TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Integral Security Resources Hub (ISRH) Project Phase II
Annual Evaluation 2024**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION

ISRH Project Phase II

The **Integral Security Resources Hub Project (ISRH) – Phase II** is a two-year initiative (2023–2025) aimed at strengthening and operationalizing a network of service provider organizations to protect Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs) in Indonesia. Building on the foundation laid in Phase I, this phase addresses gaps in service delivery and enhances the capacity of service providers to offer comprehensive protection for HRDs and EHRDs facing threats and attacks while advocating for human rights and environmental protection. Additionally, the project seeks to bolster the resilience of civil society organizations amidst Indonesia's shrinking civic space and democratic decline.

The project responds to the alarming rise in violence, harassment, and criminalization against HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia, including increasing digital threats such as doxing, impersonation, trolling, hacking, surveillance, and DDoS attacks. Repressive laws exacerbate criminalization, while conflicts of interest involving public officials in extractive industries further endanger defenders and society at large.

To address these challenges, ISRH Phase II adopts three core strategies:

1. **Establishing a Collaborative Network:** Synergizing service provider organizations through a cohesive network or hub to improve coordination and service delivery.
2. **Providing Adaptive and Responsive Funding:** Offering flexible funds tailored to the needs of HRDs and EHRDs facing violence, threats, or criminalization, while enhancing mechanisms for faster, holistic, and more effective protection services.
3. **Building Regional and Global Alliances:** Strengthening collaboration with international organizations and networks to leverage global expertise and expand protection for HRDs and EHRDs.

This integral approach ensures that HRDs and EHRDs receive timely, robust, and effective protection, enabling them to continue their critical work in promoting human rights and environmental justice.

The Integral Security Service Providers Network (Jaringan Penyedia Layanan Keamanan Integral)

The **Integral Security Service Provider Network (Jaringan Penyedia Layanan Keamanan Integral/JPLKI)** is a collaborative network of institutions in Indonesia dedicated to providing comprehensive security protection for activists, Human Rights Defenders (HRDs), and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs). The network addresses threats, violence, criminalization, and other human rights violations aimed at obstructing their efforts to uphold human rights and protect the environment. Its protection services encompass all stages, before, during, and after incidents of physical, non-physical, or digital violence against HRDs and EHRDs.

Established on **January 16, 2024**, during the Kick-Off Meeting of the ISRH Project Phase II in Jakarta, JPLKI comprises **23 service provider organizations** categorized into six key clusters: **Physical Security, Digital Security, Emergency Fund Provision, Legal Aid, Psychosocial Support, and Research & Advocacy.**

The network operates with a flexible structure, avoiding formal institutionalization. Instead, it utilizes a **Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)** as a binding mechanism to foster collaboration and coordination among its members, ensuring effective and adaptable protection for HRDs and EHRDs.

JPLKI Initiatives: Provision of the Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF)

The **Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF)** is a vital initiative within the Integral Security Service Provider Network (Jaringan Penyedia Layanan Keamanan Integral or JPLKI), designed to provide swift and effective support to activists, Human Rights Defenders (HRDs), and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs) facing threats, violence, or criminalization. This fund not only addresses immediate emergencies but also strengthens the capacity of service providers to deliver better support and expertise, ensuring comprehensive assistance during emergencies and implementing preventive measures.

The FRF is structured around two key components. The Responsive Fund focuses on delivering rapid assistance to HRDs and EHRDs in crisis situations. It operates through two schemes: an emergency fund to address urgent needs and follow-up handling funds to provide continued support and resolution after the initial crisis. The second component, the Capacity Building Fund, is designed to enhance service delivery and expertise within the network by developing referral systems and enabling the sharing of critical information, data, and knowledge among network members. This fund supports both preventive efforts and comprehensive responses to violence and threats.

Since its launch in April 2024, the FRF has prioritized the Responsive Fund to address the urgent needs of HRDs and EHRDs, particularly during the heightened risks associated with the election and local elections. The Capacity Building Fund has not yet been utilized, as the focus remains on mitigating violence during this critical period. Thus far, the Responsive Fund has processed over 20 applications and provided assistance to 91 individuals across Indonesia. The Central Region has emerged as the area with the highest number of applicants and recipients, largely due to conflicts tied to national strategic projects such as mining, geothermal development, and agrarian disputes related to palm oil plantations.

