

## Terms of Reference

### Evaluation of the End Violence Safe Online investment portfolio's results

#### Background

The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, and its associated Fund, (End Violence), is a unique public-private coalition launched by the UN Secretary-General in July 2016 to accelerate progress towards SDG 16.2: ending all forms of violence against children by 2030. End Violence convenes partners that collaborate globally to raise awareness, catalyse leadership commitments, mobilise new resources, promote evidence-based solutions and innovation, and support those working to end all forms of violence, abuse, and neglect of children. The **Partnership** connects and facilitates collective evidence-based advocacy, especially to keep children safe in communities, online, and in and through schools, while the integrated **Fund** is a flexible funding vehicle that identifies new and emerging challenges to SDG 16.2, funds innovative initiatives that have the potential to replicate and scale, and generates data, evidence, and learning to inform policy and increase the impact of programmes. End Violence has three priority areas:

1. Works with countries to end violence against children through the process of Pathfinding, whereby governments commit to ending violence against children by implementing evidence-based solutions such as the INSPIRE strategies.
2. Strengthens the network of organisations working to keep children Safe Online by leveraging its network of grantees and partners to influence global policy debates and investing in solutions to tackle child online sexual exploitation and abuse.
3. Builds on existing efforts to ensure children are safe in and through schools via the Safe to Learn initiative, backed by a growing coalition of partners as well as countries who endorse its five-point Call to Action.

From its inception in 2016 until September 2020, End Violence raised US\$61.6 million for the Safe Online portfolio from the UK Home Office, Human Dignity Foundation and the Oak Foundation. By October 2020, it has awarded US\$44 million in capacity building, tools, programmes, and technologies to prevent and respond to online child sexual exploitation and abuse (CSEA), with impact in over 50 countries.

Through its Safe Online investment portfolio, the End Violence Fund implemented four funding rounds to date:

- First two, in 2017 and 2018, were focused on building the foundations of an integrated response to online CSEA through focusing on national, regional, and international capacities aligned with the Model National Response (MNR) to end and prevent online CSEA, a framework developed and promoted by the WePROTECT Global Alliance. Thirty-one grantees were selected via these two open Calls for Proposals and represent organisations working across the world, ranging from Latin America, Southeast Asia, Eastern and Southern Africa, North America, as well as some organisations in Central Europe, South America, and two in the Middle East. Ninety-four per cent of the projects (29/31) are implemented in ODA-eligible countries with funding from UK Home Office.

- In 2019, the Safe Online portfolio of End Violence built on the progress made during the previous two years. It continued financial and technical support to programmes and activities that delivered practical and innovative solutions to end violence against children online. In early 2019, as part of its third funding round and a targeted call focusing on Southeast Asia and Eastern/Southern Africa, End Violence focused on generating more data, evidence, and learning, one of the key capabilities of the MNR. It invested US\$6.6 million to develop Disrupting Harm, a holistic and innovative methodology and approach to conducting comprehensive assessments of online CSEA at national and regional levels in 14 countries. Disrupting Harm is a large-scale research project with multiple data collection components carried out by three international organisations that aims to better understand how digital technology facilitates the sexual abuse and exploitation of children and adolescents, both online and offline.
- To further invest in building the capabilities related to technology and innovation as outlined in the MNR, End Violence focused on channeling funding into potentially higher risk areas of investment such as technology solutions and innovation (and quite distinct from the focus of the first two rounds: capacity building, education, awareness raising, etc...). The fourth funding round was launched in September 2019 through an Open Call for Solutions focused on cutting-edge technology tools for the global community to make children safe online. This cohort enriches the diversity of the organisations End Violence is working with and brings new and much-needed expertise to the network.
- It should also be noted that since its establishment, the End Violence Fund has also made four targeted funding investments via invitation-only projects for which unique opportunities arose at the request of and with the approval of the Fund Steering Committee.

End Violence supports the Safe Online grantee community through creating a strong network which maximises the collective impact and leverages synergies i.e. we invest in more than just individual projects, we invest in global prevention and response to online CSEA. This is done in several ways: through tailored technical support in the form of programmatic visits, check-in calls, in-person convenings, networking facilitated by the End Violence Fund, and knowledge exchange opportunities via global and regional webinars to promote learning within the grantee community and the wider ecosystem. Going forward, the Safe Online team aims to continue investing in the online CSEA ecosystem and collaborative efforts, while also promoting a collaborative culture through connecting grantees to each other, and relevant key resources and mentors to ensure cross-collaboration, knowledge exchange, and learning.

