



Funded by
the European Union

BRIDGE

Civil Society, Women,
and Youth Promoting
Culture of Peace in
Mindanao, Philippines



BRIDGE: Civil Society, Women, and Youth Promoting Culture of Peace in Mindanao, Philippines

Terms of Reference (ToR) External Evaluation

I. Background

CARE International (CI) is one of the world's largest humanitarian and development organizations, operating in over 100 countries through its 20 Members, Candidates, and Affiliates. With over 75 years of experience, CARE is committed to saving lives, defeating poverty, and achieving social justice.

CARE's vision is a world of hope, inclusion, and dignity, where poverty has been eradicated and all people live in security. Gender equality, diversity, and inclusion are at the heart of CARE's work—because lasting change requires equal rights and opportunities for all.

In the Philippines, CARE has been operating since 1945, working in partnership with local and international organizations to implement programs in Development, Humanitarian Response, Resilience, Peacebuilding, and Emergency Preparedness. Among these, the BRIDGE Project represents CARE's flagship peacebuilding initiative in the country.

Project Overview

The BRIDGE Project (*Civil Society, Women, and Youth Promoting Culture of Peace in Mindanao, Philippines*) is funded by the European Commission (EU) and has been implemented since February 1, 2023 until 30 April 2026 across the municipalities of San Luis (Agusan del Sur), Buenavista (Agusan del Norte), Ampatuan and South Upi (Maguindanao del Sur), Bagumbayan (Sultan Kudarat), and the provinces of Basilan, Sulu, and Tawi-Tawi.

BRIDGE is situated within the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus framework, with strong emphasis on localization and conflict sensitivity. The project aims to reduce the drivers of chronic conflict and violence in Moro and Lumad communities in Mindanao through strengthened capacities of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and enhanced participation of youth and women in peacebuilding processes. The project is implemented through a consortium led by CARE Philippines, in partnership with ACCORD, COM, and Oxfam, who work collaboratively and directly with local CSOs and community-based organizations responsible for executing peacebuilding initiatives on the ground.

Project target groups:

The Action intends to directly reach 4,240 conflict-affected Moro and Lumad individuals, particularly vulnerable households with intersecting identities. The project primarily targets women, and youth; members of formal and informal civil society organizations; community-based organizations; indigenous elders and councils; Muslim religious leaders (MRLs); teaching and non-teaching personnel; and education authorities.

Through policy-advocacy activities, increased meaningful participation and decision-making of women and youth CSOs, and conduct of cultural peacebuilding events, the Action intends to benefit at least **4,240 individuals**. Through partnering with local government units' and government agencies' public communication, visibility, and information platforms, the Action intends to publicly engage / build impression to up to 173,690 individuals.



Project Outcomes: The project is structured around three interlinked key outcomes:

Outcome 1: Capacity Building. Build capacities to participate, lobby, and campaign for peacebuilding. – *Strengthen the capacities of CSOs and implementing partners (IPs) to participate, lobby, and campaign for peacebuilding, while enhancing their organizational, technical, and conflict transformation skills to effectively design and implement local peacebuilding projects.*

Outcome 2: Peace-Culture Promotion. Document and preserve cultural peacebuilding expressions and narrative. – *Support IPs to engage youth and women in dialogue, civic engagement, and community peace initiatives using arts, storytelling, and traditional practices that promote tolerance, inclusion, and non-violence.*

Outcome 3: Peace Education. Contextualization of peace education and integration in school curriculum. – *Promote contextualized peace education through integration of peace values, non-violence, and conflict resolution into school curricula and community learning systems, supported by IP-led education programs and collaboration with education authorities.*

II. Purpose, Objectives and Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

As the project approaches its final phase, CARE Philippines, through the BRIDGE Consortium, seeks to conduct an External Evaluation to assess the performance, results, and sustainability of the project against the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

Objective 1: Assess the Relevance of the Project Design and Interventions

- Assess the extent to which the project’s objectives, strategies, and activities respond to the needs, priorities, and peacebuilding contexts of Indigenous Peoples population, target participants and communities.
- Describe the extent to how gender and inclusion were integrated and highlighted throughout the project cycle.

