca, Colombia”, financed by the German Federal Foreign Office and developed in Colombia by the Colombian Campaign to Ban Landmines.

The Colombian Campaign to Ban Landmines, foresees an evaluation of the project “Humanitarian Demining Activities in Balboa, Cauca, Colombia” in order to measure its degree of effectiveness, relevance, impact, sustainability and efficiency. Through the final evaluation of this project among other points detailed in the ToR, it is intended to achieve the lessons learned from the experience in order to:

- Design future actions in favor of rights holders.
- Promote sustainability of the action.
- Assess the relevance of the intervention model.
- Ensure accountability of the action.

The final evaluation recommendations will be taken into account for future formulations and will serve as institutional learning and reflection; the final evaluation is expected to identify internal weaknesses in the processes and methodologies developed in the formulation and management, with the purpose of assuming learning that affects the quality of CCCM interventions.

THE PROJECT

ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND

Campaña Colombiana Contra Minas (CCCM) is a Colombian NGO with 20 years of experience in Mine Action programs in Colombia that was accredited by the National Authority in June, 2016, to carry out land release activities and authorized in 2017 to develop MRE activities during humanitarian demining operations.

By October, 2019, CCCM is implementing humanitarian demining activities in Algeciras (Huila), Balboa (Cauca), Puerto Asis, Puerto Caicedo, Puerto Guzman, Puerto Leguizamo and San Miguel (Putumayo). CCCM has 175 people accredited for NTS, Clearance and EOD activities, and has 15 NTS teams and 6 Clearance teams deployed on the field.

Since 2004, CCCM has developed various processes on victims' assistance in Cauca department. During these processes, psychosocial support, associative strengthening, legal counselling with victims, families, communities and victims' associations have been developed. Since 2006, Mine Risk Education actions have been developed in the department with different communities, including indigenous reserves. These actions include workshops with communities and educational institutions, information dissemination strategies and the design of community risk management tools.

In 2006, advocacy actions were also implemented with Cauca governments and institutions at different levels to include Mine Action activities in departmental and municipal prevention plans, to claim for the rights of victims of antipersonnel mines and to design routes on Risk management with different institutions of the department.

The CCCM began humanitarian demining activities in Balboa in July 2017 with support from the German Federal Foreign Office. Three teams were accredited to implement Non-Technical Survey (NTS) activities. Operations had to be stopped between April and June, 2018, due to lack of resources. The Kingdom of Norway and UNMAS agreed to fund NTS activities between the 1st of July and the 30th of September, 2018, to continue NTS activities.

The second GFFO project, named "Humanitarian Demining Activities in Balboa, Cauca, Colombia", started on October, 1st, 2018, to continue identifying areas with contamination by APM/UXO and also to build and deploy a clearance capacity to begin the clearance operations in the hazardous areas identified.

CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

In Colombia, the department of Cauca is geostrategic. The mountainous topography and the distance from the center of the country have favored the settlement of armed actors and the presence of illegal crops, trafficking in arms and cocaine, a situation that has caused serious humanitarian damage in recent years.

The confrontations between the different actors of the conflict have affected the communities with the use of APM-UXO (Anti-Personnel Mine-Unexploded Ordnance) and provoked social, political and economic destabilization and, therefore, Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations.

The municipality of Balboa is located in the south of the department of Cauca, in the western range of the Colombian Andes. Armed groups such as FARC and ELN, the paramilitary AUC and other groups linked to drug trafficking and paramilitary demobilization have been present in the municipality for years, generating a high level of fear in the population, due to armed confrontations, kidnappings and forced displacements, among others. As a result of the peace agreement between the Government and the FARC, Balboa was one of the priority municipalities for the early development of humanitarian demining activities, as a rapid response strategy that would allow stabilization and security guarantees in the area for the arrival of land restitution, illicit crops substitution and other development plans.

There is still a high presence of illicit crops in wide areas of the municipality, as Balboa is part of a strategic corridor that links the center of the country with the Pacific Coast.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The aim of this project was to develop a full humanitarian demining intervention in the municipality of Balboa, in Cauca. According to that, activities were developed in NTS, Clearance and community liaison (community meetings, MRE workshops, Victims assistance when required).

During NTS activities, teams focused on investigate IMSMA events recorded in the national database and do house by house interviews with the families of the sectors prioritized. With the information collected, they were able to identify and mark hazardous areas, and to elaborate reports and maps according to National Standards.

Also, community liaison activities were held as part of this process, to keep communities informed about the progresses and to develop MRE workshops to prevent accidents and inform about signaling, according to National Standards. Advice to APM/UXO victims about their rights was provided as well if survivors or families were found during the project.

On this project, CCCM trained and accredited one clearance team to start clearance with manual technique on the hazardous areas already discovered (7 areas at the beginning of this project). This allowed CCCM to destroy the remnants of war found and deliver free lands to National Authority and communities.

