# SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE-PART A

## Final Project Evaluations:

I. Food Security in Transitioning Environment (FORESITE) in Former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states.
II. Strengthening Small Holders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile States.

**FWC SIEA 2018 – LOT 1: Sustainable management of natural resources and resilience**

**[CRIS /2023/446522]**

**[OPSYS NUMBERS/PC-21143 & PC-21138]**

**CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE EUROPEAN UNION DELEGATION TO SOUTH SUDAN**

# 1 BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Relevant country South Sudan / Agriculture & Livelihoods background

South Sudan remains one of the most vulnerable countries in the East African Region. Following the attainment of independence in July 2011, hopes for peace and prosperity were dashed in 2013 and 2016, when the country descended into periods of civil war, due to political differences among the ruling elite. The situation, however, stabilised following the signing of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement in September 2018 and, after several delays and missed opportunities, on 22 February 2020 South Sudan formed the Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity (RTGoNU), which had long been provided for under 2018 Addis Ababa Agreement.

The implementation of the peace agreement has, however, been slow, with most of the targets missed. Key amongst them has been the unification of the former fighters into the national army; setting up a Hybrid Court, a Commission for Truth, Reconciliation and Healing (CTRH) and a reparations process.

Positive developments include the appointment of State Governors and national legislators into a functioning National Assembly.

Despite the cessation of hostilities and the achievement of peace at national level, intercommunal conflict has intensified at subnational levels, fuelled by armed groups and rebel militias, cattle raiding, revenge killings and conflict between pastoralists and farmers over pasture and water, resulting in widespread displacements and death of many civilians, including women and children.

Due to a combination of factors, including climate change and drought, flooding and insecurity, the country continues to face a huge cereal deficit and increasingly relies on food imports from neighbouring Kenya, Uganda and Sudan and/or on humanitarian assistance. As of March 2022, an estimated 6.6 million people (54% of the population) were facing high acute food insecurity (IPC Phase 3 or above), of which 2.2 million people faced Emergency conditions (IPC Phase 4).[1]

South Sudan remains a poor country, despite its abundant natural resources, largely due to protracted conflict and insecurity at subnational levels. According to the World Bank, about 82% of South Sudanese people (the majority residing in rural areas) face extreme poverty and live on less than $1.90 per day. Eighty percent of poor households depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Education and health indicators are among the lowest in the world, with only about 32% of the adult population (aged 15 years and above) being able to read and write as of 2022, reflecting the impact of protracted conflict and limited provision of social services. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), up to 95% of South Sudanese rely on agriculture for their livelihoods. The majority are, however, subsistence smallholder farmers who hardly produce enough for household consumption, leave alone a surplus for sale.

Agro-pastoralism is the main livelihood system in rural areas. Official figures show that South Sudan has an estimated 12 million cattle, 12.1 million sheep and 12.4 million goats, making the country one of the world leaders in animal wealth per capita. Unfortunately, hardly any economic benefits are derived from the livestock sector, as animals are used mainly for dowry payments and for settling traditional disputes.

The oil sector dominates the South Sudan economy, accounting for over 90% of the country's revenue. Poor management of the public finances and corruption mean that most of this revenue has not translated to improved infrastructure and better services for the people of South Sudan.

---

[1] *South Sudan: Acute Food Insecurity Situation October - November 2022 and Projections for December 2022 - March 2023 and April - July 2023*

EU support and investments in the sector closely align with the Government of South Sudan priorities and strategic objectives. For instance, the Revised National Development Strategy for South Sudan – 2021-2024, with the overarching theme: Consolidate Peace, Stabilize the Economy, articulates national aspirations to transition from dependence on humanitarian aid to a development path, using the humanitarian, development and peace nexus approach. Further, the Comprehensive Agriculture Master Plan (CAMP) document, developed with the support of the Government of Japan, provides a framework to promote donor investments in the sector.