The FRF continues to play a pivotal role in safeguarding HRDs and EHRDs by addressing immediate threats while laying the groundwork for long-term capacity-building initiatives that will strengthen the overall protection ecosystem.

B. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

The primary objective of the annual evaluation for the **Integral Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the network's initiatives and activities during the reporting period. This evaluation aims to provide an evidence-based understanding of the progress made toward achieving JPLKI's goals of offering comprehensive protection for Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs), addressing gaps in service delivery, and enhancing the resilience of civil society organizations in Indonesia. The evaluation also seeks to identify lessons learned and generate actionable recommendations to inform and strengthen the implementation of the network's strategies in the upcoming period.

Specific Objectives

1. **Evaluate the Functionality and Impact of the Responsive Fund**
   The evaluation will focus on analyzing the utilization of the Responsive Fund, including the emergency and follow-up handling schemes, in providing timely and effective support to HRDs and EHRDs facing violence, threats, or criminalization. The evaluation will assess the adequacy, accessibility, and impact of the fund on mitigating risks and supporting beneficiaries during crises.

2. **Assess the Progress in Building Network Capacity**
   The evaluation will examine the extent to which the network has developed its internal capacity to provide integrated and efficient services, including collaboration among service provider organizations in physical security, digital security, legal aid, psychosocial support, emergency fund provision, and research and advocacy. Particular attention will be given to the readiness and potential utilization of the Capacity Building Fund.

3. **Analyze Governance and Coordination Effectiveness**
   The evaluation will review the effectiveness of the network's governance structure, including the role of the Steering Committee, Network Assembly, and National Secretariat in fostering collaboration, ensuring accountability, and streamlining decision-making. The evaluation will also examine the operational efficiency and transparency of fund governance mechanisms.

4. **Identify Regional Disparities and Emerging Needs**
   The evaluation will investigate regional variations in the application and impact of JPLKI's services, identifying specific challenges and needs, especially in regions with heightened conflicts, such as those tied to national strategic projects or agrarian disputes.

5. **Measure Contributions to Broader Protection Goals**

The evaluation will assess how the network's activities align with and contribute to the overarching goals of improving the safety and security of HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia, fostering their ability to advocate for human rights and environmental protection. This includes assessing the network's progress in connecting with regional and global alliances and its role in addressing systemic issues such as repressive laws and digital threats.

6. **Generate Recommendations for Future Action**
   Based on the findings, the evaluation will provide practical and actionable recommendations to enhance the network's strategies, operations, and impact. This includes suggestions for improving fund utilization, strengthening governance mechanisms, and addressing emerging challenges effectively.

The evaluation will provide a comprehensive understanding of the network's performance and areas for improvement, ensuring its continued relevance and effectiveness in safeguarding HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia.

C. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The annual evaluation of the **Integral Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** will focus on the implementation, outcomes, and processes of the network during the reporting period. The evaluation will cover the following key aspects:

1. **Geographic Coverage:** The evaluation will examine the network's activities and impact across different regions of Indonesia, with particular attention to high-conflict areas such as regions affected by national strategic projects (e.g., mining, geothermal development, and agrarian conflicts). It will identify regional disparities in service delivery and assess the adequacy of support provided to Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs).
2. **Timeframe:** The evaluation will review activities conducted from the network's establishment in **January 2024** to the end of the reporting period, focusing on the effectiveness and timeliness of key initiatives, such as the Responsive Fund and governance mechanisms.
3. **Thematic Areas:** The evaluation will encompass all six service clusters provided by the network: Physical security, Digital security, Emergency fund provision, Legal aid, Psychosocial support, and Research and advocacy. It will also assess cross-cutting themes such as gender equality, diversity, inclusion, and the application of human rights principles in service delivery.
4. **Governance and Institutional Structure:** The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the governance structure, including the roles and contributions of the Steering Committee, Network Assembly, and National Secretariat. This includes reviewing decision-making processes, coordination mechanisms, and the administration of the Flexible Responsive Fund.
5. **Fund Utilization and Impact:** The evaluation will analyze the utilization of the **Responsive Fund**, focusing on its accessibility, efficiency, and impact in providing emergency and follow-up handling support to HRDs and EHRDs. Additionally, the evaluation will assess progress in initiating the Capacity Building Fund and its alignment with the network's long-term goals.
6. **Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration:** The evaluation will review the network's ability to foster collaboration among its 23 member organizations and their integration into local, national, and international protection ecosystems. It will also examine the participation of stakeholders, including service recipients, in decision-making and feedback mechanisms.
7. **Outcomes and Results:** The evaluation will measure the progress made toward achieving the network's objectives, including the establishment of a comprehensive protection system, enhancement of service delivery mechanisms, and strengthening of civil society resilience in Indonesia's shrinking civic space.
8. **Barriers, Challenges, and Opportunities:** The evaluation will identify key challenges faced during implementation, including legal, operational, or contextual barriers. It will also explore opportunities for scaling up initiatives, enhancing sustainability, and integrating lessons learned.
9. **Alignment with Regional and Global Networks:** The evaluation will assess the network's progress in establishing meaningful connections with regional and global networks, evaluating how these collaborations enhance protection efforts for HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia.

