

Terms of Reference (ToR) for Final Evaluation Consultancy

Project Title: **Promoting integrated approaches to animal health and plant protection in Abkhazia**

Country: **Abkhazia Georgia**

Project Number: **8351-00/2017**

Name of Partner Organisation: **Action Against Hunger**

1. Introduction/Background

The project “Promoting integrated approaches to animal health and plant protection in Abkhazia” has been implemented by Action Against Hunger since October 2017 and will be completed at the end of March 2020. The total budget is 780,000 Euros which is co-financed by the Austrian Development Cooperation. The intended impact of the project is that it will contribute towards the reduction of rural poverty in Abkhazia through improved agricultural production and increased agricultural productivity specifically focusing on those farming communities working in arboriculture and livestock farming, with a focus on south-eastern and central Abkhazia (Gali, Tkvarcheli, Ochamchire, Gulripshi and Sukhumi Districts).

The economy of the south-eastern region of Abkhazia is predominately focused on agricultural production; however, the majority of farm holdings are small and non-commercial, with the average farmer holding approximately 0.5 hectares of land. Almost every household has to work on a wide number of agricultural activities to ensure the food security of the household. The scope of activities focuses primarily on arboricultural production, mainly on hazelnut and citrus, but also apples, persimmons and kiwis, livestock farming (specifically, cattle rearing), some potato and corn production, and market gardening, which are primarily for self-consumption, with any surplus sold locally. Most products are sold directly by the farmers at the market or to traders who come to the village. There is no system for the collection of milk, and it is either sold privately or used for cheese production. In these integrated crop-livestock farming systems, arboriculture is the main source of income and the only one with export potential. In the past three years, the hazelnut crop in Abkhazia has been adversely affected by an invasive insect, *Halyomorpha halys*, the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (BMSB), has led to a decrease in yields. As the BMSB is polyphagous, and feeds, among other plants, on citrus fruit, apples and corn, this insect is seen as a huge threat to farmers’ incomes and livelihoods. Also, the Filbert Bud Mite (FBBM) is considered an extremely harmful pest of hazelnut cultivars in Abkhazia and plays a primary role in bud injury, which causes significant economic loss.

The outcome of project will be improved animal health and plant protection management by service providers in Abkhazia – the Plant Protection Service and the Veterinary Service Department – and increased community access to technical services. The first project output is to support the service providers in increasing their technical knowledge and skills, improving coordination and upgrading facilities and resources. Through this support these providers are able to offer enhanced and more responsive service delivery in pest management and veterinary practices, that will result in improved crop yields for farmers (specifically in hazelnut) and health and productivity of livestock (primarily cattle). The second output is the establishment of plant protection monitoring, assessment and surveillance systems that will provide the Plant

Protection Service and farmers with the requisite resources, tools and know-how to monitor and assess the prevalence, distribution and damage caused by the BMSB and FBBM. In addition to providing support to technical experts, the third project output will be to also increase accessibility to technical information and knowledge for farmers. This will be performed through training, demonstration and awareness raising to arboriculture farmers on pest management and improved hazelnut production approaches. Likewise, the project supports livestock farmers through training on animal disease prevention, diagnosis and treatment and positive animal husbandry practices. Through theoretical and practical training support, farmers are provided with information and knowledge by which to safeguard against animal health disease outbreaks and protect their hazelnut crops against invasive pests. They will be aware of correct preventative and remedial measures to take to improve their crop and livestock production, with respect to economic and environmental considerations.

2. Purpose

Action Against Hunger is seeking a consultant to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the project and to determine whether the support provided to the plant protection and veterinary services and farmers has contributed to improving agricultural practices, production and productivity in the target districts of Abkhazia. The evaluation will be used for both accountability and learning purposes to assess whether the actions of the project have had the intended impact and as well as to identify lessons learnt and good practices to inform future project design and implementation.

3. Objective

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess and report to Action Against Hunger and the Austrian Development Agency the extent to which the outputs of project have been delivered and the desired outcomes have been achieved. The evaluation report will also provide relevant conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations to both agencies.