It was expected that 66 sectors will be surveyed by NTS teams and at least 11000 m² were cleared and delivered in 7 hazardous areas. Also, 800 people between men, women and children were supposed to assist to MRE workshops and it was estimated that 7 victims would be advised. 100% of the contamination found would be destroyed.

PROJECT OUTCOME

This project aimed to continue contributing to guarantee the territorial security and the confidence of the communities by reducing the risk of accidents by APM/UXO in the municipality of Balboa, Cauca, to a level where people can live without feeling threatened. The ultimate goal was to support Colombia's broad task to have a mine-free country through humanitarian demining activities.

To achieve the general objective, CCCM continued collecting, analyzing and processing information of APM/UXO contamination and started the process of eliminating the threat posed by AMP/UXO for communities through manual clearance technique.

BENEFICIARIES OF THE PROJECT

In accordance to Colombian Mine Action National Standards, direct beneficiaries of humanitarian demining interventions are those people related with the identified areas/cleared areas because before or after the presence of APM/UXO were involved with the land by:

- Use: People made use of the land because of economic, cultural, social or religious needs

- Transit: In order to develop a daily activity like (displacement to the job place, commodities displacement, familiar visits, access to health or education services)
- Property: Land owners.

According to that, CCCM estimated 1100 direct beneficiaries between NTS, clearance and additional MRE activities and including men, women and children.

EVALUATION PROCESS

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

A comprehensive evaluation will be carried out on the intervention as a whole: all the intervention lines will be analyzed (together and individually), and in relation to the conditions of context and external factors.

The temporal scope of the evaluation will be the entire execution period, *from October, 1st, 2018 to December, 31st, 2019.*

The geographical scope of the analysis and the field work must include all of the holders of obligations, responsibilities and rights.

The key topics that should be considered by the evaluation are:

- External factors that have influenced the development of the project and therefore its results, recognizing those that have been positive and those that are negative. It will be estimated to what extent they have been influential and what the response of the project has been.
- The processes underway: the evaluation will focus on the results obtained but at the same time it will make a description and qualitative assessment of the processes initiated that have not yet been completed or that are being carried out.
- Level of coordination with different stakeholders: CCCM teams, national and local governments, OAS, beneficiaries, the United Nations, etc.

Within this framework, the external evaluation must:

- Analyze and extract lessons and elements of reflection and learning (conclusions) about the extent to which the objectives and results set in the identification and formulation of the project have been achieved, which will feed back the decision-making process.
- Provide recommendations that may be useful to contribute to organizational learning.
- Systematize learnings about the development of the project as well as the accountability on the use of resources and obtained results.

The evaluation will also include essential elements of the rights approach, such as:

- Participation: participation, as a right in itself, recognized by the international normative framework of human rights that is linked to fundamental democratic principles. Therefore, special attention will be given to the active participation of all the people involved in the formulation, execution, monitoring and evaluation of the project cycle.
- Capacity building or empowerment: so that the rights holders learn to exercise and claim them and the holders of obligations and responsibilities can fulfill them.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will adopt the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and connectedness (sustainability). Cross-cutting issues (in particular human rights and gender) must be taken into account when further elaborating questions for the evaluation. The following questions are provided as a starting point and should orient the developing design of the evaluation process:

- Relevance/Appropriateness: *Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy). Appropriateness is the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.*¹

Are the objectives of the project in line with the priorities and needs of the donor, partners and target groups? To what extent are gender and conflict sensitivity issues taken into account?

Is the engagement based on an appropriate assessment of the context and needs?

Is there an impact-oriented project concept and have priorities, strategies and indicators been defined? Impact model and indicators must be reviewed or drawn up.

Were there any synergies or duplication? How is the project integrated with other activities by national and international actors?

- Efficiency: *measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used.*²

What is your assessment of the relationship between the resources used and the results achieved?

¹ ALNAP (2006): “Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies”. Table 1. Summary definitions of DAC criteria. Page 19

² ALNAP (2006): “Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies”. Table 1. Summary definitions of DAC criteria. Page 21

Is the project managed efficiently? How do selection, decision-making and management processes work? Would it be possible to organize responsibilities in the implementing organization better?

Would it be possible to achieve the project objectives more cheaply or more economically/efficiently by means of other activities?

- Effectiveness: *measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within the criterion of effectiveness is timeliness.*³

To what extent were the project objectives met?

Did the project contribute to achieving the desired changes? How plausible are the project contributions?

Did the project measures have unintended effects (positive or negative)? If yes, what were they and what steps were taken in response?

What external factors may have positively or negatively influenced effectiveness?

- Impact / longer-term effects: *looks at the wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical, environmental – on individuals, gender- and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household)*

What overarching (political) impacts have emerged?

In what way or how plausibly does the project contribute to achieving overarching political goals of the Federal Foreign Office?

- Connectedness: *the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.*⁴

Was consideration paid to local ownership?

Has attention been paid to linking the project to longer-term interventions by other actors? Is there an exit strategy?