Objective 2: Evaluate the Effectiveness of Project Implementation

- Determine the extent to which the project achieved its intended objectives, outcomes, and capacity-building targets for IPs, including strengthening their capacities to (i) design and implement peacebuilding initiatives, and (ii) effectively engage and participate in decision-making and governance processes related to peacebuilding with relevant regional and local government actors and other state institutions.
- Identify factors that facilitated or constrained effective delivery and achievement of results.

Objective 3: Assess the Efficiency of Project Implementation

- Analyze how well resources (financial, human, and time) were used in implementing the project.
- Assess the efficiency of coordination mechanisms and management structures between the BRIDGE Project and participating communities.

Objective 4: Determine the Project’s Impact on Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion

- Assess the project’s contributions to promoting peace culture, community cohesion, strengthened local peace mechanisms, and shifts in engagement, relationships and power dynamics among stakeholders.
- Document significant or unintended (positive or negative) effects of the interventions at individual, institutional, and community levels.
- Capture community and stakeholder perceptions through the Community Score Card (CSC) to assess inclusivity, transparency, and accountability.
- Determine scope and reach through advocacy efforts through the intervention.

Objective 5: Assess the Sustainability and Lessons for Future Programming

- How well were exit and sustainability considerations integrated into project design, prioritized activities, and implementation strategies at the outset (i.e., from day one), rather than as an



- afterthought or raised as discussion and handover point with local actors only at project end?
- Evaluate the likelihood that project results, strengthened capacities, and partnerships will be sustained beyond the project period.
- Identify enabling or constraining factors affecting the continuation of IP-led peacebuilding initiatives.
- Draw lessons learned, good practices, and strategic recommendations to inform future peacebuilding and capacity development interventions.

Objective 6: Assess the Coherence of Project Design and Implementation

- Examine the consistency and alignment of the of project objectives, strategies, and activities.
- Assess the integration of project interventions into national, local, and sectoral policies and peacebuilding initiatives for Indigenous Peoples, with development priorities, peacebuilding needs, and local contexts of Caraga, BARMM, and SOCSKSARGEN.
- Review the project’s alignment with national and local peacebuilding and education frameworks, ensuring that regional distinctions are critically examined and that peacebuilding is evaluated in relation to each area’s specific socio-political and historical context.
- Identify overlaps, gaps, or complementarities with other initiatives and determine how project components reinforce each other to achieve intended outcomes.

III. Evaluation Scope and Methodology

a. Scope and limitations

The evaluation will cover:

Project Duration: February 01, 2023 to April 30, 2026

Geographic Coverage:

Mainland areas:

- San Luis, Agusan del Sur
- Buenavista, Agusan del Norte
- Ampatuan and South Upi, Maguindanao del Sur
- Bagumbayan, Sultan Kudarat

Island areas:

- Talipao, Sulu

Participants and Sampling

Purposive sampling will be used to ensure diversity among target participants — considering factors such as type, size, and geographic location — as well as representation of gender, age, and persons with disabilities, as well as other social groups in community feedback. This will enable disaggregated analysis and ensure that the perspectives of women, men, youth, older persons, and persons with disabilities are systematically captured. Participants will include project staff, CSOs, community members, local authorities, educators, youth and women’s groups, and project staff.

Some respondents may represent more than one category, as they were actively involved from the beginning to the end of the project. As a result, overlaps in representation are possible.

Respondent Category	Sample Size	Sampling Rationale/ Note
Project Staff	10 project staff from consortium partners	National and local-level project staff, including project managers, technical/ project officers, and MEAL staff
Civil Society	10 per municipality	CSO representatives that participated in



Respondent Category	Sample Size	Sampling Rationale/ Note
Organizations		project-supported capacity-building and training activities and applied acquired knowledge or skills within their respective organizations or communities.
Community Members	30-35 per municipality	Individuals from diverse backgrounds, including men, women, older persons, youth, persons with disabilities, and marginalized groups, who have directly or indirectly engaged with the project. This may include participants in project-supported trainings, community-based activities, awareness-raising initiatives, and school-related programs implemented or supported under by the project.
Local Authorities	8 per municipality	Municipal/ barangay officials involved in the project oversight and coordination.
Educators	10 per province	School principals, teachers, facilitators, and Indigenous Peoples educators who participated in or supported project-related education and school-based activities, including the delivery of cultural appropriate and inclusive learning approaches within formal and non-formal education settings.
Women's groups	12 per municipality	Members of local women's associations and empowerment initiatives.
Youth's groups	8 per municipality	Members of local youth associations or youth committees.
Indigenous Peoples/ Tribal Leaders	5 per municipality	Indigenous Peoples or tribal leaders who supported, advised, or facilitated project activities within their communities, including engagement in planning, mobilization, or community coordination.
Other Stakeholders	5 per municipality	Volunteers, local service providers, or relevant government stakeholders such as NCIP and other relevant local government agencies involved in policy, coordination, or oversight related to the project.