### 1.2 The interventions to be evaluated[2]

This evaluation covers [ 2] interventions financed by the EU in the [Agriculture & Livelihoods] sector as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Title of the intervention to be evaluated** | **1. Food Security in Transitioning Environment (FORESITE) in Former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states.** | |
| **Budget of the intervention to be evaluated** | 6,375,000 EUR | |
| **CRIS and/or OPSYS number of the intervention to be evaluated** | [CRIS/ 2023/446522<br>OPSYS/PC-21143 | |
| **Dates of the intervention to be evaluated** | **Start date** | **26/July/2019** |
| | **End date** | **26/March/2023** |
| **Description of the** intervention(s) | | |

Food Security and Resilience in Transitioning Environments (FORESITE) project implemented by World Vision (WV), AVSI Foundation and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) in collaboration with the relevant Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GoRSS) key line ministries, at national, state and county levels.

**The overall objective of the project:**

To contribute to strengthening resilience of communities, improving governance and conflict prevention and reducing forced displacements due to loss of livelihoods.

**The project specific objective is:**

To improve food security of rural smallholders in Greater Bahr el Ghazal and to empower them to cope with environmental volatility and insecurity.

To objective was to be achieved through the successful delivery of the following three interrelated outcomes:

(i) Reduced barriers to engagement in resilience building, food security and income-generating activities, especially for women and youth.
(ii) Increased anticipatory, absorptive, and adaptive capacity with respect to climate change and disruptive events including natural disasters and conflict.
(iii) Improved and resilient food security and income especially for women and youth.

[2] *The term 'intervention' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.*

The project is implemented in the three states and four counties as highlighted in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Operational Areas of the project partners and accompanying beneficiaries

| IPs | States | County | Direct beneficiaries |
|---|---|---|---|
| World Vision | Warrap | Twic, Gogrial East | 8,037 |
| AVSI | Lakes | Cueibet | 7,504 |
| NRC | Western Bahr-El-Ghazel | Jur River, Twic | 6,285 |
| **Total** | | | **21,826** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Title of the intervention to be evaluated** | **2. Strengthening Small Holders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile States.** | |
| **Budget of the intervention to be evaluated** | 6,375,000 EUR | |
| **CRIS and/or OPSYS number of the intervention to be evaluated** | CRIS/ 2023/446522<br>OPSYS/ PC-21138 | |
| **Dates of the intervention to be evaluated** | 3. Start date: | 01/01/2020 |
| | 4. End date | 31/12/2023 |

The "South Sudan Rural Development: Strengthening Smallholders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile" began on January 1, 2020, to 31 Dec 2023 (48-months), implemented by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and its partners ZOA and Cordaid in the Greater Upper Nile Region ( Unity, Upper Nile, and Jonglei states) of South Sudan.

The **overall objective** of the Action is to contribute to strengthening the resilience of communities, improving governance of natural resources and conflict prevention, and reducing forced displacements due to loss of livelihoods in the Greater Upper Nile region. The **specific objective** of the Action is to improve the food security of rural smallholders in the Greater Upper Nile and to empower them to cope with environmental volatility and insecurity.

**Results**

1. Increased food production and productivity
2. Increased dietary diversity.
3. Enhanced household income and access to market systems.
4. Increased community capacity to mitigate and enhance resilience to natural shocks and stresses.

## 1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention

The following table describes the key stakeholders of the intervention.