10. **Evaluation Methodology:** The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. It will include desk reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys with network members, HRDs, EHRDs, and other stakeholders.

D. METHODOLOGY & APPROACH

The evaluation of the **Integral Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** will employ a participatory and mixed-methods approach to comprehensively assess the network's performance, impact, and areas for improvement. The methodology integrates both qualitative and quantitative techniques to ensure robust, evidence-based insights.

Methodology

1. **Mixed-Methods Approach:** The evaluation will combine qualitative and quantitative research methods to provide a well-rounded understanding of the network's outcomes, processes, and challenges. This approach will ensure that diverse perspectives from stakeholders are captured, and findings are substantiated with data.
2. **Participatory Approach:** Stakeholder engagement is central to the evaluation process. Members of the network, beneficiaries, and other relevant stakeholders will be actively involved through interviews, focus group discussions, and feedback mechanisms. This participatory approach will ensure the evaluation reflects the lived realities of those directly impacted by JPLKI's work.
3. **Triangulation of Data:** To enhance the reliability and validity of findings, data from multiple sources (e.g., documents, surveys, interviews, and focus groups) will be triangulated. This process will provide a comprehensive view of the network's operations and impact.

Components of Methodology

1. **Desk Review:** Comprehensive analysis of project documents, reports, governance frameworks, policy papers, and other relevant materials. Includes the review of the Flexible Responsive Fund's documentation and service delivery processes.
2. **Key Informant Interviews (KII):** Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, including members of the Steering Committee, National Secretariat, service provider organizations, and fund recipients. Aims to gather insights on governance, fund utilization, and overall network performance.
3. **Focus Group Discussions (FGD):** Interactive discussions with clusters of network members and beneficiaries to explore qualitative aspects of service delivery, collaboration, and challenges. Ensures diverse perspectives from across the six service clusters are included.
4. **Surveys:** Administered to HRDs, EHRDs, and member organizations to collect quantitative data on service accessibility, responsiveness, and impact. Designed to be statistically representative, with a confidence level of at least 95% and a margin of error of 5%.
5. **Case Studies:** Development of detailed case studies to highlight specific instances of service delivery success or challenges. Provides a deeper understanding of the impact of network interventions in different regional and contextual settings.
6. **Workshops:**
   - **Inception Workshop**: Conducted at the start to finalize evaluation questions, methodologies, and tools with key stakeholders.
   - **Validation Workshop**: Organized post-evaluation to present initial findings and gather feedback for refining conclusions and recommendations.

Analysis and Reporting

1. **Qualitative Analysis:** Thematic analysis of interviews, FGDs, and case studies to identify patterns, challenges, and opportunities.
2. **Quantitative Analysis:** Statistical analysis of survey data to measure trends, performance indicators, and beneficiary satisfaction.
3. **Comparative Analysis:** Cross-regional and cross-cluster comparisons to identify disparities and best practices.

4. **Outcome Mapping:** Assessment of progress toward the network's objectives using outcome mapping to capture tangible and intangible results.

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will be guided by the **OECD/DAC evaluation criteria**: **Relevance**, **Coherence**, **Effectiveness**, **Efficiency**, **Impact**, and **Sustainability**. These criteria will form the foundation for assessing the project's interventions. While evaluators may adjust the criteria and evaluation questions as necessary, any modifications must receive prior approval from Tifa Foundation and be incorporated into the inception report. Once approved, evaluators may proceed to refine the evaluation questions.

The conclusions presented in the evaluation must be comprehensive and balanced, highlighting the strengths, weaknesses, and achievements of the project. These conclusions should be supported by robust evidence and aligned with the outcomes of the annual evaluation and good practice study. Additionally, the conclusions must address the key evaluation questions and provide insights or solutions to critical issues relevant to the project's stakeholders, Tifa Foundation, and its implementing partners.

1. **Relevance**
   This criterion assesses whether the objectives and activities of JPLKI address the needs and priorities of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs), Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs), and other stakeholders.
   - To what extent do the network's goals and activities align with the needs of HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia?
   - How well do the initiatives respond to emerging threats, such as violence, digital attacks, or criminalization?
   - Are the services and resources provided by JPLKI suitable for addressing regional and sectoral challenges?
   - How relevant are the Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF) schemes (emergency fund and follow-up handling) to the immediate needs of beneficiaries?

2. **Coherence**
   This criterion evaluates the integration and synergy of JPLKI's initiatives with other protection efforts at local, national, and international levels.
   - How effectively does JPLKI coordinate with local, national, and international protection organizations?
   - To what extent do JPLKI's activities complement existing programs and policies for HRDs and EHRDs?
   - Are there duplications or gaps in services provided by JPLKI and other organizations?
   - How well does JPLKI align with global standards and frameworks for HRD and EHRD protection?

3. **Effectiveness**
   This criterion examines the extent to which JPLKI achieves its objectives and delivers desired outcomes.
   - Has the establishment of JPLKI improved the accessibility and quality of security services for HRDs and EHRDs?
   - How effective is the Flexible Responsive Fund in addressing emergency needs and follow-up handling?
   - To what extent has JPLKI enhanced collaboration and synergy among its 23 service provider organizations?
   - How effective are governance structures (Steering Committee, National Secretariat, and Network Assembly) in facilitating decision-making and implementation?
   - Are JPLKI's services addressing both physical and digital threats comprehensively?

4. **Efficiency**
   This criterion evaluates how well resources (funds, time, and human capital) are utilized to achieve results.
   - Are the governance mechanisms for the Flexible Responsive Fund efficient in ensuring timely disbursement and impact?
   - How effectively does the National Secretariat coordinate administrative and operational tasks?
   - Are network resources (human, financial, and organizational) used optimally to achieve objectives?
   - Could alternative approaches or methodologies improve cost-effectiveness or service delivery?

5. **Impact**

   This criterion focuses on the long-term effects and changes brought about by JPLKI's initiatives.
   - What tangible outcomes have been achieved for HRDs and EHRDs as a result of JPLKI's activities?
   - How has the network contributed to reducing risks and increasing resilience for HRDs and EHRDs?
   - What systemic changes (e.g., policy shifts, increased awareness, or strengthened civil society) have been observed?
   - Are there unintended consequences, either positive or negative, of JPLKI's interventions?

6. **Sustainability**

   This criterion assesses the likelihood of continued benefits from JPLKI's initiatives after the current project phase.
   - To what extent are JPLKI's governance and funding mechanisms sustainable in the long term?
   - How well are network members equipped to continue collaboration and service provision independently?
   - Are there plans to institutionalize best practices and lessons learned from this phase of the project?
   - What factors support or hinder the sustainability of the network and its impact on HRDs and EHRDs?

7. **Cross-Cutting Issues**

   In addition to the six criteria, the evaluation will incorporate cross-cutting themes of **gender equality, diversity, inclusion, and human rights** to ensure a holistic and equitable assessment.
   - How effectively does JPLKI integrate gender, diversity, and inclusion into its programs and services?
   - Are the needs of vulnerable groups within HRDs and EHRDs adequately addressed?
   - To what extent does JPLKI promote equity and human rights principles in its operations and governance?

Deliverables for the Annual Evaluation

The annual evaluation of the **Integral Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** will result in the following key deliverables:

