

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Integrated Security Resources Hub (ISRH) Project Phase II 2nd Annual Evaluation (January 2025 – February 2026)

18 Office Park Lt. 15C-D
Jl. T.B. Simatupang No. 18
Kebagusan - Pasar Minggu
Jakarta 12520
Telp. +62 (21) 2270-1427
Fax. +62 (21) 2278-3970

Email: public@tifafoundation.id
www.tifafoundation.id

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	INTRODUCTION	2
	ISRH Project Phase II	2
	The Integrated Security Service Providers Network (Jaringan Penyedia Layanan Keamanan Integral).....	2
	JPLKI Initiatives: Provision of the Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF).....	3
B.	EVALUATION OBJECTIVE	3
	Specific Objectives	3
C.	SCOPE OF EVALUATION	4
D.	METHODOLOGY & APPROACH	5
	Methodology.....	5
	Components of Methodology	5
	Analysis and Reporting	6
	Evaluation Criteria	6
	Deliverables for the Annual Evaluation	7
E.	CONTRACT FLOW & REPORTING STRUCTURE	8
	Contract Flow	8
	Payment Terms & Conditions.....	8
	Evaluator Contract Terms	9
	Evaluation Principles	9
	Reporting.....	9
	Annual Evaluation Report Format	9
F.	Qualification & Proposal Submission	10
	Evaluator Qualification	10
	Budget.....	10
	Proposal Submission.....	11

A. INTRODUCTION

ISRH Project Phase II

The **Integrated Security Resources Hub Project (ISRH) – Phase II** is a two-and-a-half-year initiative (late 2023–June 2026) aimed at strengthening and operationalising a network of service provider organisations to protect Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs) in Indonesia. Building on the foundation laid in Phase I, this phase addresses gaps in service delivery and enhances service providers' capacity to offer comprehensive protection to Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defender (EHRDs) facing threats and attacks, while advocating for human rights and environmental protection. Additionally, the project seeks to bolster the resilience of civil society organisations amidst Indonesia's shrinking civic space and democratic decline.

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

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

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

These core strategies formulated an integrated approach that ensures HRDs receive timely, robust, and effective protection, enabling them to continue their critical work in promoting human rights and environmental justice. This approach establishes a collaborative network, the Integrated Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI) and a support funding mechanism, the Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF).

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

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

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

The network operates with a flexible structure, avoiding formal institutionalisation. Instead, it utilises a **Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)** as a binding mechanism to foster collaboration and coordination among its members, ensuring effective and adaptable protection for HRDs and EHRDs. After the network's second year of operation, several adjustments and improvements to governance and service delivery have been made, which will be the subject of reflection and evaluation.

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

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

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

Since its launch in April 2024, the FRF has prioritised the Responsive Fund to address the urgent needs of EHRDs, particularly during the heightened risks associated with the election and local elections. In 2025, the Capacity Building Fund was utilised to support 7 local organisations, as the focus remains on mitigating violence during this critical period. Thus far, the Flexible Responsive Fund has processed around 50 applications (including the capacity-building fund) and provided assistance to around 300 individuals across Indonesia through 2025. The Central Region has emerged as the area with the highest number of applicants and recipients, largely due to conflicts tied to national strategic projects such as mining, geothermal development, and agrarian disputes related to palm oil plantations.

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

B. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

The primary objective of the 2025 annual evaluation for the **Integrated Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the network's initiatives and activities during the reporting period. This evaluation aims to provide an evidence-based understanding of progress toward achieving JPLKI's goals of offering comprehensive protection for HRDs and EHRDs, addressing gaps in service delivery, and enhancing the resilience of civil society organisations in Indonesia in the second year of JPLKI. The second annual evaluation also seeks to identify lessons learned and generate actionable recommendations to inform and strengthen the implementation of the network's strategies in the upcoming period.