**1.**

| Stakeholder groups | Role and involvement in the intervention | How the intervention is expected to impact on the stakeholder group |
|---|---|---|
| **Implementing partners** | Implementation, Coordination, Monitoring and reporting. | Productive coordination among consortium partners, effective monitoring and accountability. |
| **National partners** | Coordination and engagement in all circles of the projects. | Increased participation and accountability among stakeholders. |
| **Target groups** | Engagement in all circles of the projects. | Increased sense of ownership, equal community participation and strengthened social cohesion of peaceful co-existence. |

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

| |
|---|
| **Key conclusions of previous ROM missions of the projects, Food security in Transitioning Environment (FORESITE) for former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states.** |
| • During the ROM, some of the five principles of Rights-Based approach were being observed albeit not deliberately. The principles include; Apply all human rights (legality/universality/indivisibility); participation and Access decision-making; Non-discrimination and Equal access; Accountability and Access to the rule of law. |
| • The action was not all-inclusive in working with people living with disabilities, children and the elderly. The mid-term evaluation also noted this. |
| • The consortium's efforts to collaborate and work in partnership with other EU projects did not come out clearly. There was no information availed as to how the EU funded FORESITE project was working with other EU funded projects in the area. |
| • As the action is entering the exit stretch, there were no records or reports to show the action's preparedness for a phase-out. There was no exit strategy of disengagement of the consortium and the EU funding. |
| **Key conclusions of previous ROM missions of project, Strengthening Smallholders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile States (SSRGUN).** |
| • The project has not revised the analysis of assumptions and risk matrix since the start of implementation in January 2020. However, flooding of the Nile River has severely eroded the coping capacity and resilience of target communities, groups and beneficiaries in the years 2020 and 2021 though flooding was identified and its extent was ranked as MEDIUM during the project design. |
| • There are still sustainability threats because of limited resilience of the of the target communities, groups and beneficiaries to externalities such as flooding, insecurity and communal conflicts. |
| • The IPs have almost been implementing similar project activities in different states. However, some cases of inconsistency in modality of implementation were reported in the provision of start-up capital for examples to VSLA groups and farm inputs for FFS. |

# 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<tr><td>Type of evaluation</td><td colspan="2">Final Projects Evaluations</td></tr>
<tr><td>Coverage</td><td colspan="2">The Actions to their entirety</td></tr>
<tr><td>Geographic scope</td><td colspan="2">South Sudan</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Period to be evaluated</td><td>26/July/2019 to 26/March/2023</td><td>Food Security in Transitioning Environment (FORESITE) in Former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states.</td></tr>
<tr><td>01/January/2020 to 31/Dec/2023</td><td>Strengthening Small Holders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile States.</td></tr>
</table>

## 2.1 Objectives of the evaluation and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[3] of the European Commission[4]. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**[5] 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.**[6]

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether and how the EU intervention(s) has/have 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, the interested stakeholders and other audience] with:

- An overall independent assessment of the performance of the " Food Security in Transitioning Environment (FORSITE) in former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states" and, "Strengthening Small holders' Resilience in Greater Upper Niles States" projects, 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 current and future interventions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve as source to inform decision-making on the appropriateness and thematic priorities of a larger scale interventions and its replicability by drawing on lessons learnt from

---

[3] *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 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008*

[4] *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 Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://commission.europa.eu/publications/completing-better-regulation-agenda-2017_en*

[5] *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://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0236.*

[6] *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*

engagement. In addition, the results of their evaluation will provide valuable information towards future actions by checking effectiveness and scalability.

The main users of this evaluation will be the European Union Delegation to South Sudan, European Commission, International donor community, UN agencies, NGOs, civil society organizations, national stakeholders including relevant authorities.

The evaluation will assess the intervention(s) using the **six standard DAC evaluation criteria**, namely: **relevance**, **coherence**, **efficiency**, **effectiveness, sustainability** and **Impact**. In addition, the evaluation will assess the intervention(s) 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 empowerment**[7], **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 Manager[8] and Reference Group and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions. This will include an 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. To what extent have the interventions contributed to improved governance, conflict prevention and forced displacements due to loss of livelihoods.
2. To what extent the intervention achieved the objective of improve food security of rural smallholders farmers to cope with environmental volatility and insecurity in Greater Bahr el Ghazel and Greater Upper Nile states.
3. To what extent have the two interventions achieved their stated expected results?
4. What are the key lessons learned, conclusions, and recommendations that would inform future interventions, including best practices are how these recommendations on how these can be harmonised and promoted.