## Rationale

After more than three years of supporting projects at country, regional and global levels, now is an opportune time to evaluate how End Violence's Safe Online investment portfolio has been able to achieve the intended results through **first two cohorts of grantees** from 2017 and 2018 and get recommendations on how to best amplify the impact of the Safe Online window of the Fund as it completes its fourth year of investments and plans for the future.

Specifically, the evaluation will focus on two key areas:

1. *Overall Safe Online grantees' programmatic contribution to the response to online CSEA across the national, regional and international levels focusing specifically on the results of the first two rounds of grantees (selected in 2017 and 2018).*
2. *The End Violence and Safe Online's value proposition, its wrap-around support to the grantees and the End Violence community (strategic advice, intelligence, advocacy, communications, convening, knowledge sharing, etc.), value for money, its accountability to donors and its transparency.*

The focus is being put on the first two funding rounds because these two cohorts have matured the most in terms of project implementation, with some having ended as early as September 2019 and several will be ending in the fourth quarter of 2020. These two cohorts also went through two very similar calls for proposals where grantees were required to design projects that aligned with the MNR. Grantees were also required to indicate how their projects aligned with the Theory of Change developed for the Safe Online window by using a standardised M&E indicator framework. As such these 31 projects focused on building national, regional and international capacities of countries and organisations based on four levels of change: Individuals, Society, Systems, and Industry.

## Key intended users

Given that prevention and response to online CSEA is a relatively new field, and much evaluative evidence is yet to be documented and understood, this evaluation will be critical for many reasons and will be used by multiple audiences. Concretely, it will allow users to better understand the contribution that the End Violence grantees have made to tackle online CSEA in their implementing context, offer insights into how the MNR as the model framework has been used, adapted and implemented by key stakeholders, as well as the role of the End Violence Partnership and its Safe Online team in facilitating key processes, supporting the Fund Steering Committee, and contributing to change at different levels.

### *Primary users:*

1. End Violence Partnership and Fund/Safe Online team to acquire insights into and recommendations on:
  - a. its contribution to building national, regional and global capacity to tackle online CSEA, including its role in helping to get this issue on the national agendas
  - b. areas in which the most progress has been made by its grantees, why and how, and areas in which there are gaps, or progress has not been made or stalled, that require further focus/investment, and the reasons why;
  - c. the effectiveness and performance of its investment approach, the wrap-around functions it is providing to the network of its grantees and End violence partners (knowledge management, technical support, policy advocacy and communications, etc.); and the operational areas that it can further improve;
  - d. strategic vision, investing approach and plans to increase results on the ground, value for money for donors; and its value proposition when it comes to resource mobilisation.
  - e. how well the Safe Online work is integrated into the wider efforts to end violence against children from the End Violence Partnership, including the Pathfinding Countries and Safe to Learn initiatives, and recommendations on how to strengthen these links further as the Partnership evolves and matures.
2. WePROTECT Global Alliance to acquire insights into and recommendations on:
  - a. Implementation of the MNR on the ground in ODA-eligible countries as the key national framework for building a functioning system to prevent and respond to online CSEA and the results achieved by the Fund's grantees;
  - b. Incorporating these insights into a wider review of MNR effectiveness and impact, enabling evaluation of project outputs and outcomes to drive improvements to the strategic response to online CSEA and embed an effective intelligence and learning cycle.
3. The End Violence donors, both those specific to online CSEA and others, to acquire insights into and recommendations on:
  - a. The results that were achieved with their funding so far;
  - b. The value of the End Violence Partnership and the Fund/Safe Online team in providing wrap-around functions, such as grant management, strategic advice and on-ground support

- in implementing the first two funding rounds, amplifying the results on the ground, and policy advocacy and communications;
- c. Areas and programmes that have proven to be most effective in achieving planned outcomes and results;
- d. Areas where there are funding gaps and are in need of further attention and investment;
- e. Areas where funding was not as effective.

#### *Secondary users:*

4. End Violence grantees:
  - a. To understand where the most progress has been made as it aligns with the MNR by the two cohorts and how their specific projects have contributed or align to these results and areas where they can make more efforts;
  - b. To see the value of the wrap-around functions provided by the End Violence Fund and how they can further take advantage of such in the future for the benefit of their projects or organisations;
  - c. To inform future project design, identifying opportunities to build on and refine delivery and provide an evidence-base for future funding bids.
5. End Violence community and relevant stakeholders, including potential donors:
  - a. To understand the contribution the two cohorts of grantees have made in tackling online CSEA via investments from the End Violence Fund;
  - b. To see the value of the End Violence Fund as a vehicle for change on the ground but also the types of wrap-around functions it provides to the grantee community and the online CSEA ecosystem in general;
  - c. To provide insights into the interaction and relationship between the online harms pillar and other forms of violence against children (e.g. sexual abuse, trafficking and physical violence), reducing the risk of siloing and setting online CSEA in a broader VAC and SDG context.
6. Partners in Pathfinding countries:
  - a. To see if, where appropriate, the investments via projects on online CSEA have led to integration into larger national coordination bodies and national action plans on Violence Against Children more broadly

