

## Terms of references

### Final evaluation of KIYO's *Empowering youth together globally* program

### Belgium

1. Context of the programme .....	1
2. Justification and objectives of the evaluation .....	2
3. Evaluation (learning) questions .....	3
4. Methodology .....	5
5. Expected services and products .....	6
Indicative schedule of the process (per outcome) .....	6
6. Persons involved .....	7
7. Available budget .....	7
8. Practicalities .....	7
9. Expected profile of the consultant .....	7
10. Ethical code .....	7
11. Tender procedures .....	8
12. Evaluation matrix of the proposals .....	9
13. Annexes .....	10

#### 1. Context of the programme

KIYO's five-year DGD programme (2022–2026), *Empowering Youth Together Globally*, aims to create quality learning environments that enable young people to discover and develop their talents and potential, to become aware of their rights and claim them, and to actively shape their future while contributing to a more just and sustainable world.

KIYO has adopted an international approach that combines a shared strategic focus with contextual flexibility. The central goal of creating empowering learning environments for youth is reflected in each country programme, adapted to the local context and to the specific expertise and methods of the partner organisations.

To foster these quality learning environments, KIYO works through local partner organisations that engage community actors involved in educating, training, and supporting young people across formal, non-formal, and informal settings. These partners promote inclusive education and training, youth employability and active citizenship.

The programme is implemented in five countries — Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Philippines. While all outcomes were designed under the same overarching strategy, each applies distinct

emphases in terms of partnerships, priority result areas, and key empowerment approaches, reflecting local contexts and strengths.

In Belgium, KIYO implements the programme directly with secondary schools and organisations that work *for, with and through* young people.

This programme translates into two major result areas.

On the one hand, the work with secondary school teachers focuses on building their competence to create an inclusive, quality learning environment in which all students can develop themselves, learn from and experiment with societal challenges. Within this result area, the *School for Rights* project is included. This project is implemented in partnership with four other organisations and supports teachers through long-term trajectories to structurally integrate children's rights and global citizenship into the school culture. Another component of the work in schools is the *Action4Rights/Youth2Youth* initiative which guides students through a citizenship pathway to encourage them toward active engagement.

A second result area relates to work with organisations that work with, for, and by young people. Here, mentors are strengthened in their capacity to create a quality, inclusive learning environment in which all young people are aware of their rights and potential, feel safe, can express themselves, and develop new skills to become more resilient in life. This also includes the work with fourth-pillar initiatives.

The work of KIYO in Belgium takes place in Flanders and Brussels.

Outcomes	Result areas	Partners	Approaches
Belgium	Education (formal and in/non formal)	Direct implementation	-School4Rights -Action4rights/Youth2Youth -Strengthening organisations with, for and by youth

## 2. Justification and objectives of the evaluation

### Justification

Two evaluations were planned within the five-year timeframe of KIYO's *Empowering Youth Together Globally* programme:

- a mid-term evaluation, conducted in 2024; and
- a final evaluation, to be carried out in 2026.

The mid-term evaluation was designed as an integral part of the programme's learning and implementation strategy, rather than as a separate, accountability-driven exercise. Its primary purpose was to promote mutual and shared learning within and across all country programmes, in line with KIYO's international youth empowerment and partnership strategies.

The mid-term evaluation brought together several complementary and mutually reinforcing components:

1. Facilitated peer-to-peer evaluations between KIYO's country offices outside Belgium;

2. Structured peer learning exchanges among KIYO's partner organisations across the different country programmes;
3. Peer learning processes between KIYO and other organisations; and
4. An external evaluation of the Belgium programme, complemented by peer learning exchanges with organisations in Belgium and the partner countries.

The process was facilitated by INANGA International Development Consulting, and all related reports are available on KIYO's website: <https://kiyo-ngo.be/what-we-do/reports>

Wherever possible, the findings and shared learning outcomes from the mid-term evaluation were integrated into the ongoing implementation of the programme during the second half of 2024 and 2025.

### Objectives of the evaluation

The final evaluation aims primarily to ensure accountability and to foster learning for KIYO, its partners, and other stakeholders within the wider NGO sector.

The evaluation results will enable KIYO and its partners to:

- Demonstrate accountability by assessing the extent to which the programme has achieved its intended outcomes, using the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. The evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, sustainability, and impact of KIYO's interventions across the different countries.
- Generate learning by identifying what worked well, what worked less well, and why — with the aim of informing future youth empowerment initiatives and the broader sector, even beyond KIYO's own organisational framework.

### **3. Evaluation (learning) questions**

#### OECD DAC criteria

The final evaluation will be conducted according to the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, as follows:

- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives and design of each outcome responded to the needs and priorities of target groups and stakeholders and remain appropriate amid evolving contexts and changes.
- Efficiency: The degree to which results have been achieved in a cost-effective and timely manner. This criterion examines whether available resources — financial, human, and time-related — were used optimally to deliver outputs and outcomes.
- Effectiveness: The extent to which the outcomes and expected results have been achieved or are likely to be achieved.
- Coherence: The extent to which the programme is consistent and complementary with other interventions within the same sector, country, or region.
- Sustainability: The likelihood that the benefits of the intervention will continue after external support has ended, considering financial, technical and social dimensions.
- Impact: The extent to which the intervention has produced, or is expected to produce, long-term positive or negative effects — direct or indirect, intended or unintended.

Also, the transversal themes gender and environment will be considered.

Not all criteria will be assessed with the same intensity. The intensity and focus with which each DAC criterion will be assessed will depend on the specific challenges and contextual realities of each country, as well as on the issues identified through the programme's performance scores and mid-term evaluation. Below is an indication of the key guiding questions that the evaluation should seek to answer under each criterion.

#### Evaluation questions

Criteria	Guiding Questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the programme addressed the needs and priorities of partners, community actors, and youth?</li> <li>• How well does the programme align with national and/or regional and/or local priorities?</li> <li>• How have contextual or organisational changes affected relevance, and how were these managed?</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have financial, human, logistical, and technical resources been used effectively and within planned timeframes?</li> <li>• Are resource allocations proportionate to the programme's scope and objectives?</li> <li>• Have inputs been managed economically?</li> <li>• What factors have facilitated or constrained efficiency?</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have implemented strategies contributed to achieving expected results and outcomes?</li> <li>• How satisfactory is the quality of the achieved results?</li> <li>• Has the programme effectively empowered youth by strengthening learning environments?</li> <li>• What factors have facilitated or hindered the achievement of results?</li> </ul>
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the programme coherent and complementary with other interventions in the same country or sector?</li> <li>• Has it provided added value and avoided duplication?</li> <li>• To what extent has it collaborated with other development actors, including other Belgian stakeholders?</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial: Are the strategies, approaches, and materials financially sustainable and likely to continue beyond the programme's end?</li> <li>• Social: Have participation and ownership among target groups and intermediaries ensured continued social relevance?</li> <li>• Technical: Has the programme strengthened the capacities of target groups and partners to maintain and build upon results?</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the medium- and long-term effects of the intervention (positive or negative, intended or unintended)?</li> <li>• Have benefits for target groups generated broader changes or multiplier effects at community, sector, or national levels?</li> </ul>
Transversal Themes – Gender & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have gender equality and environmental sustainability been integrated into programme activities, monitoring, and results?</li> </ul>

## 4. Methodology

The final evaluation will be carried out in each of KIYO's partner countries — Brazil, Burundi, the DRC, the Philippines, and Belgium. Each evaluation will be conducted by an external national or local consultant. The external consultant will assess the specific learning questions identified for each context. The methodology should, at a minimum, include the following elements:

### 1. Document Review

The consultant will review relevant programme and organisational documentation, including:

- MEAL system tools and reports: logical framework, theory of change, scorecards, youth databases and communication materials;
- Moral reporting (lessons learned and performance scores) and financial reports submitted to DGD for the 2022–2025 period;
- Mid-term evaluation reports and management responses.

### 2. Key Informant Interviews

To gain in-depth qualitative insights, the consultant will conduct semi-structured interviews with a diverse range of stakeholders, including:

- KIYO country office staff (e.g. country representative, programme coordinator, financial manager);
- Youth involved in the projects
- Representatives of schools and organisations (e.g. school management team, teachers, project staff (e.g. School for Rights partnership) and mentors)
- Strategic partners (e.g. synergy partners, or other relevant actors).

These interviews should explore perceptions of programme performance, relevance, challenges, and sustainability, as well as lessons that can inform future initiatives beyond KIYO.

### 3. On-site visits, interviews and Focus Group Discussions

The consultant will conduct on-site visits, interviews and participatory focus group discussions with school staff, mentors and youth. These will help capture beneficiaries' perspectives and assess the quality and sustainability of outcomes at local level.

On-site visits and group discussions should allow the consultant to observe programme results firsthand, verify information from partners and staff, and triangulate findings. The combined use of document analysis, interviews, and focus group discussions enables triangulation across stakeholder levels (youth, partners, staff) and data types (quantitative and qualitative), ensuring credibility and accuracy.

### 4. Restitution Workshop

A restitution session will be organised to share and discuss the preliminary findings with:

- KIYO country office staff;

- KIYO programme coordinator based in Belgium
- Synergy partners

## 5. Expected services and products

The consultant is expected to:

- Develop data collection and analysis tools aligned with the proposed methodological framework, designed to generate information and insights to answer the key evaluation questions;
- Collect and analyse data in accordance with the approved methodology and ethical standards;
- Synthesize findings and produce a draft and final evaluation report, structured according to the prescribed template (see annexe 1);
- Facilitate an online or hybrid restitution workshop to present and discuss preliminary findings with KIYO and its partners (i.e. the School for Rights partnership);
- Document at least one best practice or promising approach per outcome, highlighting effective or innovative strategies identified during the evaluation.

## Indicative schedule of the process (per outcome)

	<b>Key events</b>	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Timing</b>
1	Introduction & Methodology development	Introduction of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KIYO country program</li> <li>- Global partnership and program strategy</li> <li>- Methodological framework</li> </ul> Development of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data collection tools</li> <li>- Sampling proposal</li> <li>- Data analysis framework</li> </ul> Validation of methodology	February 2026 2 days
2	Final evaluation	Data collection through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documentary review</li> <li>- On-site visits</li> <li>- Key informant interviews</li> <li>- Focus group discussions</li> </ul>	February 2026 Max. 4 days
3	Data analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Triangulation of findings in support of the evaluation questions</li> <li>- Draft evaluation report</li> </ul>	February/March 2026 3 days
4	Restitution workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of preliminary evaluation findings</li> </ul>	March 2026 0,5 day
5	End report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporation of feedback in final report</li> </ul>	March 2026 0,5 day
Overall period: between February and March 2026			

The total level of effort for this assignment shall not exceed **10 working days**, subject to minor adjustments reflecting contextual and logistical considerations, including travel time to reach partners and youth.

## 6. Persons involved

- The team coordinator Belgium will be the first point of contact for the consultant
- The team coordinator will facilitate the contact between the consultant, the target groups and strategic partners.

## 7. Available budget

The maximum available budget for consultancy fees, including VAT, is as follows:

- Belgium: maximum €5,000.

These amounts cover **consultancy fees only**. Local logistical costs (e.g. local transport, venue rental, per diems, catering) will be managed directly by KIYO in coordination with the respective country offices.

## 8. Practicalities

- The logistical support in the countries for the consultant will be assumed by the receiving country office in collaboration with the partners (e.g.: organization of meeting venues, scheduling meetings with schools, organisations and youth).

## 9. Expected profile of the consultant

This evaluation must be carried out by a national/ local consultant (a team of two national consultants could be accepted provided that the available budget is respected).

### Required:

- Experience in the country concerned (i.e. Belgium)
- Minimum of 5 years of experience in evaluation
- Language proficiency (Belgium - Dutch)
- Excellent ability to write explicit, concrete and illustrated reports;

### Added value :

- Experience in at least one of the following fields: youth empowerment / youth organisations / education sector / gender / global citizenship / rights-based programming

## 10. Ethical code

The following ethical standard based on the United Nations assessment group<sup>1</sup> is applicable:

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation - ([www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102))

The final evaluation must be carried out according to the strictest requirements in terms of integrity and in accordance with the beliefs, customs and habits of the social and cultural environments in which it takes place; respecting human rights and gender equality; and in accordance with the "do no harm" principle. Evaluators must respect the right of individuals and institutions to provide information on a confidential basis and ensure that data classified as sensitive is protected and does not allow its source to be traced. They must also validate the declarations present in the reports with their authors. When they want to use personal information, evaluators must obtain the informed consent of the people concerned. When an offense or malfeasance is uncovered, this fact must be reported discreetly to the competent bodies (for example, <https://www.kiyo-ngo.be/fr/report-a-complaint>).

## 11. Tender procedures

The proposal submitted must contain a technical and financial component. However, they need to be submitted separately, in different documents.

### Technical proposal (not to exceed 6 pages)

The document should include at least the following elements:

- Comprehension of ToR
  - KIYO global strategies
  - Evaluation questions
  - Role of national consultant
  - Challenges / pitfalls / obstacles / facilitating factors
  - Application ethical code
- First outline methodology (e.g. process, tools, content, ...)
- Planning
- Profile consultant(s)
  - Experiences (CV)
  - Roles assigned, if two consultants
- List of references
  - Evaluation assignments
  - Theme related assignments

NB. Including a short description of the assignment and for at least three assignments a contact person.

- Example of evaluation report

### Financial proposal (Not to exceed 3 pages)

The document will clearly state the following:

- Consultancy fee
- Number of days per specified task, referring to the services and products requested, including the consultants involved if applicable
- Estimated logistical cost (e.g. local flights or transport, per diem or accommodation and restauration cost)
- Material needed

Deadline for submission: Monday, February 2, 2026

To be submitted to the following persons:

- Michiel De Baere, Team coördinator Belgium  
[michiel.debaere@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:michiel.debaere@kiyo-ngo.be)
- Sandra Bootsma, Senior Trainer  
[Sandra.bootsma@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:Sandra.bootsma@kiyo-ngo.be)
- Pieter Thys, Programme Manager  
[pieter.thys@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:pieter.thys@kiyo-ngo.be)

Communication results of the selection process: at the latest, Monday February 9, 2026

Contacts for questions:

- Michiel De Baere Team coördinator Belgium  
[michiel.debaere@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:michiel.debaere@kiyo-ngo.be)
- Sandra Bootsma, Senior Trainer  
[Sandra.bootsma@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:Sandra.bootsma@kiyo-ngo.be)
- Pieter Thys, Programme Manager  
[pieter.thys@kiyo-ngo.be](mailto:pieter.thys@kiyo-ngo.be)

## 12. Evaluation matrix of the proposals

Criteria	Weight coefficient	Maximum score
Approach and methodology (including timing) (under this point is also appreciated the adequacy between expectations, deadlines and budget)	4	20 points
Experience of the proposed team related to evaluation practice and theory	4	20 points
Knowledge and experience of the proposed team related to the country / region context	2	10 points
Knowledge and experience of the proposed team regarding specifics of the project / programme (e.g. youth empowerment, employment, saving and credit, education, ...)	3	15 points
General quality of the proposal (structure, writing style, consistency, ...)	3	15 points
Total price	1	5 points
Average price per day	3	15 points
<b>Total</b>		<b>100 points</b>

## 13. Annexes

### 1. Standard outline evaluation report

These are minimum elements to be included in the final evaluation I reports.

Report should not exceed 35 pages (without annexes).

#### 1. Title and Front Page

- Title of the evaluation
- Outcome(s) covered
- Period of evaluation and report date
- Names and affiliations of the evaluator(s)
- Commissioning organisation
- Acknowledgements

#### 2. Table of Contents

- Including boxes, figures, tables, and annex references

#### 3. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

#### 4. Executive Summary (max. 4 pages)

- Purpose and scope of the evaluation
- Overview of methodology
- Key findings by DAC criteria
- Main conclusions
- Key lessons learned
- Principal recommendations (general and partner-specific)

#### 5. Introduction

- Purpose and context of the final evaluation
- Background on the Empowering Youth Together Globally programme
- Country and partner overview (brief summary)
- Intended users and utilisation of the evaluation findings

#### 6. Description of the Intervention

- Overview of the country programme evaluated (objectives, key results, partners, approaches)
- Implementation context and any relevant changes since the mid-term evaluation

#### 7. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Questions

- Justification for the evaluation
- Evaluation objectives (accountability and learning)
- Evaluation questions aligned with OECD DAC criteria:
  - Relevance

- Coherence
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Sustainability
- Impact
- Cross-cutting themes (gender, environment)

## 8. Methodology

- Overall evaluation design and approach
- Data collection methods and tools (document review, interviews, focus groups, site visits)
- Sampling and selection criteria
- Triangulation and data validation
- Limitations and mitigation strategies
- Ethical considerations

## 9. Findings and Analysis

Structured by DAC criteria, integrating transversal themes where relevant:

- **Relevance**
- **Coherence**
- **Efficiency**
- **Effectiveness**
- **Sustainability**
- **Impact**
- **Gender and Environment**

## 10. Synthesis and Conclusions

- Overall assessment of programme performance and achievements
- Factors explaining success or limitations
- Reflection on the mutual/shared capacity development approach
- Key lessons emerging

## 11. Good Practices and Promising Approaches

- At least one case per outcome
- Short illustrative descriptions (what worked, why, and transferability)

## 12. Recommendations

- General recommendations (strategic and organisational level)
- Partner-specific recommendations
- Perspectives for future youth empowerment initiatives beyond KIYO

## 13. Lessons Learned

- Strategic
- Operational
- Partnership and collaboration management

## 14. Annexes

- Terms of Reference
- Data collection tools and analysis framework
- List of stakeholders consulted (people and organisations)
- Sites visited
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation matrix
- Photos or illustrative evidence (optional)

### 2. Documentation

The following documentation will be available for the consultant on request during the assignment (list is not exhaustive):

- Program documents
- Theory of change
- MEAL tools
- Annual partner reports
- Lessons learned and performance scores (DGD moral reporting)