What are the greatest risks to the sustainability and/or continuity of the project impacts?

³ ALNAP (2006): "Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies". Table 1. Summary definitions of DAC criteria Page 21

⁴ ALNAP (2006): "Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies". Table 1. Summary definitions of DAC criteria. Page 20.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation is to be conducted using a mix of methodologies incorporating quantitative and qualitative data collection and analytical methods as used in empirical social research.

Methodological phases of the evaluation will be developed as follows:

- **Desk study:** initially, available documentation and data will be incorporated into the analysis and assessed as part of the evaluation: proposal, logical framework, project reports, ...

- **Field study:** primary data collection from different sources and the application of quality assurance methods such as triangulation of data is required. Different methods of data collection should be listed as part of the work plan for the evaluation, among others:

- Interviews with different stakeholders: National Mine Action Authority representatives, Mine Action organizations, UN agencies, OAS, German Embassy, local government, ...

- Interviews/workshops with CCCM national team: project manager, operations management staff, M&E staff, ...

- Field visit to Balboa operations and interviews with the field teams.

- Interviews/workshops/surveys with beneficiaries, survivors and project participants.

To collect all the primary data, a visit must be conducted in both headquarters (Bogota) and field (Balboa, Cauca). This field visit should start with a kick-off workshop in Bogota headquarters with the project team, to clarify methodological and conceptual issues regarding the evaluation process.

At the end of the field visit, a debriefing meeting to discuss data validity and primary impressions should be conducted between the evaluator/evaluation team and the CCCM team.

Please note that all documents and data collected are to be treated confidentially. Personal data are to be treated in accordance with the Federal Data Protection Act and used solely for the purposes of the evaluation. In general, interviews are to be anonymized. Participants must not be quoted in the reports without their consent. At the latest one year after the finalization of the evaluation (submission of final report), the Contractor has to delete/destroy data and documents permanently and in a non-restorable way.

- **Draft report (*in English*):** the initial version of the report must include the following parts:

- An *Executive Summary* that does not exceed three pages, describing the purpose of the evaluation, the process adopted and the key results of the process.

- A full report document providing detailed description of the evaluation methods conducted, the results, the conclusions (approx. 35 pages):

1. Description – basic information and data about the project and any background information needed to understand the project
2. Methodology – brief explanation of the methods used to conduct the evaluation in both field and desk.
3. Findings – an objective presentation of the results obtained from analyzing the data
4. Evaluation – evaluation of the findings
5. Lessons learned and recommendations – list of all recommendations made on the basis of the findings.

- Appendix which includes a list of the data used, sources and literature; the questionnaires and interview guidelines/questions and any additional analyses (if not already included in appendix of inception report). This appendix may be provided in electronic form alone.

The evaluation report must be clear, unambiguous and intelligible. All potential users must be able to understand the purpose, subject-matter, methods, assessments and conclusions of the evaluation;

- **Final report:** the draft evaluation report will be presented and discussed. The Evaluator's independence (with respect to the results, conclusions and recommendations) shall be guaranteed. The final version shall thereupon be sent to the CCCM in electronic form including annexes. An extra language version in Spanish can be presented as well.

QUALIFICATIONS/REQUIREMENTS

Applications from individuals as well as organizations will be received, as long as they comply with the following requirements:

- Evaluator/Evaluation team with proven experience developing external evaluations of programs and projects of similar value to this one with various donors and organizations (at least 3 evaluations per evaluator/evaluation team)

- Knowledge and experience of collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data.

- Knowledge of Colombian context and institutions.

- Availability to travel to Colombia and field operations.

- *Desirable:* knowledge of the Mine Action sector.

- *Desirable*: fluent spoken and written English and Spanish.

POTENTIAL RISKS FOR FIELD WORK

Evaluators/Evaluation teams willing to conduct this evaluation must take into account that there is a series of potential risks that are posed when conducting activities in a mine contaminated environment.

In this sense, evaluators must commit to listen, internalize and implement all safety recommendations transmitted by the CCCM team.

EXPECTED TIMEFRAME

Submission of proposals: November, 14 – November, 19, 2019

Contract signature: November, 20, 2019

Field work: November, 21 – December, 6, 2019

1st report draft submission: December, 13, 2019

Comments to draft report: December, 16, 2019

Final report: December, 20, 2019

APPLICATION PROCESS

DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED AS APPLICATION PACKAGE (IN ENGLISH)

A detailed working plan, a detailed methodology document and an estimated budget (including all costs considered to conduct the evaluation) should be submitted as an application package.

Evaluators/Evaluation teams must also submit a CV for each person of the team which contains: relevant qualifications, professional experience, language skills, details of reference projects, local knowledge, etc.

Financial proposals shouldn't exceed 21.000 EUR and technical proposals should consider the expected timeframe established above.

Proposals may be submitted to Ester Martinez (internacional@colombiasinminas.org) before 5:00 p.m. (GMT-5) November, 19.