

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A
Myanmar Sustainable Aquaculture Programme (MYSAP) Final Evaluation
FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1: Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Resilience
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi
SIEA-2018-11506

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO MYANMAR

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | BACKGROUND | 2 |
| 1.1 | RELEVANT COUNTRY, SECTOR AND INTERVENTION BACKGROUND | 2 |
| 1.2 | THE INTERVENTION TO BE EVALUATED | 3 |
| 1.3 | STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION..... | 4 |
| 1.4 | PREVIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MONITORING (INCL. ROM), EVALUATIONS AND OTHER STUDIES UNDERTAKEN | 5 |
| 2 | DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT | 5 |
| 2.1 | OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA | 5 |
| 2.2 | INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS | 6 |
| 2.3 | STRUCTURING OF THE EVALUATION AND OUTPUTS | 7 |
| 2.4 | SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)..... | 11 |
| 2.5 | MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION | 11 |
| 2.6 | LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT AND OF THE DELIVERABLES..... | 12 |
| 3 | LOGISTICS AND TIMING | 12 |
| 3.1 | PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION OF STAFF PLACEMENT..... | 12 |
| 4 | REQUIREMENTS..... | 12 |
| 5 | REPORTS..... | 13 |
| 5.1 | USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS..... | 13 |
| 5.2 | NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES | 13 |
| 5.3 | FORMATTING OF REPORTS..... | 13 |
| 6 | MONITORING AND EVALUATION | 13 |
| 6.1 | CONTENT OF REPORTING | 13 |
| 6.2 | COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS | 13 |
| 6.3 | ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 13 |
| 7 | PRACTICAL INFORMATION | 13 |
| | ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION | 14 |
| 8 | ANNEX 1: UPDATED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK | 14 |
| | ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA | 21 |
| | ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM..... | 22 |
| | ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX..... | 23 |
| | ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS | 25 |
| | ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE | 28 |
| | ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID | 29 |

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country, sector and intervention background

Myanmar, officially the **Republic of the Union of Myanmar**, also called **Burma**, is a country in Southeast Asia. It is the largest country in Mainland Southeast Asia, and has a population of about 54 million as of 2017. Myanmar is bordered by Bangladesh and India to its northwest, China to its northeast, Laos and Thailand to its east and southeast, and the Andaman Sea and the Bay of Bengal to its south and southwest. The country's capital city is Naypyidaw, and its largest city is Yangon (Rangoon).

With a coastline of nearly 2,000 km, several large estuarine delta systems as well as permanent and seasonal freshwater bodies of a total of 82,000 km², Myanmar provides habitats for a considerable diversity of aquatic species. Fisheries and aquaculture account for the main source of animal protein and micronutrients in domestic diets. The sector directly employs approximately 3 million people and provides livelihoods for up to 15 million. Amid the recent return to international markets, the country's rich aquatic resources offer many opportunities for a thriving economy to create jobs and export earnings.

However, due to unsustainable management of marine and inland fisheries, wild stocks have rapidly declined over the past decades. This significantly threatens both nutrition and income particularly in rural areas, where 70% of the population lives. Myanmar is among 24 “high-burden” countries, ranked by the largest number of chronically malnourished children under the age of five. Therefore, aquaculture development become a priority area for the Myanmar Government, which had launched a large-scale campaign to tackle malnutrition.

Implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the **Myanmar Sustainable Aquaculture Programme (MYSAP)** works to intensify aquaculture in a sustainable way. With the European Union (EU) as the main funding agency followed by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), MYSAP works with all members of aquaculture value chains. This includes farmers, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), Government and Non-Governmental Organizations, the private sector, academia and other stakeholders.

After the military coup d'état in Myanmar on 1 February 2021, EU and BMZ decided to cease all cooperation with Myanmar's state institutions, suspending activities and outputs laid out in MYSAP. BMZ announced a moratorium on project activities on 5 February 2021 and finally communicated the termination of its bilateral development cooperation to the EU, including its contribution to MYSAP on 19 March 2021.

After negotiations among EU, BMZ and GIZ, a new BMZ programme was identified to allow the continuation of some of MYSAP activities. GIZ proposed that a Transitional Development Assistance project named **“Food and Nutrition Security in Rakhine State” (FNS Rakhine)** could contribute to the remaining parts of MYSAP with a no-cost-extension of 8 months. Transitional Development Assistance, in a nutshell, is a concept from the BMZ, financed with a special budget line. The aim is to make particularly vulnerable people and institutions more resilient in the long term, so that they can better deal with and prevent crises in the future. On 30 July 2021, GIZ submitted its proposal to amend the Agreement, and the Agreement was amended on 12 Oct 2021.

The remaining intervention under FNS Rakhine doesn't have interactions with governmental institutions anymore, which is in line with the EU foreign council decision condemning the military coup and refocusing development cooperation funds to directly benefitting the people of Myanmar as well as Myanmar's civil society. All remaining MYSAP activities are implemented in Rakhine State. The measures are concentrated in and around the three townships of Pauktaw, Kyauktaw and Sittwe, Rakhine State, which are FNS-Rakhine's designated implementation areas.

1.2 The intervention to be evaluated¹

This evaluation covers 1 intervention financed by the EU in the aquaculture sector as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Myanmar Sustainable Aquaculture Programme (MYSAP) |
| Budget of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Cost = 20 472 189 EUR • EU Contribution = 18 051 526 EUR • BMZ Contribution = 2 420 663 EUR |
| CRIS and/or OPSYS number of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRIS: 2016 / 378-411 • OPSYS: INTV-6269 |
| Dates of the intervention to be evaluated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start date: 01/12/2016 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End date: 31/07/2022 |

The **Overall Objective** of MYSAP is to contribute to poverty reduction and improved food security and nutrition in selected areas of Myanmar.