1. **Inception Report:** A detailed plan outlining the evaluation's scope, methodology, and timeline. Includes proposed evaluation questions, criteria, tools, and any initial adjustments to the evaluation framework, subject to Tifa Foundation's approval.
2. **Data Collection Tools:** Finalized tools for surveys, interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and case studies. Includes sampling strategies and protocols to ensure comprehensive and reliable data collection.
3. **Preliminary Findings Report:** A brief document summarizing key observations and emerging trends based on initial data analysis. Presented during a validation workshop to gather feedback from stakeholders and refine conclusions.
4. **Draft Evaluation Report:** A comprehensive report presenting the evaluation's findings, structured according to the agreed evaluation criteria: Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, and Cross-cutting Issues. Includes an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT), as well as lessons learned and good practices.
5. **Validation Workshop:** A workshop to present and discuss the draft evaluation findings with stakeholders, including Tifa Foundation, network members, and beneficiaries. Provides a platform for feedback and refinement of the final report.
6. **Annual evaluation Report:** A polished and comprehensive document addressing all evaluation objectives and criteria.
7. **Case Studies and Good Practice Documentation:** In-depth case studies illustrating key challenges, successes, and innovations in JPLKI's initiatives. Highlighted examples of good practices to inform future project phases.
8. **Presentation to Donors:** A concise and visually engaging presentation summarizing the evaluation findings, tailored for Tifa Foundation and its donors.
9. **Evaluation Tools Repository:** A collection of finalized data collection tools, templates, and guides used in the evaluation, to serve as resources for future evaluations.
10. **Evaluation Data Archive:** A well-organized archive of all primary data collected during the evaluation, ensuring transparency and accessibility for future reference.

E. CONTRACT FLOW & REPORTING STRUCTURE

Contract Flow

The evaluation process is expected to run for about two months, starting from 01 December 2024 – 31 January 2025, with the following flow design:

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	TIME FRAME	PIC	PAYMENT
Proposal calls and deadlines	25 Nov – 01 Dec 2024	Secretariat	
Proposals considered, shortlisting and follow-up	02 – 03 Dec 2024	Secretariat	
Evaluators invitation for Interview	04 – 05 Dec 2024	Secretariat	
Evaluator interview and final selection	06 – 11 Dec 2024	Secretariat	
Evaluator Contract Signing	13 Dec 2024	Secretariat	
Review of relevant program documents, reports, data, and development of a draft inception report	14 – 17 Dec 2024	Evaluator	**Payment I: 30%**
Inception Workshop: Meet with evaluators and agree on evaluation methodology, action plan, work schedule	18 Dec 2024	Evaluator and Secretariat	
Submission of Inception Report	06 Jan 2025	Evaluators	
Discussion of Inception Report	08 Jan 2025	Evaluator and Secretariat	
Data Collection and analysis of evaluation data	09 – 19 Jan 2025	Evaluator	
Submission of draft report to Secretariat	20 Jan 2025	Evaluator	**Payment II: 30%**
Secretariat's response to the draft report	22 Jan 2025	Secretariat	
Validation workshop: presentation of findings and evaluation results to Secretariat and stakeholders	24 Jan 2025	Evaluator, Secretariat, and stakeholders	
Report customization based on feedback from the post-evaluation workshop	25 – 30 Jan 2025	Evaluator	
The final report was submitted to the Secretariat	31 Jan 2025	Evaluator	**Payment III: 40%**

Payment Terms & Conditions

Payment will be made according to deliverables and deadlines as follows:

- 30% of the total amount – submission of a preliminary report
- 30% of the total amount – submission of the first draft of the evaluation report
- 40% of total amount – submission of final report, including all outputs and annexes

Evaluator Contract Terms

The agreed contract value includes all costs below:

- Work-related transportation costs for evaluators and teams
- Local trips for evaluators and teams
- Accommodation while on the ground
- Tax liability as required by negara

Evaluation Principles

Evaluators appointed for this task by JPLKI National Secretariat are expected to strictly adhere to the Evaluator Guiding Principles as defined by the American Evaluation Association. These principles include:

1. **Systematic Inquiry**: Evaluators must undertake thorough and systematic research that relies on concrete data.
2. **Competence**: Evaluators should consistently exhibit professional excellence and competency to all involved parties.

3. **Integrity**: Throughout the evaluation process, evaluators must uphold the highest levels of honesty and integrity.
4. **Respect and Privacy**: All individuals involved in the evaluation must be treated with utmost respect, ensuring their privacy, dignity, and integrity.
5. **Commitment to Public Welfare**: Evaluators should prioritize the interests of the public and take into account pertinent values during the evaluation.

For a more detailed understanding of these principles, refer to the American Evaluation Association website. It's crucial to note that all materials, documents, or information procured by the evaluator during the contractual period remain the proprietary property of JPLKI National Secretariat and must not be disseminated. This encompasses both inception and midterm evaluation reports. Throughout the evaluation, continuous coordination with JPLKI National Secretariat is imperative, ensuring adherence to the set Terms of Reference.