Under the relevant OECD DAC evaluation criteria and specifically effectiveness, impact and sustainability) the evaluation consultant has to analyse the following points:

- a) the extent to which the project has already achieved its objectives and results or is likely to achieve them, including the extent to which the livelihoods of the project beneficiaries has already been improved.
- b) The extent to which the supported institutions have developed capacity and how this is already benefitting people.
- c) the strengths and weaknesses of the project in terms of planning, management and implementation and how this could have been improved
- d) the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender and environment mainstreaming, social inclusion) were applied.

4. Subject and Focus

The evaluation should examine the quality and effectiveness of the support provided in the target region and districts (Sukhumi, Gulripshi, Tkvarcheli, Ochamchire and Gali) by the project from data collected from a wide range of stakeholders and beneficiaries including the service providers, farmers and other key stakeholders and through observation and assessment of the inputs and support delivered.

5. Specific Evaluation Questions

The evaluation should look to answer the following questions:

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) or will be likely to achieve it?
- To what extent has the project already achieved its expected outputs or will be likely to achieve them?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome(s) and outputs? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
- Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned. Assess the coordination and collaboration between the project team and the Veterinary Service Department and Plant Protection Service?
- Did the project contribute to capacity development as planned? To what extent is the project likely to increase the capacity of the stakeholders?
- Assess the quality and effectiveness of tools, materials and actions (i.e. demonstration units) developed through the project as learning tools;
- To what extent did the project supplement the activities and inputs with resources from other projects/programmes?
- To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA gender appraisal considered and implemented?
- To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA environmental appraisal considered and implemented?
- To what extent was social inclusion mainstreamed in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA social standards appraisal considered and implemented?

Impact

- Which institutions have already benefitted from the project and how?
- What has changed for whom (immediate impact)?
- Are there any other important aspects regarding impact?

Sustainability

- Which components of the project are likely to continue after the end of the project timeframe?
- Will the project support be integrated into local structures and/or funded by other sources?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project/programme?
- What could be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?

6. Approach

The evaluation will consist of several phases:

Contract and Kick-off meeting: Contract is signed, and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents, including available data, are provided to the evaluator.

Desk Study: The evaluator studies all necessary project documents; analyses the intervention logic and theory of change and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted.

Inception Phase: In the inception report the evaluator will describe the design of the evaluation, including the submission of the evaluation design and methodology, and an evaluation matrix outlining key evaluation questions, data sources, data collection methods/tools and methods for the data analysis. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.

The field trip will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the contractor.

Field-phase: Data needs to be gathered by conducting key informant interviews, focus group discussions as well as carry out field visits.

Presentation: Presentation of key findings (feedback workshop) at the end of the field trip.

Data analysis and Interpretation: Based on the evaluation data comprising desk research and empirical data, needs to be analysed and interpreted. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by sex.

Final Draft Report: Submission and presentation of final draft report, inclusion of comments from the contractor.

Final Report: Submission of final report (*see reporting requirements under point 9*).

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process.

Also see: http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf

7. Timetable

It is anticipated that the evaluation assignment will require a total of 16 working days (8 home-based days and 8 field visit days).

Action	Responsible	Date
Submission of bid (electronically)	Consultant	03/03/20
Interviews of Consultant	Contractor & Consultant	05/03/20
Contract signed and documents provided	Contract signed between the contractor and consultant	09/03/20
Kick-Off meeting	Meeting between contractor and consultant	10/03/20
Desk Study and preparation of inception report	Consultant	3 days 10/03-12/03/20
Submission of draft inception report	Consultant	12/03/20
Inclusion of comments in inception report	Consultant	13/03/20
Submission of final inception report	Consultant	14/03/20
Field Visit, interviews data analysis and feedback workshop	Consultant	8 days 16/03-23/03/20
Writing of final draft report	Consultant	5 days 24-28/03/20
Submission of final draft report	Consultant	28/03/20
Inclusion of feedback in final draft report	Contractor	30/03/20

Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor	Consultant	31/03/20
---	------------	----------

8. Qualifications and experience of Consultant

- Academic degree (master level) in agronomy or relevant subject;
- A minimum of five years' experience and expertise of working directly in the agricultural field/sector in a development environment;
- To have conducted at least three evaluations in the last five years (ideally in the relevant field);
- Knowledge and working experience of country / context a significant advantage;
- Experience in project cycle management
- Experience preparing and analysing a theory of change
- Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues
- Experience in social science methods
- Excellent oral and written English skills (Russian language an advantage)
- Sound MS Office and IT skills

The consultants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project/programme.