### **Scope of the evaluation**

This evaluation will involve assessing how the Fund's Safe Online window has contributed to national, regional, and international response to online CSEA via the work of its grantees within its first two funding rounds (2017 and 2018). It will also consider the Fund's achievements and challenges thus far via its grant-making support to grantees and its wrap-around support and contribution to the field in general through the End Violence Partnership and the wider work of the Safe Online team.

Since its inception in 2016, the Fund has provided financial and technical support to 31 projects addressing online CSEA in over 20 countries, including regional and global projects, amounting US\$24 million for these two cohorts. The grants' duration ranges from two to three years, and the individual grant value is from US\$ 300,000 to US\$ 1 million. The 31 projects' main areas of focus include:

- Improve reporting, investigation and prosecution of online CSEA cases
- Generate knowledge and evidence to inform programming and influence policy and advocacy
- Expand and improve the quality of services for child victims of online CSEA
- Strengthen cooperation and policy development at national and regional levels
- Engage industry and media to prevent and end online CSEA
- Ensure child participation in combatting online CSEA

- Build resilience, enhance digital education and awareness raising, and address social norms

As spelled out above, the evaluation will focus on **two** main areas and the final report will incorporate all aspects:

1. *Overall Safe Online grantees' programmatic contribution to the response to online CSEA across the national, regional and international levels focusing specifically on the results of the first two rounds of grantees (selected in 2017 and 2018).*
2. *The End Violence and Safe Online's value proposition, its wrap-around support to the grantees and the End Violence community (strategic advice, intelligence, advocacy, communications, convening, knowledge sharing, etc.), value for money, its accountability to donors and its transparency.*

## Methodology

The evaluation will be mixed methods (quantitative where relevant information/indicators exist from grantees' project results) but will rely primarily on qualitative data. It will be conducted based on desk research, documents review, and individual and group interviews. Some primary data collection from the grantees may be expected, for which focal points' contact details will be made accessible by the End Violence Safe Online team.

The key stakeholders and informants may include the following (but not limited to):

- Global Partnerships to End Violence Against Children, including:
  - o Fund Steering Committee
  - o Executive Committee
  - o End Violence Safe Online team and broader Leadership Team
- Donors:
  - o Government of the United Kingdom: Home Office
  - o Oak Foundation
  - o Human Dignity Foundation
- Grantees and their implementing partners and, where applicable, host governments and some Pathfinder country partners
- Partners, such as Australian E-Safety Commissioner's Office, Tech Coalition, WePROTECT Global Alliance

Below is a set of *preliminary* evaluation questions. **The selected evaluation team is expected to refine them further based on desk research and discussions with members of the FSC and the Safe Online Team.** A contribution analysis methodology may be envisaged by the evaluation team.

## Preliminary evaluation questions:

*Grantees' programmatic contribution to tackling online CSEA:*

1. What have been the key results/achievements and contribution of the Safe Online window of the Fund in terms of preventing and responding to online CSEA at the national, regional and international levels through the work of the grantees of the first two funding rounds in 2017 and 2018? What evidence is there that they achieved the intended results? How were they achieved, i.e. people and mechanisms?

2. How have key intended target groups (children/adolescents, families, society and key stakeholders) benefitted from these projects and programmes? What are the good practices and what are the gaps?
3. For grantees whose projects have since closed, have their results been sustained? What is the evidence that can illustrate this? Why or why not? Have the Safe Online investments enabled organizations and countries to generate attention to the issues and secure additional resources and partnerships? What more can be done by End Violence/Safe Online team to further strengthen the sustainability of projects or organisations supported?
4. Beyond tackling online CSEA, has there been integration of the online CSEA projects and their results into larger national coordination bodies and national action plans on dealing with violence against children (where applicable), particularly in countries that have also signed up to Pathfinding via End Violence?

*The End Violence's accountability to donors, its transparency to external stakeholders, and its wrap-around functions and support to grantees and the global ecosystem:*

1. Does End Violence/Safe Online support programs and projects align to its mission, vision, and value? Is there "mission creep"?
2. Are the open calls and selection processes used in the first two funding rounds appropriate, transparent and fair? What more can be done to ensure maximum impact when it comes to funding rounds and selection of grantees? Has the Safe Online team built in any lessons from the first two funding rounds into its future funding approach (third and fourth funding round and future plans);
3. Does the selection of grantees demonstrate a diverse and capable group of organisations who are involved in this field? Are local communities and children meaningfully engaged? How relevant were these two funding rounds for the needs of the organisations working in the field?
4. Has End Violence/Safe Online team raised the profile of the issue at national, regional and global level? Has the End Violence/Safe Online gained credibility as global leader in the fight to online CSEA? How can this be demonstrated via the methodology chosen?
5. What are the main value add of End Violence/Safe Online, its value proposition as it relates to resource mobilisation and the best way for it to demonstrate its impact on the ground according to key stakeholder groups? Given the current ecosystem of organisations committed to ending online CSEA, what is the best investment case that can be made for End Violence's Safe Online work and its investment portfolio? How can it be demonstrated and aligned with other initiatives?
6. Has the type, quality, and amount of wrap-around functions (knowledge sharing, networking, convening, advocacy, technical resources, grants management) that it offers to grantees and the wider community been appropriate, high, and adequate, respectively? Is it sustainable? What areas should improve?
7. Is the Safe Online's Theory of Change still relevant? If not, what should be changed based on results achieved or the changes in the field of online CSEA?
8. How can the work of the Safe Online priority of the End Violence Partnership be integrated into the wider efforts to end violence against children from across the Partnership? What recommendations are realistic and feasible given the current operating context of the Partnership?

Bidders are encouraged to propose a methodology that is appropriate given the kinds of questions asked and timeline allotted. It is expected that the methodology will use at minimum in-depth interviews, a group/cohort online survey, and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders, such as the cohort of grantees. Proposals that include case study methodology to further illustrate results and how investments have 'moved the needle' in this space are welcome. Bidders will be given full access to internal reporting.



## Ethics and Safeguarding

In order to ensure the protection of, and respect for, human and child rights throughout the process, the applicants will be required to follow relevant international norms and standards of ethics in research and evidence generation - including UNICEF's Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis.

It is also expected that the contractor will select for this work reliable persons who will perform effectively, respect the local customs, and conform to a high standard of moral and ethical conduct and comply with relevant provisions of the Safeguarding Policy of the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, and internationally agreed core labour standards.

## Limitations

The evaluation does not aim to assess the impact of the Safe Online window of the Fund using experimental methods whereby treatment and control groups are possible. As this is primarily qualitative, it is foreseen that the evaluation team will be able to use the interviews with stakeholders and available documents to ascertain a type of counterfactual to assess the Safe Online's contribution.

The 31 projects are also at various stages of implementation with some having closed almost a year ago as of August 2020 and some are mid-way through. And as the 31 projects often differ in their scope and ways of delivery/implementation, not all projects will have quantitative baseline, midline, and endline data. The evaluation team is encouraged to think of creative and innovative ways to demonstrate contribution and gather the requisite data and information from all grantees, such as in the form of a group online survey and similar.

The COVID-19 pandemic and its effects around the world are still yet to be known fully. Therefore, it is envisaged that the primary research for this evaluation will be done online/remotely. This could introduce certain limitations to the richness of the interaction of the stakeholders as well as the inability to observe project implementation in the field.

## Duty Station and Management Arrangements

The evaluation will be managed by the Safe Online team at the End Violence Secretariat, with strategic oversight by the Safe Online Working Group of the Executive Committee. The Fund Portfolio Manager will have day-to-day management responsibilities and will be the main focal point for the evaluation team. The team will be expected to work remotely and be responsible for providing their own IT equipment and health insurance.

## Timeframe and Deliverables

The estimated timeframe for this evaluation is 40 working days over the period of 3 months.

### Key tasks:

1. Desk review, inception report drafting, including action plan and proposed methodology – 10 working days
2. Data collection and analysis: KIIs, FGDs, online survey, write up of case studies – 15 working days
3. Consolidation of initial findings and preparation of a draft report (Word Document) – 5 working days
4. Presentation to the Safe Online Working Group of the Executive Committee – 2 working days (preparation of a PowerPoint presentation and delivery of the presentation)
5. Consolidation of feedback and final report writing (Word and PowerPoint presentation) – 8 working days

### **Deliverables will be as follows:**

1. Inception report and detailed methodology outline
2. Draft report with initial findings
3. PowerPoint presentation to Safe Online Working Group of the Executive Committee
4. Final report (Word and PowerPoint presentation)

### **Payment Schedule**

Compensation will be paid upon receipt of satisfactory deliverables as follows:

<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Payment Schedule</b>	
Inception report	30%	
Draft report, PPT and virtual presentation to Safe Online Working Group of the Executive Committee	40%	
Final report and PowerPoint	30%	

### **Suggested structure of the evaluation report**

In preparing the evaluation results, the findings will be evidence based and will have clear references to the source. The preliminary structure of the evaluation report can be as follows:

- Title page
- Table of contents
- Executive Summary with the purpose of the evaluation, key findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order
- Background/context of the evaluation that includes a description of the project intervention, Log frame/result matrix/theory of change
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations
- Methodology and limitations
- Findings per criteria/focus areas
- Conclusions and recommendations, explicitly linked to the findings
- Lessons learned and areas for improvement

In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- List of informants interviewed
- List of documents reviewed



- Any other relevant materials

## Qualifications and Experience

End Violence is seeking a small team of experts to conduct this evaluation. If a team of consultants is applying as a consortium, then a combination of qualifications among the team will be considered. In such cases, each person's qualifications and how he/she is best suited for the task at hand should be clearly explained. Changes in the team proposed must be approved by the End Violence Safe Online team for the duration of the contract. The following qualifications and experience are required:

### Mandatory

- At least 8-10 years of experience in conducting mixed-method program and project evaluations
- An advanced university degree in social sciences, international development or related field.
- Qualitative research skills, including interview techniques such as in-depth interviews and key informant interviews
- Ability to synthesize information from multiple sources
- Oral and written excellence in English.

### Desired

- Experience managing, reviewing or evaluating the impact of global funds
- Expertise in violence against children, particularly direct programming, desirable
- Relevant experience within the UN system, other multilateral organizations or Public-Private Partnerships.
- Working knowledge in any local language related to the countries of implementation within the scope of work

## How to Apply

### Structure of the proposal (MANDATORY document requirements)

The Proposal shall contain the mandatory documentation identified below.

1. Company profile and qualifications of the personnel
  - Provide a brief description of the organization submitting the proposal, including types of activities undertaken.
  - Describe the availability of resources in terms of personnel and their qualifications required for this assignment. Describe the structure of the proposed team/personnel, and the work tasks which would be assigned to each.
  - Provide curricula vitae of the personnel who will be involved in the assignment. Highlight relevant academic qualifications, work experience, and specialized knowledge areas.
  - Special attention should be given to providing a clear picture of roles, responsibilities and accountability.
2. Methodology, project management and quality control
  - The proposal should describe the organization's methodology used to provide the services, including their approach to quality assurance.

- Describe the potential risks that may impact quality or timely completion of expected results. Describe measures that will be put in place to mitigate these risks.
3. Experience
- Please outline experience in providing the required services. Bidders should include at least three (3) cases with a description of the services provided and its outcome.

**IMPORTANT:** Items 1-3 will constitute vendor's Technical Proposal.

4. Financial proposal

The financial proposal shall be submitted per each deliverable described in Section 5 (i-iv). Detailed breakdown of hourly rates and time estimates should be included, when applicable. Failure to quote in USD will result in the disqualification of the proposal.

**Evaluation process and method**

Proposals will be reviewed following a two-step process:

3. Technical evaluation (80 points)
4. Evaluation of financial proposal (20 points)

A maximum of 80 points will be allocated to the technical aspects of the bids, with a further 20 points for the price component, for a maximum possible score of 100 points.

**A. Technical evaluation (80 points)**

Each proposal will first be assessed on the basis of the service provider's company profile and proposed methodology, including processes for effective quality management. The organization's structure and capacity and the expertise and experience of the proposed team will then be reviewed. Finally, the bidder's particular experience with the required services assignments will be assessed.

*Reviewers will use the following point system to evaluate the proposals received:*

<b>5. Company profile and personnel</b>	
1.1 Relevance of the company profile	10
1.2 Qualifications, competencies and specialized knowledge areas of proposed personnel	20
<b>6. Proposed methodology and project management</b>	
2.1 Methodology, project management and quality assurance	20
2.2 Potential risks and mitigation measures	20
<b>7. Experience in similar projects and their outcome</b>	
3.1 Sufficient experiences (minimum 3 cases)	10
	<b>80</b>

Only those proposals that score **65** points and above will be considered technically compliant and will proceed to the financial evaluation.

### **B. Financial evaluation (20 points)**

A proposal offering the lowest total costs for the assignment shall be awarded 20 points; all other price proposals receive scores in inverse proportion according to the following formula:

*Score for price proposal X = (Maximum score for price proposal (e.g. 20) \* Price of lowest priced proposal) / Price of proposal X*

### **C. Combined Evaluation**

Proposal obtaining the overall highest combined/cumulative score as a result of technical and financial evaluations will be considered as the most responsive proposal, i.e. representing best value, and will be recommended for award.