Limitations

Potential limitations such as time constraints, accessibility of sites, or availability of baseline data will be acknowledged. Mitigation strategies—such as triangulation, use of secondary data, and virtual interviews—will be applied to minimize their impact on the quality of findings.

Ethical Standards, Safeguarding, Data protection, Ownership, and Quality Assurance

All evaluation activities will adhere to CARE's ethical standards, safeguarding policies, and the do-no-harm principle, while complying with national protection and data privacy regulations. Particular attention will be given to engaging women, children, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and other vulnerable groups in ways that are safe, respectful, and inclusive. The evaluation team will undergo safeguarding orientation and ensure informed



consent or assent is obtained from all participants. Confidentiality and anonymity will be strictly maintained especially in sensitive discussions, and culturally appropriate, gender-sensitive, and disability-inclusive approaches will be applied. Clear referral pathways will be established for safeguarding concerns, including disclosures of abuse, exploitation, or misconduct.

All data collected will be treated as confidential and managed in line with CARE's data protection standards and applicable laws. Quantitative datasets will be anonymized and securely stored, while qualitative data will be anonymized unless explicit consent is provided. Ownership of all reports, datasets, tools, and analytical products will remain with CARE Philippines and the BRIDGE Consortium, and evaluators may not use or disseminate outputs without prior written consent.

Quality assurance will be embedded throughout the evaluation to ensure consistency, credibility, and usability of findings. This will include review and approval of the inception report and tools, technical oversight by the designated CARE and consortium technical reviewers, validation of findings through stakeholder consultations, and transparent documentation of assumptions, limitations, and methodological constraints. All processes will align with CARE's evaluation standards, ensuring accountability, inclusivity, and methodological integrity.

b. Methodology

The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods and participatory approach combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.

Data Collection Methods

- **Document Review:** Analysis of project documents, reports, MEAL data, and policy frameworks to assess alignment, performance, and contextual relevance, including attention to inclusive and equitable outcomes.
- **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** Conducted with consortium members, government officials, youth, women, and community representatives to gather insights on relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Participation will be inclusive, ensuring voices are captured across gender, age, and disability status.
- **Surveys/Questionnaires:** Used to collect quantitative data on efficiency, satisfaction, and perceived outcomes. Data will be disaggregated by gender, age, and disability where feasible to enable differentiated analysis.
- **Participatory Tools:** The Community Score Card (CSC) and Outcome Harvesting/Most Significant Change (MSC) methods will capture community perceptions, accountability, and significant peacebuilding results.
- **Advocacy Impact and Influencing Reporting (AIIR) Tool** will also be used to assess the significance of the outcomes, the level of contribution of CARE and its partners, the resulting impact (including who stands to benefit from the change), and the evidence supporting these outcomes, considering differences across gender, age, and disability status.
- **Learning and Validation:** Organized with stakeholders to review findings, confirm lessons learned, and develop actionable recommendations for future programming. Sessions will ensure inclusive representation to reflect diverse perspectives from all relevant groups.