9. Reports

The consultant will submit the following reports:

- an inception report (approx. 10 pages without annexes) on the design of the evaluation and how the data will be obtained and analysed,
- a final draft evaluation report (about 25-30 pages without annexes) and the results-assessment form (see attached and part of the reporting requirement)
- and the final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes) and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)

All reports need to be written in English. The executive summary should summarize key findings and recommendations (three to five pages) and needs to be submitted as part of the final draft report. The findings and recommendations of the draft final report and final report have to be structured according to the evaluation questions. An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

- Is the results-matrix format part of the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
- Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
- Are all evaluation questions answered?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe, program theory) and present/analyze a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
- Are cross-cutting issues analyzed in the report?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?

- Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

10. Co-ordination/Responsibility

Mr. Richard Maxfield will be the contact person for this evaluation

Contact details: rmaxfield@sc.acfspain.org

11. Annex:

Results-Assessment Form (only to be filled during the evaluation – not in the application)

12. General Conditions

Required start date: 10th March 2020

Duration of work: 8 days in Abkhazia and 8 days home-based for preparatory works and report writing

Location of work: Abkhazia

Schedule/agenda: The schedule/agenda will be made together with Action Against Hunger. Prior to the evaluation, a briefing will be conducted with the mission personnel, including staff involved in the implementation of the program

Fees: The total amount for consultancy fees to be negotiated based on the proposition and experience of the consultant.

Per diem: The amount of requested per diem should be included separately with the consultancy fee

Payment: 100% of the fees to be paid on completion of the report and approval of the timesheet by AAH.

Travel: Travel to Georgia and back and all internal travel will be arranged and paid for by Action Against Hunger.

Accommodation: Hotel or guesthouse accommodation in Tbilisi and Abkhazia will be arranged and paid for by Action Against Hunger.

Report: The final document will be submitted in an electronic version in the English language.

Rights: The ownership of the final report document will belong to Action Against Hunger and the donor organisation exclusively. The document, or any publication related to it, will not be shared by the consultant to anybody prior to the delivery of the final document to the donor by Action Against Hunger.

AAH may share the results of the report with the following groups:

- Donor(s)
- Key Stakeholders
- Various co-ordination bodies

Visa: Action Against Hunger will support the consultant in the visa application and make payment for the visa for Abkhazia.

Insurance: The consultant shall manage his/her own insurance and provide the details of coverage to AAH before departure.

Translation: Action Against Hunger will provide spoken translation from Russian/English and English/Russian as required by the consultant.

Other: Any materials required to carry out the assigned consultancy (laptop, mobile phone etc.), must be provided by the consultant.

13. Application Process

- Interested applicants should send their **CV** and a one/two-page **technical and financial proposition**. The technical proposition should clearly lay out the consultancy evaluation design and methodology, including the data collection tools to be used as well as the data analysis approach.
- The financial proposition should include the proposed **gross daily rate** for remuneration (**in Euros**). This daily rate should include the consultancy fee and per diem (for field visit) and both should be separately stated. ***Please note that international and internal travel, accommodation and visa costs will be covered by Action Against Hunger***
- The proposition should also state the earliest date that the applicant could begin the consultancy.
- Applications to be sent to the Action Against Hunger email address procurement@sc.acfspain.org with the subject “**AAH Evaluation**” no later than **3rd March 2020**.

Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.

Title of project/programme (please, spell out):			
Contract Period of project/programme:			
ADC number of project/programme:			
Name of project/programme partner:			
Country and Region of project/programme:			
Budget of this project/programme:			
Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators:			
Date of completion of evaluation/review:			
Please tick appropriate box:			
a) Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office		<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Evaluation managed by project partner:		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please tick appropriate box:			
a) Mid-Term Evaluation	b) Final Evaluation	c) Mid-Term Review	d) Final Review
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others: please, specify:			
Project Outcome (<i>Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix</i>):			
For Final Evaluation/Review¹: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? <u>Please, tick appropriate box</u>			
Outcome(s) was/were:			

¹ Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review.

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not? (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review²: Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix
Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) will most likely be:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, also explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs³ according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate boxes

Output 1 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix)*:

Output was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

² Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review.

³ In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.

Output 2 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 2 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 3 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 3 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.

Impact/Beneficiaries:

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:

Gender: To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

Environment: To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain

Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

Overall/Other Comments: