# Corporate Accountability, Resilience and Participation for an Equitable Transition (CARPET) Project
# NDCI HR INTPA/2024/177407-1/42

## Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation

# 1. General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project title** | Corporate Accountability, Resilience and Participation for an Equitable Transition (CARPET) |
| **Partners** | Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (BHRRC UK)<br>Network of African National Human Rights Institutions (NANHRI)<br>Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia (YLBHI) |
| **Focus countries** | Indonesia, Kenya, Philippines, South Africa |
| **Project duration** | 1 January 2025 – 30 June 2028 |
| **Evaluation coverage period** | 1 January 2025 – 30 September 2026 |

## 1.1. Context

The global transition to a zero-carbon economy is accelerating, driven by rising demand for critical minerals, renewable energy infrastructure, and sustainable supply chains - with Africa and Asia at the centre of this shift. Kenya and South Africa offer strategic leverage for advancing business and human rights, supported by emerging policy frameworks and just transition initiatives, while Indonesia and the Philippines, as leading global suppliers of transition minerals, are pursuing ambitious industrial and energy strategies.

This rapid economic expansion, however, is unfolding in contexts of significant human rights risk. In Kenya and South Africa, communities face land, water, and livelihood pressures linked to mining and renewable energy expansion, alongside labour rights violations in agribusiness and textile export zones. In Indonesia and the Philippines, the weakening of local and Indigenous community participation has intensified conflicts over land and natural resources.

It is within this context of accelerating economic transition, persistent governance gaps, and growing regulatory leverage from Europe that the Corporate Accountability, Resilience and Participation for an Equitable Transition (CARPET) project was designed to strengthen corporate accountability and civil society participation across its four target countries: Kenya, South Africa, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

## 1.2. Project overview

The Corporate Accountability, Resilience and Participation for an Equitable Transition (CARPET) project is a 42-month action co-funded by the European Union under the NDICI–Global Europe Programme. The project is led by the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (BHRRC UK), in partnership with the Network of African National Human Rights Institutions (NANHRI) in Kenya and Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia (YLBHI) in Indonesia. Operating across Kenya, South Africa, Indonesia, and the Philippines, the CARPET project works at the intersection of green economic transition, corporate accountability, and human rights.

In response to the risks and opportunities outlined above, the CARPET project promotes corporate human rights and environmental due diligence (HREDD), strengthens civil society participation, and fosters accountable business practices and responsive governance. It adopts a human rights-based and bottom-up approach, placing affected communities (“rightsholders”) at the centre of decision-making processes. Particular attention is given to women, Indigenous Peoples, and environmental human rights defenders, who are disproportionately exposed to land dispossession, poor working conditions, environmental harm, and retaliation when raising concerns.

The **overarching objective** of the CARPET project is to support a transition to a green, rights-based economy in Africa and Asia, grounded in robust corporate human rights and environmental due diligence, shared prosperity, and fair negotiations. It focuses on **four high-risk sectors** that are central to green economic development and at the same time associated with significant human rights and environmental risks: critical minerals mining, renewable energy, textiles, and agribusiness.

The CARPET project seeks to achieve **three interlinked results**:

- **Result 1:** Strengthening affected rights-holders and civil society’s resilience and assertiveness to influence the design and delivery of green economic initiatives by governments and businesses.
- **Result 2:** Engaging key companies and investors operating in Asia and Africa to transform business practices and build trust-based relationships with rights-holders.
- **Result 3:** Influencing governments to commit to adopting and enforcing regulations, norms, and incentives that create a right-respecting business environment.

### 1.3. Results of previous evaluations

No prior external evaluation of the CARPET project has been conducted. This Mid-Term Evaluation will be the first comprehensive assessment of the project’s design and results. It will build on internal monitoring data (e.g., internal baseline assessment, project monitoring meetings (internal and with consortium partners), periodic progress reports, and the results framework with indicators) but will bring an external, objective perspective. The timing is intended to inform strategic adjustments for the final implementation phase and to ensure accountability to stakeholders.

## 2. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to support evidence-based decision-making during the remaining implementation period of the CARPET project. It will provide BHRRC, its implementing partners, the European Union and other relevant stakeholders with an independent assessment of whether the project remains relevant and is on track to achieve its intended outcomes, while identifying practical adjustments needed to strengthen implementation, learning and sustainability.

The evaluation will serve two complementary purposes:

- Learning and adaptive management: Generate evidence, lessons and practical recommendations to guide strategic and operational adjustments during the remaining implementation period.
- Accountability: Provide an independent assessment of implementation progress, emerging results and the use of resources against the approved action, work plan and results framework, taking account of any agreed adaptations.

The evaluation objectives are:

1. Assess the continued relevance and coherence of the project's intervention logic, assumptions, country and sector strategies, considering changes in context and the priorities of affected rights-holders and other stakeholders.
2. Assess progress towards intended outputs and outcomes and examine the project's credible contribution to observed or emerging changes.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the project's principal strategies, including rights-holder and civil society support, advocacy, convening, engagement with companies, investors and policymakers, and collaboration between implementing partners.
4. Assess the efficiency and appropriateness of project management, coordination, resource allocation, partnership arrangements and monitoring, evaluation and learning systems.
5. Review the design, management and early implementation of the Financial Support to Third Parties component, including its emerging contribution and any measures needed to strengthen its effectiveness.
6. Assess how effectively human rights-based, gender-responsive, inclusive, participatory, safeguarding and do-no-harm principles are integrated across implementation.
7. Identify lessons, risks and adaptation needs and provide feasible, prioritised and actionable recommendations for the remaining implementation period and preparation for the final evaluation.

## 3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the period from **1 January 2025**, when the project began, to the agreed evaluation cut-off date of **30 September 2026**. It will examine implementation across Kenya, South Africa, Indonesia, and the Philippines, including relevant regional and cross-country work.

The assessment will focus on the project's four priority sectors:  critical minerals mining, renewable energy, textiles, and agribusiness and will consider the perspectives and experiences of key stakeholder groups, including rights-holders, workers, communities, human rights defenders, civil society actors, national human rights institutions, partner staff, policymakers, and, where appropriate, companies and investors engaged by the project.

In terms of results, the evaluation will review implementation progress, outputs, emerging outcomes, the project's contribution to wider change, the functioning of partnerships, and the quality of monitoring, learning, and adaptation systems. Throughout, the evaluation will apply a cross-cutting lens that considers gender, inclusion, intersectionality, do-no-harm, participation, and learning.

## 4. Evaluation criteria and key questions

The evaluation should apply the OECD DAC evaluation criteria in a proportionate way for a mid-term review, with particular attention to relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, emerging impact/contribution, and sustainability prospects. The evaluator should also apply a human rights and gender equality lens throughout the exercise. The following key evaluation questions are indicative; the evaluator may propose additional questions.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Relevance** | • To what extent do the project objectives, strategies, and target groups remain responsive to the priorities and realities of rights-holders, workers, communities, and civic actors in the four countries?<br>• How well does the intervention logic reflect the political economy and human rights risks of the four sectors?<br>• Have the context and assumptions changed significantly since design? |
| **Coherence** | • How well does the project complement and align with related national, regional, and international business and human rights efforts, including regulatory and advocacy processes?<br>• To what extent is the project complementary with other EU-funded or donor-funded interventions?<br>• How coherent are the different project components across the four countries and four sectors?<br>• To what extent has collaboration between the implementing partners created added value in the program? How could the collaborations be improved? |
| **Effectiveness** | • To what extent is the project on track to achieve its intended outcomes?<br>• What factors have facilitated or hindered progress toward achieving the intended outcomes?<br>• Which strategies appear most and least effective in strengthening rights-holder agency, influencing business practice, and shaping state commitments or policy processes?<br>• Are there early signs that rights-holders and civil society organizations increased their capacity to engage with governments and businesses on green economic initiatives? |
| **Efficiency** | • How well are time, funds, staffing, coordination arrangements, and partner roles being used to deliver results?<br>• Are the monitoring, reporting, and learning systems sufficient for tracking progress and informing decisions?<br>• Are there early signs that engagements are moving beyond dialogue toward concrete commitments and behaviour change? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Identify operational good practices, bottlenecks, and lessons to improve value for money during the remaining implementation period. |
| **Emerging impact/ contribution** | • What evidence exists of early or intermediate changes in behaviours, relationships, discourse, institutional practice, or policy that plausibly relate to project efforts?<br>• What contribution story is emerging?<br>• Are rights-holders reporting increased confidence and agency in engaging duty-bearers? |
| **Sustainability** | • What factors are likely to support or undermine the continuation, uptake, institutionalisation, or scaling of results beyond the project period?<br>• What risks threaten long-term results? |
| **Human rights, gender, and inclusion** | • How well does the project address power, participation, safety, voice, and differential effects across gender and other identities?<br>• Are ethical and protection considerations appropriately embedded in implementation? |

## 5. Expected evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluator is expected to propose a proportionate mixed-methods, contribution-oriented methodology capable of addressing the evaluation questions within the available timeframe and resources. This approach should recognize the complexity of the project's operating environment and seek to understand how the intervention contributes to observed changes rather than attempting to claim direct causality. Generally, the methodology should match as much as possible to guidance in the EU ROM Methodology handbook. The final methodology, evaluation matrix, sampling approach and data-collection tools will be agreed during the inception phase.

The methodology should also demonstrate sensitivity to variation across countries, sectors, and stakeholder groups, ensuring that analysis adequately reflects contextual differences and diverse perspectives. Data collection methods may include a combination of remote and in-person approaches, selected based on considerations of feasibility, accessibility, and, importantly, the safety of all participants. No international travel is foreseen in the evaluation exercise for environmental and sustainability reasons.

Furthermore, the evaluator should integrate strong ethical and safeguarding principles throughout the process, including ensuring confidentiality, securing informed consent, and applying a strict do-no-harm approach. Finally, the methodology should incorporate the appropriate use of interpreters and translators where needed and employ culturally and contextually sensitive methods to ensure meaningful and respectful engagement with all stakeholders.

At minimum, the methodology should include:

- An inception phase that refines evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, sampling logic, workplan, and tools.
- Desk review of project documentation, including the grant contract and annexes, project budget, approved logframe, baseline materials, progress reports, partner reports, monitoring data, relevant publications, and contextual documents.
- Primary data collection through a combination of key informant interviews, case studies, and/or other appropriate methods.
- Sampling that covers different countries, sectors, and stakeholder categories and explains inclusion/exclusion choices.
- Triangulation of qualitative and quantitative evidence.
- A clear explanation of limitations, assumptions, and confidence levels for findings.

## 6. Evaluation schedule

The evaluation will be conducted in several phases over a planned duration of **four months** from the start in **October 2026** to completion by **January 2027**. The timeline below outlines the main phases, key tasks, and deliverables, along with an indicative schedule:

| | Deliverable | Description | Indicative schedule |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inception report | Refined methodology, evaluation matrix, sampling plan, tools, workplan, ethics/protection approach, and document request list. | Within 15 working days of contract start |
| 2 | Debrief / emerging findings presentation | Presentation of emerging findings and issues for validation with the management group. | After primary data collection |
| 3 | Draft evaluation report | Clear findings, conclusions, lessons, and practical recommendations; executive summary included. | By 21 December 2026 |
| 4 | Validation workshop/ presentation | Facilitated discussion of draft findings and recommendations. | Shortly after draft report submission |
| 5 | Final evaluation report | Revised report addressing comments, plus annexes and final evidence references. | By 29 January 2027 |
| 6 | Final presentation/ summary products | PowerPoint and concise management summary. | By 29 January 2027 |

The evaluation team is expected to manage time efficiently. If unforeseen circumstances respondent availability issues require slight adjustments to the timeline, the evaluators should promptly communicate this. Any extension of deadlines would need approval, but given the need to inform ongoing project implementation, the intent is to complete within the stipulated period. All deliverables shall be submitted in English unless otherwise agreed. The final report should be concise and decision oriented. As a guide, the main report should preferably **not exceed 30-35 pages** excluding annexes.

The expected duration of the assignment is approximately **12 calendar weeks**. The indicative schedule below may be adjusted during contract negotiation.

| Milestone | Indicative timing |
|---|---|
| Contract signature and mobilisation | 30 September 2026 |
| Inception phase | 4-18 October 2026 |
| Desk review and tool finalisation | 18 October 2026 |
| Primary data collection | November 2026 |
| Analysis and debrief | 7-14 December 2026 |
| Draft report submission | 21 December 2026 |
| Final report and close-out | 29 January 2027 |

## 7. Fees, expenses and payment arrangements

The assignment will be contracted on a fixed-fee, deliverable-based basis. Tenderers should submit an all-inclusive financial proposal in Euros, indicating the total proposed price and providing a clear breakdown of:

- Expert days and daily rates by team member;
- Any applicable taxes; and
- Any other anticipated costs, including interpretation, translation or locally based data collection support.

The anticipated level of effort is approximately 30–35 expert days. Tenderers may propose a different allocation where this is clearly justified by the proposed methodology and team composition.

Payments will be made in instalments following BHRRC’s written acceptance of the agreed deliverables, according to a payment schedule to be finalised during contracting. Proposals will be assessed on technical quality, methodological feasibility and overall value for money. No international travel is anticipated. Any locally incurred data-collection or related costs must be clearly identified and included in the total financial proposal unless otherwise agreed in writing by BHRRC.

## 8. Management of the evaluation

The evaluation will be commissioned by BHRRC UK, on behalf of the CARPET project. Day-to-day coordination will be led by a designated evaluation manager or focal point. The following governance arrangements are proposed:

- A small management group to handle contract management, document access, logistics, comments consolidation, and sign-off.
- A technical reference group, if needed, to support factual clarification and validation of feasibility of recommendations.

- The evaluator will remain independent in the formulation of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
- All requests for interviews, country access, and document sharing will be channelled through the agreed focal point unless otherwise agreed.

## 9. Required expertise of the evaluation team

The tenderer should propose a team with a strong mix of evaluation and subject-matter expertise. At minimum, the team should demonstrate:

- Proven experience leading external evaluations of multi-country development or human rights programmes;
- Strong knowledge of OECD DAC evaluation criteria and mixed-method evaluation design;
- Demonstrable expertise in business and human rights, corporate accountability, human rights due diligence, civic space, labour/community rights, and/or just transition issues;
- Experience working in Africa and Asia, preferably including one or more of the target countries;
- Experience working with human rights based CSOs;
- Capacity to conduct politically and ethically sensitive research involving rights-holders and civil society actors;
- Strong analytical and report-writing skills in English;
- Gender, inclusion, and safeguarding competence.

## 10. Annexes

The following documents and resources will be provided to the evaluation team at the start of the assignment, to support the desk review and planning:

- Original project proposal and logframe/results framework (with baseline values and targets for all indicators).
- Progress reports (narrative and financial) submitted to the donor to date.
- Minutes or reports from key project events.
- Publications produced by the project.
- M&E tools.
- Any prior research or context analyses done during project design that are relevant.