c. Project Indicators

Table 1. Project Participants Reached across Geographical Areas

Project Outcomes/ Outputs/ Activity Indicators	Geographical Location	Total Individuals Reached
Outcome 1: Supported and capacitated CSOs, and Moro and Lumad youth and women's groups to participate, lobby, and campaign for gender-sensitive and inclusive cultural peacebuilding actions and partnerships in triple-nexus spaces		
1.1 Number of trained or supported entities acting to prevent conflict and build peace		
1.2 The intervention was successful in promoting the empowerment of women and girls.		
Output 1: Capacity strengthening and organising of CSOs and community-based Moro and lumad youth and women's groups on gender-sensitive and inclusive cultural peacebuilding, conflict-sensitive humanitarian actions and social accountability mechanisms, and networking in advocacy spaces		
1.1 A stakeholder analysis, highlighting the differences between and among different groups.		
1.2 A gender analysis, highlighting the differences between and among women and men, girls and boys in terms of their relative distribution of resources, opportunities, constraints and power in a given context, was done.		
1.3 Number of peace committees/ structures formed / enhanced.		
1.4 Number of entities trained on conflict-sensitive humanitarian actions, and social accountability mechanisms		
1.5 % of women among mediators, negotiators and technical experts engaged in the intervention.		
1.6 The dimensions on age and diversity were included as well.		
Activity 1.1.1 Conduct a culture and gender-sensitive conflict and resilience analysis on voice and leadership, gender, and power – including capacity gaps among CSOs	CARAGA, BARMM, BASULTA, SOCCSKSARGEN.	492
Activity 1.1.2 Form and build capacity of existing CSOs, community-based youth IDPs and women support groups on culture- and gender-sensitive peacebuilding activities, conflict-sensitive humanitarian actions and social accountability mechanisms, and networking and partnerships	CARAGA, BARMM, BASULTA, SOCCSKSARGEN.	1,165
Activity 1.1.3 Support CSOs, youth and women's groups in voicing out their aspirations and needs and representing their agenda for peace and development through innovative peace-promoting campaigns and mainstreaming gender-, cultural- and religious-sensitive policies	CARAGA, BARMM, BASULTA, SOCCSKSARGEN.	1,326
Outcome 2: Enabled CSOs, and Moro and Lumad youth and women's groups to document positive peace narratives and preserve cultural peacebuilding expressions and practices within community structures and in advocacy spaces		
2.1 Number of civil society organisations engaging in the formal or informal peace architecture		
2.2 The intervention was implemented using a conflict sensitive – do no harm approach.		
2.3 The intervention envisages information sharing and coordination with (other) multilateral institutions.		
2.4 The action foresees cooperation, complementarity and/or synergies with other multilateral institutions' initiatives.		
Output 2.1: Facilitating and documenting cultural peacebuilding narratives, active practice of peace-promoting expressions, traditions, beliefs, customs, and art forms		
2.1 Number of advocacy initiatives targeting peace and security policy makers and service providers		
2.2 Number of consultations, coordination meetings and joint actions with other institutions realise		
Activity 2.1.1 Map and document existing cultural / peacebuilding spaces (informal / formal), beliefs, customs, traditions, and practices among youth groups, women leaders, IP councils and elders, religious leaders, civil society actors, etc	CARAGA, BARMM, BASULTA, SOCCSKSARGEN.	332
Activity 2.1.2 Conduct peace-promoting cultural activities, community dialogues, and peace narrative-building among youth and women groups, IP councils and elders, religious leaders, parents, and teachers, and CSOs	CARAGA, BARMM, SOCCSKSARGEN.	2,155
Activity 2.1.3 Produce positive and peace-promoting narratives, case stories, learning briefs, knowledge products, and multimedia collaterals from interactions with various stakeholders addressing misinformation	BARMM	7
Activity 2.1.4 Hold cultural and peace dialogues and create an audience composed of peace champions / Internally Displaced People (IDP) and transitional justice legislation advocates and peace process actors	CARAGA, BARMM, BASULTA, SOCCSKSARGEN.	551
Outcome 3: Improved understanding and recognition of conflict drivers and injustices among conflict-affected Moro and Lumad communities through the contextualisation of peace education in formal and non-formal education curricula		
3.1 Alignment of the intervention with the correct understanding of the conflict situation.		
3.2 A gender perspective was mainstreamed throughout the implementation of the intervention.		
Output 3.1: Contextualising gender and culture in peace education activities and tools, through the engagement of education personnel and lumad and Moro women and youth groups, community members, in complementation with existing cultural structures		
3.1 No. of learning tools/modules integrating positive peace promoting narratives.		
3.2 % of women among mediators, negotiators and technical experts engaged in the intervention.		
Activity 3.1.1 Assess teaching personnel, volunteer community educators and parents' capacities in culture- and gender-sensitive peace education, consult, and secure buy-in with stakeholders in the education sector	CARAGA	107



Project Outcomes/ Outputs/ Activity Indicators	Geographical Location	Total Individuals Reached
Activity 3.1.2 Train teaching personnel in delivering child-friendly peace education activities in formal and non-formal schools, and develop or enhance learning tools through the contextualization of culture and gender	CARAGA, BARMM, SOCCSKSARGEN.	266
Activity 3.1.3 Conduct peace education activities in formal and non-formal schools in complementation with community-level peacebuilding activities	BARMM	622

d. Evaluation Design and Data Collection

As an essential component of the external evaluation, the consultant's bid will include a comprehensive evaluation design and detailed data collection procedures.