Specific Objectives

- 1. Evaluate the Functionality and Impact of the Responsive Fund**

The evaluation will focus on analysing the utilisation of the Responsive Fund, including the emergency and follow-up handling schemes, in providing timely and effective support to HRDs and EHRDs facing violence, threats, or criminalisation. The evaluation will assess the fund's adequacy, accessibility, and impact in mitigating risks and supporting beneficiaries during crises in 2025.
- 2. Assess the Progress in Building Network Capacity**

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the network has developed its internal capacity to provide integrated and efficient services, including collaboration among service provider organisations in physical security, digital security, legal aid, psychosocial support, emergency fund provision, and research and advocacy. Attention will be paid to the utilisation of the Capacity Building Fund and its impact on local organisations during 2025.
- 3. Analyse Governance and Coordination Effectiveness**

The evaluation will review the effectiveness of the network's governance structure, including the role of the Steering Committee, Network Assembly, and National Secretariat in fostering collaboration, ensuring

accountability, and streamlining decision-making. This evaluation will also examine the operational efficiency and transparency of the fund's governance mechanisms following the evaluation and improvements made during 2025.

4. **Identify Regional Disparities and Emerging Needs**

The evaluation will investigate regional variations in the application and impact of JPLKI's services during 2025, identifying specific challenges and needs, particularly in regions with heightened conflict, such as those linked to national strategic projects or agrarian disputes.

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

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

6. **Generate Recommendations for Future Action**

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

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

C. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The second annual evaluation of the **Integrated Security Service Provider Network (JPLKI)** will focus on the network's implementation, outcomes, and processes in the second year following JPLKI's establishment (January 2025 to February 2026). The evaluation will cover the following key aspects:

1. **Geographic Coverage:** The evaluation will examine the network's activities and impact across different regions of Indonesia, with particular attention to high-conflict areas such as regions affected by national strategic projects (e.g., mining, geothermal development, and agrarian conflicts), including South Papua, Southeast Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, Jambi, and Central Kalimantan. It will identify regional disparities in service delivery and assess the adequacy of support provided to Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) and Environmental Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs).
2. **Timeframe:** The evaluation will review activities conducted from the second year since the establishment of JPKI in **January 2025 to February 2026**, focusing on the effectiveness and timeliness of key initiatives, such as the Responsive Fund and governance mechanisms.
3. **Thematic Areas:** The evaluation will encompass all six service clusters provided by the network: Physical security, Digital security, Emergency fund provision, Legal aid, Psychosocial support, and Research and advocacy. It will also assess cross-cutting themes such as gender equality, diversity, inclusion, and the application of human rights principles in service delivery.
4. **Governance and Institutional Structure:** The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the governance structure, including the roles and contributions of the Steering Committee, Network Assembly, and National Secretariat. This includes reviewing decision-making processes, coordination mechanisms, and the administration of the Flexible Responsive Fund.
5. **Fund Utilisation and Impact:** **The evaluation will analyse the utilisation of the Responsive Fund**, focusing on its accessibility, efficiency, and impact in providing emergency and follow-up handling support to HRDs and EHRDs. In addition, this evaluation will assess progress in implementing the Capacity Building Fund during the initial phase and its alignment with the network's long-term goals.
6. **Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration:** The evaluation will review the network's ability to foster collaboration among its 23 member organisations and their integration into local, national, and international protection ecosystems. It will also examine stakeholders' participation, including service recipients, in decision-making and feedback mechanisms.

7. **Outcomes and Results:** The evaluation will measure the progress made toward achieving the network's objectives, including the establishment of a comprehensive protection system, enhancement of service delivery mechanisms, and strengthening of civil society resilience in Indonesia's shrinking civic space.
8. **Barriers, Challenges, and Opportunities:** The evaluation will identify key challenges faced during implementation, including legal, operational, or contextual barriers. It will also explore opportunities to scale up initiatives, enhance sustainability, and integrate lessons learned.
9. **Alignment with Regional and Global Networks:** The evaluation will assess the network's progress in establishing meaningful connections with regional and global networks, evaluating how these collaborations enhance protection efforts for HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia.
10. **Evaluation Methodology:** The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. It will include desk reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys with network members, HRDs/EHRDs, and other stakeholders.