The **Specific Objective** is sustainably intensified aquaculture. This will be attained by supporting the:

- scaling up of sustainable freshwater aquaculture to increase the availability of quality fish in the domestic market;
- environmental and productive recovery of coastal shrimp farms through ecosystem-based farming practices (including mangrove reforestation);
- demonstration and scaling up of a sustainable mud crab value chain to reduce pressure on wild resources;
- development of local hatcheries and the demonstration of environment friendly practices;
- introduction of measures to improve the access of vulnerable parts of the population to quality fish proteins from aquaculture;
- increased participation of vulnerable rural households, especially smallholders and the landless, in the aquaculture value chain.

The **Expected Results** are:

1. The institutional and policy context for inclusive and sustainable development of aquaculture is strengthened.
2. The capacities for providing demand-oriented and high quality education and training in the aquaculture sector are strengthened.
3. The Competitiveness of P. Monodon (giant tiger prawn) and mud crab (Scylla spp.) value chains is strengthened, considering environmental sustainability, climate resilience and social inclusiveness.
4. The value chains for small fish farming in Shan and Sagaing are strengthened in a sustainable and inclusive manner, improving the availability and access to aquaculture products for disadvantaged population groups.

¹ The term 'intervention' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

The above-mentioned four Expected Results were amended after the military coup on 1 February 2021. The implementation of activities in the field of supporting institutional and policy development (Expected Result 1) was terminated on 19 March 2021, to avoid giving legitimacy to the post-coup military regime. Under Expected Result 2, only the funding for scholarships continues to enable students to finish their master's degrees. Some activities under Expected Results 3 and 4 continue, but only in Rakhine State.

1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention

The following describes the key stakeholders of the intervention.

Implementing Partner:

The **Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH** is the implementing agency of MYSAP. GIZ provides international cooperation services in around 120 countries (over 50 years' experience in a wide variety of areas, 24,977 employees, business volume in 2020 exceeded three billion euros). After the military coup in February 2021, Germany suspended its bilateral cooperation with Myanmar. Currently on behalf of the German Government, GIZ is supporting crisis prevention in Myanmar by providing transitional development assistance and implementing measures as part of the Special Initiative on Displacement. GIZ is working in crisis areas in Myanmar to improve nutrition, particularly for women and young children.

Government:

The **Department of Fisheries (DoF)** under the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MoALI) was the main national partner of MYSAP before the military coup. In line with the Ministry's policies, it aims at promoting and increasing domestic production and consumption of fisheries' resources, and controlling infectious diseases, ensuring sustainable rural development, food security and food safety, and building up the capacity of its human resources focusing on rural development and poverty alleviation.

After the February 2021 military coup d'état, cooperation with government agencies was suspended.

Private Sector:

The Yangon based **Myanmar Fisheries Federation (MFF)** was founded in 1989 as a non-profit sharing and non-governmental organization with a view to encourage and to promote the fisheries industry in Myanmar. MFF is one of the most important key stakeholders of MYSAP. MFF represents approximately 35,000 member companies of its 10 sub-sector associations including the entire value chain from input supply, via farming, to processing and sales of various fishery and aquaculture products. Its objectives include the promotion of socio-economic development of the whole fisheries communities, and to collaborate with the governmental sectors, NGOs, INGOs.

After the February 2021 military coup d'état, the German Ministry BMZ regarded the MFF as "government related" and therefore this cooperation was suspended.

Civil Society:

MYSAP cooperates with members of the **Scaling Up Nutrition Civil Society Alliance in Myanmar (SUN CSA Myanmar)** in the context of nutrition activities. MYSAP also directly works with several civil society organizations on contractual basis. Some of these organizations are the **Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD)**, **NIRAS/IP Consult/Solidaridad**, **GOPA/COFAD/IETS**, **Worldfish**, **BRAC**, **Ar Yon Oo** and **Malteser International**. From 12 Oct 2021, MYSAP continues under "Food and Nutrition Security in Rakhine

State” (FNS Rakhine). The implementation of FNS Rakhine is jointly done with national and international partners including **Consortium of Dutch NGOs (CDN-ZOA)**, **WaterAid**, **Action Contre la Faim (ACF)**, **Myanmar Health Assistant Association (MHAA)** and **Network Activities Group (NAG)**.

End Beneficiaries:

End beneficiaries are small and medium-scale producers, women and men employed in the aquaculture value chain. Furthermore, indirect benefits include contributions to safeguarding the livelihood of coastal populations through improved coastal protection from storms and floods through restoration of mangrove forest.

1.4 Previous internal and external monitoring (incl. ROM), evaluations and other studies undertaken

In 2019, MYSAP underwent a **Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM)** exercise, which concluded on the need for the programme to improve its logframe, in particular its intervention logic but also its indicators to capture more effectively the efforts being undertaken by the project in the areas of inclusiveness, gender equality and importantly nutrition. As a result, a revised logframe was discussed and prepared with all relevant partners and stakeholders. It led to a reduction from 6 anticipated results to 4 main results while 2 were mainstreamed across the 4 main results. The revised logframe reflects better the organisational structure of the programme whereby different teams work on different geographical locations and different value chains but all focusing on supporting better quality inputs (feed, post larvae/fingerlings) and more sustainable practices. The description of the results was refined, and the Objectively Verifiable Indicators were streamlined and strengthened.

The Mid-term Evaluation was not conducted due to the Covid19 pandemic and the political crisis caused by the February 2021 military coup.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

| Type of evaluation | Final |
|------------------------|--|
| Coverage | The intervention in its entirety |
| Geographic scope | Myanmar (Ayeyarwady Region, Mandalay Region, Sagaing Region, Yangon Region, Shan State, and Rakhine State) |
| Period to be evaluated | Entire period of the intervention |

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority² of the European Commission³. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the

² COM(2013) 686 final “Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation” - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

³ SEC (2007)213 “Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation”, http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 “Better Regulation Guidelines”, http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final ‘Completing the Better

results⁴ of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy, with increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the achievement of the SDGs.⁵**

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether and how the EU intervention has contributed to the achievement of these results** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress.**

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, and the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the performance of the **Myanmar Sustainable Aquaculture Programme (MYSAP)**, paying particular attention to its different levels of results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve future interventions.

In particular, this evaluation will contribute to accountability for the use of EU resources in relation to the results of the program.

The main users of this evaluation will be the European Union Delegation to Myanmar (EUD), Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Yangon, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and other private and non-governmental stakeholders involved in the intervention.

The evaluation will assess the intervention using the **six standard DAC evaluation criteria**, namely: **relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.** In addition, the evaluation will assess the intervention through an **EU specific evaluation criterion**, which is the **EU added value.**

The **definitions** of the 6 DAC + 1 EU **evaluation criteria** are contained for reference in **Annex II.**

Furthermore, the evaluation team should consider whether **gender equality and women's empowerment⁶, poverty reduction, environment and adaptation to climate change** were mainstreamed; the relevant **SDGs and their interlinkages** were identified; the principle of **Leave No One Behind** and the **Human Rights-Based Approach** was followed during design, and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific EQs, as formulated below, are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, and further to the finalisation/reconstruction of the Intervention Logic of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, the evaluation team will discuss these with the Evaluation Manager⁷ and Reference Group and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions. This will include an

Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁴ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁵ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

⁶ Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link (outdated, produced at the time of the GAP II): https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/documents/new-guidance-note-evaluation-gender-cross-cutting-dimension

⁷ The Evaluation Manager is the staff member of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational Manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

1. Relevance

To what extent has the programme responded to the specific needs of beneficiaries at the national and subnational level? Consider the changing policy context since the programme was designed in 2016.

2. Effectiveness

To what extent and in what ways has the programme reached its objectives?

3. Efficiency

Is this implementation modality cost-effective, in itself as well as in comparison to different programme modalities?

4. Sustainability

Is the implementation of the programme, including its exit strategy, conducive to obtaining durable results?

5. Impact

Which areas of the programme are likely to have most/least impact, and why?

6. Complementarity and Coherence

To which extent partner policies and actions were complementary to the programme? To what extent is the programme coherent with interventions by other international actors?

7. Replicability

Which good activities could be replicated in possible future actions, and which areas of intervention deserve further support in view of consolidating results achieved so far?

8. Crosscutting issues

Is the programme designed and implemented in a way that is sensitive to conflict, environmental issues, and gender equality?

9. EU added value

To what extent does the action bring additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only?

2.3 Structuring of the evaluation and outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases and two activities:

- Inception phase
- Interim phase
 - Desk and field activities
- Synthesis phase
- Dissemination phase

Throughout the evaluation and following approval of the Inception Report, if any significant deviation from the work plan could compromise the quality of the evaluation or jeopardise the completion of the specific

contract within the contractual timeframe, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures taken.

2.3.1 Inception Phase

Objectives of the phase: to structure the evaluation and clarify the key issues to be addressed.

Main activities of evaluators during the Inception Phase

- Initial review of background documents (see Annex IV).
- Remote kick-off session between the Reference Group and the evaluators. Objectives of the meeting: i) to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility; ii) to clarify the expectations of the evaluation; iii) to illustrate the tentative methodology to be used; iv) any other relevant objectives.
- Initial interviews with key stakeholders.
- Finalisation or reconstruction of the description of the Intervention Logic/Theory of Change and its underlying assumptions. This requires an assessment of the evidence (between the hierarchy of results e.g., outputs, outcomes and impact) and the assumptions necessary for the intervention to deliver change as planned.
- Graphic representation of the reconstructed/finalised Intervention Logic/Theory of Change.
- Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and on the reconstructed Intervention Logic.
- Finalisation of the evaluation methodology, including the definition of judgement criteria and indicators per Evaluation Question, the selection of data collection tools and sources. The methodology should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and assess if, and how, interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.
- Representation of the methodological approach in an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex IV).
- Workplan of subsequent phases.
- Identification of the expected risks and limitations of the methodology, and of the envisaged mitigation measures.
- Preparation of the Inception Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Remote presentation of the Inception Report to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.

2.3.2 Interim Phase

This phase is entirely devoted to gathering and analysing the information required to provide preliminary answers to the EQs. Work in this phase will consist of two activities.

1. Desk activities - review of documentation and interviews with key stakeholders and other initial data collection using different tools such as surveys.
2. Field activities - further data collection and analysis with the aim of testing the hypotheses identified during the 'Desk activities'.

2.3.2.1 Desk and field activities

Objective of the phase: to analyse the relevant secondary data and conducting primary research.

Main activities of evaluators

- Completion of in-depth analysis of relevant documents and other secondary sources, to be done systematically and to reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.
- Selected remote interviews to support the analysis of secondary data, as relevant.

- Formulation of the preliminary responses to each Evaluation Question, with analysis of their validity and limitations.
- Identification of the issues still to be covered and of the preliminary hypotheses to be tested during primary research.
- Remote presentation of the preliminary findings emerging from the desk review (incl. gaps and hypotheses to be tested in the field) to kick-off the in-country portion of this Interim Phase, supported by a slide presentation.
- Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
- Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different non-government stakeholders, throughout the Interim Phase.
- Use of the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respecting the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and being sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local, social and cultural environments, throughout the Interim Phase. Preparation of the Intermediary Note; its content is described in Annex V.
- Preparation of a slide presentation of intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions (to be tested with the Reference group) (free format).
- Remote presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions to the Reference Group, supported by the slide presentation.

2.3.3 Synthesis Phase

Objectives of the phase: to report on results from the evaluation (final answers to the Evaluation Questions (final findings) and formulate conclusions and recommendations).

Main activities of evaluators

- Analysis and synthesis of the evidence and data collected during the previous phases to provide a final answer to the Evaluation Questions.
- Preparation of the Draft Final Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Remote presentation of the Draft Final Report to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Preparation of a response to the draft QAG (Quality Assessment Grid) formulated by the Evaluation Manager via the EVAL module⁸.
- Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report, and uploading it to the EVAL module; its content is described in Annex V. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluators must explain the reasons in writing (free format).
- Preparation of the Executive Summary and upload to the EVAL module by using the compulsory format given in the module.
- Inclusion of an executive summary (free text format) in the Final Report (see Annex V).

The evaluators will make sure that:

- their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.

⁸ All mentions to the EVAL module throughout the text in accordance with the Art.43.3 of the "Draft Framework Contract Agreement and Special Conditions" of the SIEA Framework Contract. The module EVAL will be integrated into OPSYS.

- when drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be taking place already.
- the wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, considers the audience as identified in Art. 2.1 above.

2.3.4 Dissemination Phase

Objective of the phase is to support the communication of the results of the evaluation.

The targeted audience will be the European Union Delegation to Myanmar (EUD), Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Yangon, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and other relevant private and non-governmental stakeholders.

Main activities of evaluators

- The final presentation seminar will be organized via remote conference.

References: the team should take inspiration from the ESS/INTPA work on **Dissemination of Evaluation Results** at https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations; this contains an analysis of best practices in 12 international organisations and NGOs plus five 'how-to' guides on the production of infographics, briefs, videos, blogs and podcasts.

2.3.5 Overview of deliverables and meetings and their timing

The synoptic table below presents an overview of the deliverables to be produced by the evaluation team, the key meetings with the Reference Group (including the Evaluation Manager) as described previously, as well as their timing.

| Evaluation phases | Deliverables and meetings | Timing |
|---|---|--|
| Inception phase | • <i>Meeting: kick off</i> | • After initial document analysis |
| | • Inception Report | • End of Inception Phase |
| | • Slide presentation | • End of Inception Phase |
| | • <i>Meeting: presentation of Inception Report</i> | • End of Inception Phase |
| Interim: Desk and Field activities | • <i>Meeting: presentation of preliminary findings (to be tested) emerging from the desk work</i> | • Shortly before or at the beginning of the field activities |
| | • Intermediary Note | • End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| | • Slide presentation | • End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| | • <i>Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings</i> | • End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase |
| Synthesis phase | • Draft Final Report | • Shortly after the beginning of the Synthesis phase |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortly after the beginning of the Synthesis phase |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on the draft QAG | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Together with Final Report |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary of the Final Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Together with Final Report |
| Dissemination Phase | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Presentation Seminar | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After receiving the Final Report |

2.4 Specific contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited framework contractors will submit their specific contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its Annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference; it should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and be able to demonstrate how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The methodology should also include (if applicable) communication-related actions, messages, materials, and related managerial structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific contract Organisation and Methodology is 20 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the Framework Contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the annexes foreseen as part of the present specific ToRs. The timetable is not included in this limit and may be presented on an A3 page.

2.4.1 Evaluation ethics

All evaluations must be credible and free from bias; they must respect dignity and diversity and protect stakeholders' rights and interests. Evaluators must ensure confidentiality and anonymity of informants and be guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in observation of the 'do no harm' principle. The approach of framework contractors to observe these obligations must be explicitly addressed in the specific Organisation and Methodology, and implemented by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation, including during dissemination of results.

2.5 Management and steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Evaluation Manager with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of EUD staff, and representatives of GIZ.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- to propose indicative Evaluation Questions
- to validate the final Evaluation Questions

- to facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders
- to ensure that the evaluation team has access to, and has consulted with, all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention
- to discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team
- to provide feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation
- to support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

The MYSAP's management and staff will assist the evaluators during the assignment, in particular with setting up meetings with relevant stakeholders.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the requirements set out in Article 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively Annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs, and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- support the Team Leader in their role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood
- provide backstopping and quality control for the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment
- ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the timeframe of the contract.

2.6 Language of the specific contract and of the deliverables

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

All reports will be submitted in English.

3 LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

3.1 Planning, including the period for notification of staff placement⁹

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in Annex VI. The 'indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national/local authorities or other stakeholders.

4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

⁹ As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

All costs, other than the costs for key experts of the evaluation team will be reflected in a dedicated budget line under the chapter “Other details” of the framework contractor’s financial offer.

5 REPORTS

For the list of reports, please refer to Chapter 2.3 of Part A and to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

The selected contractor will **submit all deliverables by uploading them into the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related specific contract validity.

5.2 Number of report copies

Apart from its submission, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 10 paper copies and in electronic version in Word and PDF formats at no extra cost.

5.3 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman, minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1 Content of reporting

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs, and tables; a map of the area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as annex).

6.2 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send the contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 14 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments will be submitted within 14 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

6.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex VII). The Contractor is given the chance to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager through the EVAL module. The QAG will then be reviewed, following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation of the FWC SIEA’s specific contract Performance Evaluation by the Evaluation Manager.

7 PRACTICAL INFORMATION

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address:

DELEGATION-MYANMAR-OPSY-FWC@eeas.europa.eu

ANNEXES TO TOR - PART A

ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

8 ANNEX 1: UPDATED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The log frame below had to be amended after the military coup on 1st February 2021. GIZ proposes the following intervention logic in which the targets, objectives and indicators that are no longer appropriate are **already removed**. The whole intervention logic is then subject to final reporting at the end of implementation.

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Overall Objective: Contribute to poverty reduction and improved food security and nutrition in selected areas of Myanmar | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS VERIFICATION OF | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| OO 2) Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age in Myanmar in percent by EOP | 2015-16: 29,2% | By 2030 end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age. The intermediate target is a reduction in the prevalence of stunting by 40% by 2025 (from 2012 levels). | SDG Indicator 2.2.1 See https://sdg-tracker.org/zero-hunger See Myanmar Government 2017: Measuring Myanmar's starting point for the Sustainable Development Goals – SDG Indicator Baseline Report EU Multiannual Indicative Strategy for Myanmar Indicator 1.3.1 | Government Statistics, Demographic and Health Survey (DHS, 2015-2016) - MS-NPAN | |
| OO 4) Amount of aquaculture products produced in Myanmar measured in metric tonnes by EOP | 2017-2018: 11,303,500 | 2020-2021: 14,000,000 | | DoF Fisheries Statistics: Table.2. TOTAL AQUACULTURE PONDS AND PRODUCTION | No new DOF date for 2020. Due to the pandemic and the coup these figures are highly unreliable. |

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Specific Objective: The aquaculture sector is sustainably strengthened thereby realizing its potential for food security, nutrition and sustainable livelihoods | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS VERIFICATION OF | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| SO 1) Average food intake diversity in target | 3.34 MDD-W | 3.51 MDD-W | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1 | Project surveys, Ministry of Health and | Regional instability due to tensions between the |

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Specific Objective: The aquaculture sector is sustainably strengthened thereby realizing its potential for food security, nutrition and sustainable livelihoods | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| areas measured by the Minimum Dietary Diversity Score for Women (MDD-W) by EOP | | Note: related baseline study for FNS Rakhine State pending. | | Sports surveys and data of other development partners, LIFT reports (baseline survey 2012, HH survey 2013) | local armed group (Arakan Army) and the military regime won't affect the project. Trained target groups apply the knowledge gained. Another COVID-19 wave won't hit the country. |
| SO 2) Cumulative number of women of reproductive age and adolescent girls reporting an increased diversified diet through nutrition related interventions supported by the project by EOP | 0 | Total (cumulative): 210 2018: 0 2019: 105 2020: 210 2021: 210 MYSAP awareness campaigns in drylands: 140 MYSAP awareness campaigns in coastal areas (Ayeyarwady and Yangon region): 70 Note: related baseline study for FNS Rakhine State pending. | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 2.1.3 | Project surveys | Political stability Trained target groups apply the knowledge gained. |
| SO 6) Number of hectares of ponds where sustainable aquaculture management practices have been introduced with project support by EOP | 0 | New TOTAL TARGET = 10628 ha MYSAP INLAND 104 hectares | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1.4 EURF Indicator 2.4 "Agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha)" | Project statistics | Trained aquaculture producers apply improved practices in their farms Regional instability due to tensions between the local armed group (Arakan Army) and the |

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Specific Objective: The aquaculture sector is sustainably strengthened thereby realizing its potential for food security, nutrition and sustainable livelihoods | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS VERIFICATION OF | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| | | <p>MYSAP COAST</p> <p>4500 ha of ponds (extensive farming of <i>P. monodon</i> (giant tiger prawn) and/or polyculture)</p> <p>2000 ha of artemia polyculture ponds</p> <p>FNS Rakhine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4500 ha (Extensive farming of <i>P. monodon</i> (giant tiger prawn) and/or polyculture) 24 ha of freshwater aquaculture | Compliance with Aichi Biodiversity Target # 7 “By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity”. | | <p>military regime won't affect the project.</p> <p>Another COVID-19 wave won't hit the country too hard.</p> <p>No cyclones and no other major shock or natural disasters will affect the project</p> |
| SO 8) Cumulated quantity of aquaculture products harvested annually in selected demonstration farms of fish-deficient areas measured in kg per hectare year by EOP | 2,052 kg per ha per year (including Kale, Shwebo, Kengtong, Amarapura and Pinlaung) | <p>2,257.2 kg per ha per year (including Kale, Shwebo, Kengtong, Amarapura and Pinlaung)</p> <p>10% increase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline FNS Rakhine: 1,475.87 kg/hectar Target: 4500 Kg/hectare | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1 | Project survey | <p>Regional instability due to tensions between the local armed group (Arakan Army) and the military regime won't affect the project.</p> <p>Another COVID-19 wave won't hit the country too hard.</p> <p>No cyclones and no other major shock or natural disasters will affect the project</p> |

INTERVENTION LOGIC

Result 2: The capacities for providing demand-oriented and high quality education and training in the aquaculture sector are strengthened

| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE - 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| 2.3 Number of students who have obtained a Master of Science degree from regional (international) universities or through partners of the EU - European Aquaculture Technology and Innovation Platform (EATIP) with project support by EOP (sex disaggregated) | 0 | 12 (50% female) | NESP 2016-21, Higher Education Strategy 3, Component 2 | Completion certificate | Assumption: The flow of funding can continue. No complete COVID-19 lockdowns in Vietnam. |

INTERVENTION LOGIC

Result 3: The competitiveness of *P. monodon* (giant tiger prawn) and *Scylla* spp. (mud crab) value chains is strengthened, considering environmental sustainability, climate resilience and social inclusiveness

| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE - 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 3.6 Number of <i>P. monodon</i> (giant tiger prawn) farmers technically and economically capacitated, i.e. organised into clusters/groups, implementing collective approaches to input supply and possibly jointly marketing high value products, trained for sustainable climate-resilient production techniques by the project by EOP (sex disaggregated) | 0 | 150 (aiming for 20% female farmers) FNS-Rakhine: 300 | MS-NPAN Sub-sector key results 1.1.8 and 2.1.2 EURF Indicator 2.03 "Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land Compliance with Aichi Biodiversity Target # 6 "Trends in proportion of depleted, target and bycatch species with recovery plans" | | <u>Assumption:</u> Availability and transportability of production materials within Rakhine State <u>Assumption:</u> to be operational, nursery ponds must be filled either before monsoon season or at the start of monsoon <u>Assumption:</u> No major disease outbreak <u>Assumption:</u> Domestic drive aquaculture Development <u>Assumption:</u> |
| 3.12 Number of farmers trained on post-harvest handling of | 0 | 150 (<i>P. monodon</i> (giant tiger prawn) farmers) (sex | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1.8 | Workshop notes, participation lists | No natural disasters |

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Result 3: The competitiveness of <i>P. monodon</i> (giant tiger prawn) and <i>Scylla</i> spp. (mud crab) value chains is strengthened, considering environmental sustainability, climate resilience and social inclusiveness | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE - 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | TO MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| aquaculture products by EOP (sex disaggregated) | | disaggregated, aiming for 50% female farmers) FNS-Rakhine: 200 <i>P. monodon</i> farmers 69 freshwater farmers | | | Assumptions: Regional instability due to tensions between the local armed group (Arakan Army) and the military regime won't affect the project. Assumptions: Another COVID-19 wave won't hit the country too hard. |
| 3.13 Assessment on nutritional status of members of landless households involved in mud crab farming by EOP | Nutritional status unknown | Nutritional status of members of landless households involved in mud crab farming is assessed and needs are identified and addressed. Note: A new target has to be elaborated with a baseline study after shifting activities to Rakhine State from 1st August onwards | | Assessment, work plan, participation lists, workshop notes | |

| INTERVENTION LOGIC | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Result 4: The value chains for small fish farming in Shan and Sagaing are strengthened in a sustainable and inclusive manner, improving the availability and access to aquaculture products for disadvantaged population groups | | | | | |
| PROPOSED INDICATOR | BASELINE - 2017 unless otherwise specified | TARGET By End of Project (EOP) unless otherwise specified | LINK DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES | TO MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
| 4.6 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land by EOP (EURF Indicator 2.3) (sex disaggregated) | 0 | 1,264 FNS Rakhine: 69 | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 2.1 EURF Indicator 2.03 "Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to | Farmer profiles, participation lists | Assumption: to be operational, nursery ponds must be filled either before monsoon season or at the start of monsoon Assumption: No major disease outbreak Assumption: The political and |

| | | | | | |
|--|------|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | markets and/or security of land". | | <p>security situation in Rakhine State remains conducive for the development of aquaculture</p> <p>Assumption:</p> <p>Domestic markets drive aquaculture Development</p> <p>Assumption:</p> <p>No natural disasters</p> <p>Assumptions: Regional instability due to tensions between the local armed group (Arakan Army) and the military regime won't affect the project.</p> <p>Assumptions: Another COVID-19 wave won't hit the country too hard.</p> |
| 4.8 Number of hectares of ponds where sustainable aquaculture management practices have been introduced with project support by EOP Note: this indicator is repeated at SO level. However at SO level, the value is aggregated with other hectares brought under sustainable production under Result 3 (MYSAP COAST), therefore be careful not to double count hectares when reporting on EU Result Framework (EURF). | 0 ha | 104 ha FNS Rakhine: 24 ha freshwaterponds | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1. EURF Indicator 2.4 "Agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha)" | Farmer surveys, GPS data | |
| 4.11 Proportion of aquaculture products consumed by-low-income households ¹⁰ in intervention areas by EOP, measured as percentage of number of meals consumed over seven days. | 40% | 50% Note: A new target will be elaborated with a baseline study after shifting activities to Rakhine State. | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 2.1 | Farmer surveys | |
| 4.12 Number of women trained on fish processing and reduction of post-harvest losses in fish-deficient areas until EOP. | 0 | 67 FNS Rakhine: Kyauktaw & Sittwe: 100 females (from total of 200 participants) Pauktaw: 100 females (from total of 200 participants) Total new Target: 200 females plus 67 = 267 | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 1.1.8 and 2.1.3 | Workshop notes, participation lists | |
| 4.14 Cumulative number of women of reproductive age and adolescent girls directly reached by nutrition related | 0 | Total (cumulative): 3068 MYSAP awareness campaigns in drylands: 1400 | MS-NPAN Sector-Level Key Results for MoALI 2.1.3 EURF Indicator 2.02 "Number of women of reproductive age, | Participation lists | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>interventions supported by the project by EOP (disaggregated by age)</p> <p><u>Risk of double-counting:</u> Careful to count number individuals and not number of participants</p> | | <p>2018: 500 2019: 450 2020: 450 2021: 0</p> <p>MYSAP INLAND: 1668 women of reproductive age and adolescent girls (10-49)</p> <p>2018: 992 2019: 676 2020: 0 2021: 0</p> <p>FNS Rakhine: New Target: Baseline pending</p> | <p>adolescent girls and children under 5 reached by nutrition related interventions supported by the EU”</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of DAC evaluation criteria has changed following the release (10 December 2019) of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” (DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL).

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis respects the new definitions of these criteria, their explanatory notes and the guidance document. These can be found at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in chapter 2.1, the evaluation will assess the intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their short definitions are reported below:

DAC CRITERIA

- **Relevance:** the “extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”
- **Coherence:** the “compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”
- **Effectiveness:** the “extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”
- **Efficiency:** the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”
- **Impact:** the “extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.”
- **Sustainability:** the “extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.”

EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION

- **EU added value:** the extent to which the intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).

ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

The following is an indicative list of the documents that the Contracting Authority will make available to the selected evaluators shortly after the contract signature:

- Multiannual Indicative Programme for (MIP) Myanmar/Burma 2014-2020
- Myanmar Government sector policies and plans, including the National Aquaculture Development Plan
- Intervention financing agreement and addenda
- Delegation agreement between EU and GIZ, and addenda
- Intervention's annual progress reports, technical reports, studies and publications
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Report
- Relevant documentation from partners and other donors
- Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings
- Other relevant documents

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the intervention.

ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX

The evaluation matrix (hereinafter: the matrix) will accompany the whole evaluation by summarising its **methodological design (Part A)**, to be filled and included in the Inception Report) and **documenting the evidence analysed** to answer each EQ (Part B)

The full matrix (parts A and B) is to be included in all reports.

Use one set of tables (Parts A and B) for each Evaluation Question (EQ) and add or delete as many rows as needed to reflect the selected judgement criteria and indicators. Delete the guidance and the footnotes when including the matrix in the reports.

PART A – Evaluation design

| EQ1: "XXX?" | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Evaluation criteria covered ¹¹ | | | | |
| Judgement criteria (JC) ¹² | Indicators (Ind) ¹³ | Information sources | | Methods / tools |
| | | Primary | Secondary | |
| JC 1.1 - | I 1.1.1 - | | | |
| | I 1.1.2 - | | | |
| | I 1.1.3 - | | | |
| JC 1.2 - | I 1.2.1 - | | | |
| | I 1.2.2 - | | | |
| | I 1.2.3 - | | | |
| JC 1.3 - | I 1.3.1 - | | | |
| | I 1.3.2 - | | | |
| | I 1.3.3 - | | | |

¹¹ What evaluation criterion/criteria is/are addressed by this EQ?

¹² Describe each selected JC and number them as illustrated in the template; the first numeric value represents the EQ the JC refers to.

¹³ As above. The two first numeric values represent the JC the indicators refer to. The number of JC and indicators per JC as reported in the table is purely illustrative. The table is to be adapted to your specific evaluation and reflect the appropriate JCs and indicators.

PART B – Evidence log

| Ind ¹⁴ | Baseline data ¹⁵ | Evidence gathered/analysed | Quality of evidence ¹⁶ |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| I 1.1.1 | | | |
| I 1.1.2 | | | |
| I 1.1.3 | | | |
| I 1.2.1 | | | |
| I 1.2.2 | | | |
| I 1.3.1 | | | |

¹⁴ Use the same numbering as in Part A; no need to describe the indicators.

¹⁵ In case they are available. This column can also be used to record mid-term data (if available).

¹⁶ Score as follows: 0 (no evidence), 1 (some evidence), 2 (sufficient evidence), 3 (conclusive evidence)

ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS

1. INCEPTION REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Inception phase)

The format of the Inception Report is free and should have a maximum length of 20 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

| | |
|---|--|
| Introduction | Short description of the context of the evaluation, its objectives and focus |
| Reconstructed Intervention Logic | This will be based on initial analysis of secondary sources and consultation with key stakeholders |
| Stakeholder map | Free format: this will represent the key stakeholders of the intervention(s) under evaluation and their relations with the intervention(s) |
| Finalised Evaluation Questions with Judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix, part A) | See the template |
| Methodology of the evaluation | This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of entire evaluation process and tools ○ Consultation strategy ○ Approach to the following phase of the evaluation, including planning of field missions |
| Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures | In tabular form (free style) |
| Ethics rules | Including, but not limited to, avoiding harm and conflict of interest, informed consent, confidentiality and awareness of local governance and regulations |
| Work plan | This will include a free text description of the plans and their representation in Gantt format |

2. INTERMEDIARY DESK AND FIELD NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the Desk and Field phase)

The format of the Intermediary Desk and Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 15 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

| |
|---|
| list of activities conducted |
| difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted |
| intermediate/preliminary consolidated Desk and Field findings |
| preliminary overall conclusions (to be tested with the Reference Group) |

3. DRAFT FINAL REPORT AND FINAL REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Synthesis phase)

The Draft Final and the Final Report have the same structure, format, and content. They should be consistent, concise, and clear, and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation, if foreseen. The Final Report should not be longer than 40 pages excluding annexes. The presentation must be properly spaced, and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report should carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission".

The main sections of the evaluation report should be as follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| Executive Summary | The Executive Summary is expected to highlight the evaluation purpose, the methods used, the main evaluation findings and the conclusions and recommendations. It is to be considered a "stand alone" document. |
| 1. Introduction | A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| 2. Findings | A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Question headings, supported by evidence and reasoning. Findings per judgement criteria and detailed evidence per indicator are included in an annex to the Report. |
| 3. Overall assessment (<i>optional</i>) | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the intervention. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria. |
| 4. Conclusions and Recommendations | |
| 4.1 Conclusions | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasising the three or four major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. |
| 4.2 Recommendations | They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle underway, or to prepare the design of a new intervention for the next cycle. |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure. |
| 4.3 Lessons learnt | Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions. |
| 5. Annexes to the report | <p>The report should include the following annexes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference of the evaluation • names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person) • detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses • detailed answer by judgement criteria • evaluation matrix with data gathered and analysed by (EQ/JC) indicator • Intervention Logic/Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated) • relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place • list of persons/organisations consulted • literature and documentation consulted • other technical annexes (e.g., statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant. |

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (EVAL Module)

An Executive Summary is to be prepared using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. Its format will be available to evaluators at the time of submission of the Final Report through EVAL. This is addition to the request to prepare a self-standing executive summary to be included in the Final Report (please refer to the paragraph above, detailing the content of the Final Report).

ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by framework contractors in their specific contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it.

Framework contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation should reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

| | | Indicative Duration in working days ¹⁷ | | |
|--|----------|---|-----------|------------------|
| Activity | Location | Team Leader | Evaluator | Indicative Dates |
| Inception phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Desk activities: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Field activities: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Synthesis phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Dissemination phase: total days | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| TOTAL working days (maximum) | | | | |

¹⁷ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (following the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included in the **EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, who will be able to include their comments.

Intervention (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

| Evaluation data | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation title | | | |
| Evaluation managed by | | Type of evaluation | |
| Ref. of the evaluation contract | | EVAL ref. | |
| Evaluation budget | | | |
| EUD/Unit in charge | | Evaluation Manager | |
| Evaluation dates | Start: | End: | |
| Date of draft final report | | Date of Response of the Services | |
| Comments | | | |
| Project data | | | |
| Main project evaluated | | | |
| CRIS/OPSYS # of evaluated project(s) | | | |
| DAC Sector | | | |
| Contractor's details | | | |
| Evaluation Team Leader | | Evaluation Contractor | |
| Evaluation expert(s) | | | |

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers;
- highlight the key messages;
- have various chapters and annexes well balanced in length;
- contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding;
- contain a list of acronyms (only the Report);
- avoid unnecessary duplications;
- have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors.
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document.



| Strengths | Weaknesses | Score |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| | | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments | |
| | | |

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology;
- the report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations;
- the report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures.






| Strengths | Weaknesses | Score |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| | | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments | |
| | | |

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- findings derive from the evidence gathered;
- findings address all selected evaluation criteria;
- findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources;
- when assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts;
- the analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors.



| Strengths | Weaknesses | Score |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| | | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments | |
| | | |
| 4. Validity of conclusions | | |
| <p>This criterion analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis; conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the Evaluation Questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions; conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation; conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations; (if relevant) the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues | | |
| | |  |
| Strengths | Weaknesses | Score |
| | | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments | |
| | | |
| 5. Usefulness of recommendations | | |
| <p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions; are concrete, achievable and realistic; are targeted to specific addressees; are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound; (if relevant) provide advice for the intervention's exit strategy, post-intervention sustainability or for adjusting the intervention's design or plans. | | |
| | |  |
| Strengths | Weaknesses | Score |
| | | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments | |
| | | |
| 6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators) | | |
| <p>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lessons are identified; | | |
| | |  |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> where relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s). | |
| Strengths | Weaknesses |
| | |
| Contractor's comments | Contractor's comments |
| | |
| Final comments on the overall quality of the report | |
| | |
| Overall score | |
| | |

TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Benefitting Zone

Myanmar

2. Contracting authority

The European Union, represented by the European Commission, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

3. Contract language

English

LOCATION AND DURATION

4. Location

- Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Home-based.
- Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): Once the COVID-19 and security-related restrictions are relaxed, travel to Yangon and Rakhine, Myanmar (approx. 5 days) for field activities should be foreseen.

5. Start date and period of implementation

The indicative start date is 19/09/2022 and the period of implementation of the contract will be 180 days from this date (indicative end date: 18/03/2023).

REQUIREMENTS

6. Expertise

The minimum requirements covered by the team of experts as a whole are detailed below:

- Qualifications and skills required for the team: At least one member of the team shall possess an aquaculture-related master's degree or above from an accredited institution. Examples of aquaculture-related fields are aquaculture sustainability, fisheries management, marine biology, aquatic biology, etc. A first-level aquaculture-related university degree in combination with two additional years of aquaculture-related professional experience may be accepted in lieu of the aquaculture-related master's degree. A first-level university degree in either natural or social sciences in combination with six additional years of aquaculture-related professional experience may also be accepted in lieu of the aquaculture-related master's degree. Other members of the team shall possess a master's degree or above in either natural or social sciences from an accredited institution. A first-level university degree in combination with two additional years of professional experience may be accepted in lieu of the master's degree.
- General professional experience of the team: The evaluation team must have a cumulative experience of at least 21 years, including significant experience in evaluation, mostly in but not

limited to the field of development cooperation, with solid experience in rigorous evaluation methods and techniques.

- **Specific professional experience of the team:** At least one member of the team shall possess minimum 12 years of proven experience in aquaculture sustainability, including significant experience in design, implementation and/or evaluation of development cooperation programmes. At least one member of the team shall possess minimum 6 years of proven work experience in food and nutrition security. At least one member of the team shall possess minimum 3 years of proven experience in education policy and/or technical and vocational education. At least one member of the team shall possess proven experience in the evaluation of EU-funded projects. At least one member of the team shall possess proven work experience in Myanmar.
- **Language skills of the team:** Each member of the team shall possess minimum B2 level expertise in English language; among them at least one member shall have minimum C1 level expertise in English language. At least one member shall possess minimum C1 level expertise in Myanmar (Burmese) language.

Additional expertise requirements for the team composition:

| Position | Expert category | Minimum requirements | Minimum number of working days | Additional information |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Expert | Cat. I (>12 years of experience) | Minimum 1 evaluator | 35 | The Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Category I expert, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment. |
| Expert | Cat. II (>6 years of experience) | Minimum 1 evaluator | 35 | The Category II expert is expected to possess proven research skills. |
| Expert | Cat. III (>3 years of experience) | Minimum 1 evaluator | 35 | The Category III expert is expected to possess proven reporting skills. |

7. Incidental expenditure

No incidental expenditure provided for in this contract.

8. Lump sums

No lump sums provided for in this contract.

9. Expenditure verification

No expenditure verification report is required.

10. Other details

No other details provided for in this contract.

REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES

11. Reports and deliverables requirements

| Title | Content | Language | Submission timing or deadline |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Final Presentation Seminar | | English | Within 180 Day(s) After the project start |
| Final report | Please refer to "ANNEX V: Structure of the Reports". | English | Within 170 Day(s) After the project start |
| Comments on the draft QAG | | English | Within 170 Day(s) After the project start |
| Draft final report | Please refer to "ANNEX V: Structure of the Reports". | English | Within 120 Day(s) After the project start |
| Intermediary Note | Please refer to "ANNEX V: Structure of the Reports". | English | Within 100 Day(s) After the project start |
| Inception Report | Please refer to "ANNEX V: Structure of the Reports". | English | Within 50 Day(s) After the project start |