IV. Key Evaluation Questions

Objective 1: Relevance – Assess the alignment of project design and interventions with the needs and priorities of IPs and target communities

1. How relevant were the project's objectives and strategies to the context and needs of IPs and target communities?
2. To what extent does the project respond to the needs and priorities of Lumad, Moro, and non-Moro IP communities, and conflict-affected areas? (SO.1)
3. How has the project deepened participants' understanding of the local context, including issues of conflict, violence, and poverty? (KRI 3.1)
4. Were the selected IPs appropriate partners to achieve project objectives?
5. To what extent did the project consider the needs, capacities, and vulnerabilities of women and girls, and other vulnerable population throughout the design, implementation and MEAL activities?
6. How do IPs and communities perceive the relevance, quality, and inclusiveness of project support? (CSC)
 - a. To what extent do the changes or effects of an intervention satisfy (or not) stakeholders' needs?
 - b. How does the degree of satisfaction vary across different stakeholder groups?
7. How has the project design and interventions addressed nuanced, gendered local conflict and peacebuilding contexts across IP communities in all regions?
8. To what extent were conflict sensitivity and Do No Harm principles integrated into the project design and implementation across different regional contexts?
9. To what extent did the project consider environmental sustainability and climate-related risks within local conflict and peacebuilding contexts?

Objective 2: Effectiveness – Evaluate the extent to which the project achieved its intended results and strengthened capacities

1. How have IPs improved in peacebuilding, project management, and community engagement?
2. How effectively has the project strengthened IPs' capacity in peacebuilding and conflict transformation?
3. What capacities were developed and improved through the project among women and young people?
4. How effective were peace culture and peace education interventions in changing attitudes and behaviors?
5. How effectively has the project promoted the empowerment of women and youth and facilitated inclusion in decision-making and access to opportunities? (KRI 1.2)
6. How have project actions enabled IP communities to embed their peacebuilding frameworks and narratives into coordination and advocacy, and what influence have these had on other actors? (KRI 2.3)
7. How effective were the consortium's coordination and technical support mechanisms?
8. How do IPs and communities rate the project's performance, inclusivity, and responsiveness?



(CSC)

9. How fairly are the various effects distributed across the different stakeholders, regions, genders, and social groups?
10. How effectively did the MEAL systems support implementation, including use of deeper analyses of local peacebuilding contexts for advocacy, and adaptive management to address gaps and improve strategies?

Objective 3: Efficiency – Assess how well resources and coordination mechanisms supported project implementation

1. How effective were the consortium’s coordination and technical support mechanisms in supporting implementation?
2. Were financial, human, and time resources utilized in a cost-effective and timely manner?
3. What factors facilitated or constrained the efficient use of resources and implementation processes?

Objective 4: Impact – Determine tangible changes in peace culture, social cohesion, and collaboration, and broader peacebuilding systems among communities

1. What tangible changes in peace culture, social cohesion, and community collaboration can be evidenced as contributions of the project?
2. In what ways has the project integrated a gender lens in promoting and facilitating a culture of peace, including Lumad and Moro development aspirations? (KRI 3.2)
3. How has the project contributed to strengthening community-led or traditional peace mechanisms and leadership structures? (KRI 2.4)
4. Are there examples of sustained local peace initiatives emerging from IP work?
5. What are the observable outcomes in social cohesion, collaboration, and peace culture within target communities?
6. Are there any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes resulting from the project?
7. How has the quality and level of engagement of IP communities influenced relationships, power dynamics, and peacebuilding practices among project actors, partner institutions, and other stakeholders?
8. How has the engagement with IP communities influenced formal and non-formal education practices, including frameworks, curricula, tools, and analyses used in peace education?
9. To what extent have the project interventions engaged with and strengthened the rights and entitlements of IP communities, considering region-specific legal frameworks (e.g., BAA 32 and 64¹ in BARMM, IPRA/ RA 8371² and relevant local policies in other regions)?
10. Who or what institutions/ groups were engaged by participating IP communities, and what tangible or intangible outcomes emerged from these engagements, including policy or program changes, resources shifts, changes in relationships and power dynamics and shifts in narratives or mental models?
11. What evidence is there of the project’s contribution to broader peacebuilding systems and drivers of conflict in Mindanao and across all covered regions, including strengthening local peace structure, customary governance, ancestral domain rights, and the roles of women and youth in peacebuilding?
12. What evidence is there that the project contributed to environmentally sustainable peacebuilding practices or reduced environment-related conflict drivers?

¹ In BARMM, the **Bangsamoro Autonomy Act No. 64 (Bangsamoro Indigenous Peoples’ Act of 2024)** recognizes and protects the rights of Indigenous Peoples, including ancestral domains, cultural practices, and self-governance, and strengthens institutional mechanisms such as the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs to support IP development and participation (Official Gazette of BARMM, 2025).

² At the national level, the **Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act (Republic Act No. 8371, 1997)** establishes the recognition, protection, and promotion of the rights of Indigenous Cultural Communities/Indigenous Peoples (ICCs/IPs), including ancestral domains, cultural integrity, customary laws, and the right to free, prior, and informed consent. It also establishes the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) to implement these rights (LawPhil, 1997).



Objective 5: Sustainability – Assess the likelihood of sustaining results, partnerships, and local ownership beyond the project period

1. How likely are IPs to continue implementing peacebuilding activities independently?
2. How has the project promoted cooperation, joint ownership, and synergy with government, CSOs, and local leadership initiatives? (SO.3)
3. To what extent have project partnerships and coordination mechanisms fostered long-term ownership and continuity of peacebuilding efforts?
4. How effectively has the project recognized and addressed risks faced by partner communities, including those affecting different genders, ages, and ethnic identities? (KRI 2.2)
5. What institutional linkages, policy influences, or networks have been established to sustain peacebuilding initiatives beyond the project period?
6. What opportunities exist for scaling up or institutionalizing successful project approaches?
7. What community-led recommendations and priority actions have emerged for improvement? (CSC)
8. What capacities were strengthened among IP communities to sustain institutions/ groups engagements and their outcomes beyond the project period?
9. How were monitoring and learning practices embedded into project capacity-building and sustainability strategies to support long-term outcomes?
10. To what extent were exit and sustainability strategies considered from the start and integrated into the project design and activities, rather than being treated only as a handover?
11. What sustainability options or strategies emerged through collaborative learning with project implementers, IP communities, and local partners, and how were these applied during implementation to strengthen local ownership and continuity?

Objective 6: Coherence – Assess the consistency and alignment of project design and implementation

1. How consistent are the project's objectives, strategies, and activities across different components?
2. To what extent do project activities reinforce each other to achieve overall goals?
3. How well did the project align with national, local, and sectoral peacebuilding and development policies and Indigenous Peoples priorities? To what extent was this alignment intentional, informed, and effectively acted during implementation?
4. Are there overlaps, gaps, or complementarities between the BRIDGE Project and other initiatives in the same communities or sectors?
5. How effectively do project components work together to deliver intended outcomes?
6. How have peacebuilding narratives and practices from participating IP communities been integrated into advocacy strategies, approaches, and outcomes, ensuring alignment across project components?

V. Intended Users and Use

The external evaluation is designed to serve multiple stakeholders associated with the BRIDGE Project, including CARE, project participants, and consortium partners—ACCORD, COM, and Oxfam Pilipinas. In addition, it will provide valuable insights for donors, local government units (LGUs), and community stakeholders engaged in project implementation and oversight.

The evaluation's findings and outputs will guide the successful closeout of the BRIDGE Project by:

- Supporting teams in finalizing remaining activities;
- Ensuring alignment with project quality standards and donor compliance requirements; and
- Providing evidence-based recommendations to strengthen results and accountability.

The external evaluation will generate comprehensive data and analysis to assess the overall achievements, effectiveness, and sustainability of the BRIDGE Project. It will capture lessons learned, good practices, and key challenges encountered during implementation, providing evidence to



demonstrate results and accountability to stakeholders and communities. The findings will also inform future programming in peacebuilding, development, and humanitarian response, supporting CARE and its partners in strengthening program design, delivery, and impact.

The evaluation will include a structured utilization and action planning process to ensure findings inform decision-making. This will include validation workshops with consortium partners and selected IP representatives, development of a management response and action plan, and integration of key recommendations into future programming and strategy development. The evaluation design will incorporate participatory learning approaches to enhance ownership and practical use of findings. Tailored and anonymized findings and recommendations from the external evaluation will also be captured in factsheets/evaluation briefs that will be distributed to key stakeholders mentioned above.