D. METHODOLOGY & APPROACH

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

Methodology

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

Components of Methodology

1. **Desk Review:** Comprehensive analysis of project documents, reports, governance frameworks, policy papers, and other relevant materials. Includes the review of the Flexible Responsive Fund's documentation and service delivery processes.
2. **Key Informant Interviews (KII):** Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, including members of the Steering Committee, National Secretariat, service provider organisations, and fund recipients. Aims to gather insights on governance, fund utilisation, and overall network performance.
3. **Focus Group Discussions (FGD):** Interactive discussions with clusters of network members and beneficiaries to explore qualitative aspects of service delivery, collaboration, and challenges. Ensures diverse perspectives from across the six service clusters are included.
4. **Surveys:** Administered to HRDs and member organisations to collect quantitative data on service accessibility, responsiveness, and impact during the second year of JPLKI. Designed to be statistically representative, with a confidence level of at least 95% and a margin of error of 5%.
5. **Case Studies:** Development of detailed case studies to highlight specific instances of service delivery success or challenges that occurred in the second year of JPLKI (January 2025 to February 2026). Provides a deeper understanding of the impact of network interventions in different regional and contextual settings.
6. **Workshops:**
 - **Inception Workshop:** Conducted at the start to finalise evaluation questions, methodologies, and tools with key stakeholders.

- **Validation Workshop:** Organised post-evaluation to present initial findings and gather feedback for refining conclusions and recommendations.

Analysis and Reporting

1. **Qualitative Analysis:** Thematic analysis of interviews, FGDs, and case studies to identify patterns, challenges, and opportunities.
2. **Quantitative Analysis:** Statistical analysis of survey data to measure trends, performance indicators, and beneficiary satisfaction.
3. **Comparative Analysis:** Cross-regional and cross-cluster comparisons to identify disparities and best practices.
4. **Outcome Mapping:** Assessment of progress toward the network's objectives using outcome mapping to capture tangible and intangible results.

Evaluation Criteria

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

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

1. Relevance

This criterion assesses whether JPLKI's objectives and activities address the needs and priorities of Environmental and Human Rights Defenders (EHRDs) and other stakeholders.

- To what extent do the network's goals and activities align with the needs of HRDs and EHRDs in Indonesia?
- How well did these initiatives respond to emerging threats, such as violence, digital attacks, or criminalisation during the second year (January 2025-February 2026) of JPLKI?
- Are the services and resources provided by JPLKI suitable for addressing regional and sectoral challenges?
- How relevant are the Flexible Responsive Fund (FRF) schemes (emergency fund and follow-up handling) to the immediate needs of beneficiaries?

2. Coherence

This criterion evaluates the integration and synergy of JPLKI's initiatives with other protection efforts at local, national, and international levels.

- How effectively did JPLKI coordinate with local, national, and international protection organisations during the second year (January 2025-February 2026)?
- To what extent do JPLKI's activities complement existing programs and policies for EHRDs?
- Are there duplications or gaps in services provided by JPLKI and other organisations?
- How well does JPLKI align with global standards and frameworks for HRD protection?

3. Effectiveness

This criterion examines the extent to which JPLKI achieves its objectives and delivers desired outcomes.

- Has the existence of JPLKI over the past two years improved the accessibility and quality of security services for HRDs and EHRDs?
- How effective is the Flexible Responsive Fund in addressing emergency needs and follow-up handling during the second year of JPLKI?

- To what extent has JPLKI enhanced collaboration and synergy among its 23 service provider organisations?
- How effective was the governance structure (Steering Committee, National Secretariat, and Network Assembly) in facilitating decision-making and implementation during the second year (January 2025 - February 2026)?
- Are JPLKI's services addressing both physical and digital threats comprehensively?

4. Efficiency

This criterion evaluates how well resources (funds, time, and human capital) are utilised to achieve results.

- Has the Flexible Responsive Fund governance mechanism been efficient by 2025 in ensuring timely disbursement and ensuring impact??
- How effectively does the National Secretariat coordinate administrative and operational tasks?
- Are network resources (human, financial, and organisational) used optimally to achieve objectives?
- Could alternative approaches or methodologies improve cost-effectiveness or service delivery?