Reporting

The onus of producing the annual evaluation report, inclusive of the good practice studies, falls upon the evaluator. This report should comprehensively address all evaluation questions, objectives, and areas delineated in this ToR.

Guidelines for the Report:
- The report should be drafted in Indonesian, utilizing simple and jargon-free language for clarity.
- The summary section should furnish a concise overview of the program, a succinct account of the methodology employed, an expansive conclusion, and a summarization of recommendations.
- Evaluators are responsible for providing a minimum of two hard copies, along with electronic versions in Word and PDF formats, of the evaluation report prior to the predetermined deadline.
- The final report should be well-referenced, presenting clear findings underpinned by solid evidence.

Annual Evaluation Report Format

The evaluation report must be concise, written in clear and straightforward language, and should not exceed 50 pages, excluding appendices. The report should be structured as follows:

1. **Executive Summary** (max 3 pages): A condensed overview of the evaluation highlighting key findings, conclusions, learnings, and recommendations. Given its prominence, this section should be clear, succinct, and encompass all pertinent details, as it garners the most attention from readers.
2. **Introduction** (max 3 pages): Provides details about the program, sets the context for the evaluation, outlines evaluation objectives, and presents the evaluation team, the evaluation process, and its limitations.
3. **Intervention and its Context** (max 5 pages): Describes the evaluated intervention, its objectives, structure, organization, and stakeholders. The section should also analyze the political, economic, and social shifts in the intervention area during the evaluation period, with a particular focus on the "Integral Security" aspect.
4. **Methodology** (max 3 pages): Details the methodological approach, sampling details, and the tools used for data collection. It should also appraise the evaluation process.
5. **Analysis of Information Collected** (max 5 pages): Presents an analysis derived from primary and secondary sources of information, considering the evaluation criteria and questions set forth in the terms of reference.
6. **Evaluation Findings and Results** (max 30 pages): Offers evidence pertinent to the evaluation's specific questions. This evidence should be more than mere empirical data, encompassing possible conclusions. This section should be closely tied to the information analysis segment and be founded on evidence-based arguments, opinions, and interpretations.
7. **Conclusion** (max 3 pages): Provides an evaluation of interventions and their results based on set evaluation criteria, performance standards, and policies.
8. **Learning** (max 3 pages): Highlights good practices or distinctive aspects from the conclusions, with an intent to extrapolate the gleaned insights to other interventions or a wider context.
9. **Recommendations** (max 4 pages): Offers practical, actionable, and prioritized suggestions to enhance the management of future programs or interventions. These recommendations can also guide the formulation of upcoming policies and strategies.

10. **Appendices**: Incorporates essential supplementary information used or generated for the evaluation. At a minimum, this section should include:
    - Terms of Reference (ToR)
    - Proposed work, encompassing methodology and tools.
    - A list of participants in the evaluation activities.
    - Collected data.
    - Evaluation tools created.
    - A technical appendix related to methodological assessment.
    - A report on the "Good Practices of the ISRH Project Phase II."

F. Qualification & Proposal Submission

Evaluator Qualification

Secretariat seeks a highly qualified evaluator team to undertake the annual evaluation of the ISRH Project Phase II. The selection criteria are as follows:

1. **Experience in Program Evaluations**: Evaluators should have substantial experience and a commendable history in leading program evaluations.
2. **Relevant Field Experience**: Evaluators should have previously undertaken evaluations in areas related to the "Integral Security" or topics associated with HRD & EHRD Security.
3. **Research and Methodology Proficiency**: Demonstrable academic and practical expertise in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, evaluation design, and program execution is required.
4. **Program Design Expertise**: Evaluators should have a history of designing programs, with the ability to draft logical, coherent, and consistent documents.
5. **Team Collaboration**: The capacity to collaborate within multidisciplinary teams and coordinate technical inputs is essential.
6. **Participatory Tools Experience**: Evaluators should be adept at using participatory tools for data collection during program evaluation.
7. **Communication Skills**: Superior reporting and communication competencies are essential.

Budget

The allocated budget for this evaluation service encompasses both the consultancy fees and the implementation of the evaluation methodologies.

Proposal Submission

Interested evaluators are invited to submit their applications, which should encompass CVs, cover letters, and expressions of interest. The proposal should detail work plans and budgets. All submissions should be directed to: recruitment@tifafoundation.id. The deadline for submission is 01 December 2024, 23:59 WIB. Please note that only candidates who are shortlisted will receive further communication.