VI. Application Requirements

a. Qualifications and Experience

- Advanced degree in Peace and Conflict Studies, Development Studies, or a related field.
- At least 7 years of experience in evaluating peacebuilding, governance, or capacity-building projects.
- Proven expertise in participatory evaluation methodologies (especially Community Score Cards).
- Strong understanding of CSO capacity development, peace culture, and education programming.
- Excellent facilitation, communication, and analytical skills.
- Familiarity with the local peace and civil society context and fluency in *Tagalog and Bisaya* is an advantage.

VII. Roles, Responsibilities, and Timeline

b. Deliverables

1. Inception Report – Detailing methodology, tools (including CSC instruments), sampling plan, timeline, evaluation matrix and stakeholder analysis. This report must be submitted and formally approved before launching data collection.
2. Community Score Card Summary Report – Documenting scores, perceptions, and agreed action plans.
3. Datasets – Submit all cleaned and anonymized data collected for the evaluation with gender, age and disability disaggregation where possible, the final data used for analysis and reporting, and a clear data dictionary explaining each variable and each source.
4. Draft Evaluation Report – Including findings, analysis (including gender, age and disability considerations), and preliminary recommendations.
5. Validation Session – Presentation of findings to BRIDGE Project consortium, and key stakeholders for feedback.
6. Final Evaluation Report – Incorporating all feedback (maximum 40 pages, excluding annexes).
7. Evaluation Summary Briefs (2–3 pages each) – Highlighting key findings, lessons, and actionable recommendations targeting different stakeholders.

c. Duration and Timeline

The external evaluation will be from March to April 2026.

Activity	Deliverable	Timeframe
Contracting & Orientation	Kick-off meeting	Week 1
Inception Phase/Desk Review	Inception Report	Week 2
Fieldwork (including community score card)	Data collection	Weeks 3–5
Data Analysis & Draft Report	Draft report	Week 6



Validation Workshop	Presentation	Week 7
Finalization	Final report	Week 8

VIII. Management and Coordination

The External Evaluation will be jointly managed by CARE Philippines and CARE Netherlands, in close collaboration with the BRIDGE Consortium partners — ACCORD, COM, and Oxfam Pilipinas.

- Joint Oversight: CARE NL, CARE Philippines, and consortium partners will jointly review and approve the Terms of Reference (ToR), participate in the selection and hiring process of the external evaluator or evaluation firm, and review key deliverables (Inception Report, Draft Report, and Final Report).
- CARE Netherlands: As the contract holder with the European Commission (EU), CARE NL will provide strategic oversight, technical quality assurance, and final approval of all deliverables before submission to the donor.
- CARE Philippines will act as the lead coordinating agency for in-country management of the evaluation. This includes logistical arrangements, access to project documentation, coordination with implementing partners, and facilitation of fieldwork and validation workshops.
- Consortium Partners (ACCORD, COM, and Oxfam Pilipinas): Partners will support field-level coordination, ensure active participation of project participants and community stakeholders.
- CARE Philippines' MEAL Unit: Together with the BRIDGE Project Management Team, CARE Philippines' Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) Unit will serve as the primary point of contact for the evaluator, ensuring that evaluation activities adhere to CARE's quality and ethical standards.
- The evaluator or consulting firm will report directly to the HDRP Coordinator and MEAL Focal Point for CARE Philippines, with technical support and quality review from CARE NL, and regular coordination with consortium representatives.

IX. Budget, Payment Schedule, and Procedure

Payment Schedule:

- 20% upon approval of Inception Report
- 40% upon submission of Draft Evaluation Report
- 40% upon submission and approval of Final Evaluation Report

Application Procedure

Interested consultants or firms are invited to submit:

- Technical Proposal (max 10 pages) outlining understanding of the assignment, evaluation design and detailed data collection procedures, proposed methodology (including CSC process), [refined](#) evaluation questions, and work plan.
- Financial Proposal (with detailed budget).
- CV(s) of key personnel.
- Two examples of similar evaluation reports (preferably in peacebuilding or CSO capacity development).

Applications should be sent to: PHL.Procurement@care.org on or before **13 March 2026** with the subject line: "External Evaluation – BRIDGE Project".