5. Impact

This criterion focuses on the long-term effects and changes resulting from JPLKI's initiatives.

- What concrete outcomes have been achieved for human rights defenders (HRDs) and environmental human rights defenders (EHRDs) as a result of JPLKI activities in the second year (January 2025 - February 2026)?
- How has the network contributed to reducing risks and increasing resilience for HRDs and EHRDs?
- What systemic changes (e.g., policy shifts, increased awareness, or strengthening of civil society) have been observed during the two years since JPLKI was formed?
- Are there unintended consequences, either positive or negative, of JPLKI's interventions?

6. Sustainability

This criterion assesses the likelihood of continued benefits from JPLKI's initiatives after the current project phase.

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

7. Cross-Cutting Issues

In addition to the six criteria, the evaluation will incorporate cross-cutting themes of **gender equality, diversity, inclusion, and human rights** to ensure a holistic and equitable assessment.

- How effectively does JPLKI integrate gender, diversity, and inclusion into its programs and services?
- Are the needs of vulnerable groups within HRDs and EHRDs adequately addressed?
- To what extent does JPLKI promote equity and human rights principles in its operations and governance?

Deliverables for the Annual Evaluation

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

1. **Inception Report:** A detailed plan outlining the evaluation's scope, methodology, and timeline. Includes proposed evaluation questions, criteria, tools, and any initial adjustments to the evaluation framework, subject to Tifa Foundation's approval.
2. **Data Collection Tools:** Finalised tools for surveys, interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and case studies. Includes sampling strategies and protocols to ensure comprehensive and reliable data collection.
3. **Preliminary Findings Report:** A brief document summarising key observations and emerging trends based on initial data analysis. Presented during a validation workshop to gather feedback from stakeholders and refine conclusions.
4. **Draft Evaluation Report:** A comprehensive report presenting the evaluation's findings, structured according to the agreed evaluation criteria: Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, and

Cross-cutting Issues. Includes an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT), as well as lessons learned and good practices.

5. **Validation Workshop:** A workshop to present and discuss the draft evaluation findings with stakeholders, including Tifa Foundation, network members, and beneficiaries. Provides a platform for feedback and refinement of the final report.
6. **Annual evaluation Report:** A polished and comprehensive document addressing all evaluation objectives and criteria.
7. **Case Studies and Good Practice Documentation:** In-depth case studies illustrating key challenges, successes, and innovations in JPLKI's initiatives. Highlighted examples of good practices to inform future project phases.
8. **Presentation to Donors:** A concise and visually engaging presentation summarising the evaluation findings, tailored for Tifa Foundation and its donors.
9. **Evaluation Tools Repository:** A collection of finalised data collection tools, templates, and guides used in the evaluation, to serve as resources for future evaluations.
10. **Evaluation Data Archive:** A well-organised archive of all primary data collected during the evaluation, ensuring transparency and accessibility for future reference.

E. CONTRACT FLOW & REPORTING STRUCTURE

Contract Flow

The evaluation process is expected to run for about one-half month, starting from 4 May – 9 June 2026, with the following flow design:

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	TIME FRAME	PIC	PAYMENT
Proposal calls and deadlines	16 Apr – 23 Apr 2026	Secretariat	
Proposals considered, shortlisting and follow-up	24 – 26 Apr 2026	Secretariat	
Evaluators invitation for Interview	27 – 28 Apr 2026	Secretariat	
Evaluator interview and final selection	29 – 30 Apr 2026	Secretariat	
Evaluator Contract Signing	4 May 2026	Secretariat	
Review of relevant program documents, reports, data, and development of a draft inception report	4 – 11 May 2026	Evaluator	Payment I: 40%
Inception Workshop: Meet with evaluators and agree on evaluation methodology, action plan, work schedule	13 May 2026	Evaluator and Secretariat	
Submission of Inception Report	13 May 2026	Evaluators	
Discussion of Inception Report	15 May 2026	Evaluator and Secretariat	
Data Collection and analysis of evaluation data	16 – 26 May 2026	Evaluator	
Submission of draft report to Secretariat	28 May 2026	Evaluator	Payment II: 40%
Secretariat's response to the draft report	29 May 2026	Secretariat	
Validation workshop: presentation of findings and evaluation results to Secretariat and stakeholders	2 June 2026	Evaluator, Secretariat, and stakeholders	
Report customisation based on feedback from the post-evaluation workshop	3 – 7 June 2026	Evaluator	
The final report was submitted to the Secretariat	9 June 2026	Evaluator	Payment III: 20%

Payment Terms & Conditions

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

- 40% of the total amount – submission of a preliminary report
- 40% of the total amount – submission of the first draft of the evaluation report

- 20% of the total amount – submission of final report, including all outputs and annexes

Evaluator Contract Terms

The agreed contract value includes all costs below:

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

Evaluation Principles

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

1. **Systematic Inquiry:** Evaluators must undertake thorough and systematic research that relies on concrete data.
2. **Competence:** Evaluators should consistently exhibit professional excellence and competency to all involved parties.
3. **Integrity:** Throughout the evaluation process, evaluators must uphold the highest levels of honesty and integrity.
4. **Respect and Privacy:** All individuals involved in the evaluation must be treated with utmost respect, ensuring their privacy, dignity, and integrity.
5. **Commitment to Public Welfare:** Evaluators should prioritise the interests of the public and take into account pertinent values during the evaluation.

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

Reporting

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

Guidelines for the Report:

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

Annual Evaluation Report Format

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

1. **Executive Summary** (max 3 pages): A condensed overview of the evaluation, highlighting key findings, conclusions, learnings, and recommendations. Given its prominence, this section should be clear, succinct, and encompass all pertinent details, as it garners the most attention from readers.
2. **Introduction** (max 3 pages): Provides details about the program, sets the context for the evaluation, outlines evaluation objectives, and presents the evaluation team, the evaluation process, and its limitations.

3. **Intervention and its Context** (max 5 pages): Describes the evaluated intervention, its objectives, structure, organization, and stakeholders. The section should also analyse the political, economic, and social shifts in the intervention area during the evaluation period, with a particular focus on the "Integrated Security" aspect.
4. **Methodology** (max 3 pages): Details the methodological approach, sampling details, and the tools used for data collection. It should also appraise the evaluation process.
5. **Analysis of Information Collected** (max 5 pages): Presents an analysis derived from primary and secondary sources of information, considering the evaluation criteria and questions set forth in the terms of reference.
6. **Evaluation Findings and Results** (max 30 pages): Offers evidence pertinent to the evaluation's specific questions. This evidence should be more than mere empirical data; it should encompass possible conclusions. This section should be closely tied to the information analysis segment and be founded on evidence-based arguments, opinions, and interpretations.
7. **Conclusion** (max 3 pages): Provides an evaluation of interventions and their results based on set evaluation criteria, performance standards, and policies.
8. **Learning** (max 3 pages): Highlights good practices or distinctive aspects from the conclusions, with an intent to extrapolate the gleaned insights to other interventions or a wider context.
9. **Recommendations** (max 4 pages): Offers practical, actionable, and prioritised suggestions to enhance the management of future programs or interventions. These recommendations can also guide the formulation of upcoming policies and strategies.
10. **Appendices**: Incorporates essential supplementary information used or generated for the evaluation. At a minimum, this section should include:
 - Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - Proposed work, encompassing methodology and tools.
 - A list of participants in the evaluation activities.
 - Collected data.
 - Evaluation tools created.
 - A technical appendix related to methodological assessment.
 - A report on the "Good Practices of the ISRH Project Phase II."

F. Qualification & Proposal Submission

Evaluator Qualification

The Secretariat seeks a highly qualified team of evaluators to conduct the 2025 annual evaluation of the ISRH Project Phase II. The selection criteria are as follows:

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

Budget

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

Proposal Submission

Interested evaluators are invited to submit their applications, which should encompass CVs, cover letters, and expressions of interest. The proposal should detail work plans and budgets. All submissions should be directed to: recruitment@tifafoundation.id. The deadline for submission is 23 April 2026, 23:59 WIB. Please note that only shortlisted candidates will receive further communication.