### 2.3 Structuring of the evaluation and outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases, which each phase having sets of activities listed under the phase. Each of the phases should start/end with briefing and debriefing with the EU delegation.

1. Inception phase (10 days)
2. Interim phase

---

[7] *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-dimenstion*

[8] *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.*

- Desk activities (10 days)
- Field activities (15 days)

3. Synthesis phase (5 days)
4. Dissemination phase (5 days)

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 (10 days)*

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 OM 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.
- The methodology will include the proposed representative sample of interventions to be analysed in detail to inform the assessment of performance and results/sustainability. The selection of this sample should be underpinned by a clear methodology (incl. selection criteria used).
- Representation of the methodological approach in an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex IV).
- Work-plan 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 activities (10 days)

Objectives of the activities: to analyse the relevant data, draft preliminary answers to the Evaluation Questions and identify the hypotheses to be tested.

Main activities of evaluators

- In-depth analysis of relevant documents and other sources. This is to be done systematically and should reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.
- Identification of interviewees remote and other sources of information to support the analysis of data, as relevant.
- Fine-tuning of the evaluation tools.
- Finalisation of the organisation of the field visits, including list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.
- 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 field activities.
- Preparation of the Desk Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Preparation of a slide presentation of preliminary findings from the desk activities (free format).
- Remote presentation of the preliminary findings from the desk activities to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.
- Consideration of the comments to the Desk Note to be addressed in the next reports.

#### 2.3.2.2 Field activities (15 days)

Objectives of the activities: to conduct primary research and validate/modify the hypotheses formulated during the desk activities.

Main activities of evaluators

- Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
- Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders, including the relevant government and local authorities and agencies, throughout the field activities.
- 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 field activities.
- Preparation of the Intermediary Field 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).
- Remote presentation of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.

### *2.3.3 Synthesis Phase (5 days)-Remotely*

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.
- If applicable, preparation of a response to the draft QAG[9] (Quality Assessment Grid) formulated by the Evaluation Manager.
- Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report; 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
- Inclusion of an executive summary (free text format) in the Final Report (see Annex V).

<u>The evaluators will make sure that</u>:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- 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 (5 days)-Remotely*

<u>Objective of the phase</u>: to support the communication of the results of the evaluation.

<u>The targeted audience</u> will be the commission, the EU delegation, UN agencies, NGO/INGO, civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders.

<u>Main activities of evaluators</u>

- Development of 1-page infographic material for dissemination of main findings.
- Development of 2-page brief for dissemination of main findings.

<u>References</u>: 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 |
|---|---|---|

[9] The Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) is not available outside the EVAL module, and should therefore not be used for evaluations managed outside EVAL-OPSYS, such as EUTF interventions. This grid may nevertheless be used as a separate document by the evaluation managers, if they deem it useful.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Inception phase** | • *Meeting: kick off* | • After initial document analysis |
| | • Inception Report | • End of Inception Phase |
| | • Slide presentation | • End of Inception Phase |
| | • *Meeting: presentation of Inception Report* | • End of Inception Phase |
| **2. Interim phase: Desk activities** | • Desk/Interim Report | • End of Desk Activities |
| | • Slide presentation | • End of Desk Activities |
| | • *Meeting: presentation of Desk Report* | • End of Desk Activities |
| **2.1. Interim phase: Field activities** | • Intermediary note | • End of Field Activities |
| | • Slide presentation | • End of Field Activities |
| | • *Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings* | • End of Field Activities |
| **3. Synthesis phase** | • Draft Final Report | • 2 weeks after the end of field activities. |
| | • *Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report* | • 1 week after submission of the Draft Final Report |
| | • Comments on the draft QAG | • Together with Final Report |
| | • Final Report | • 15 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report |
| | • Executive summary of the Final Report | • Together with Final Report |
| **4. Dissemination Phase** | • Final Report | • 15 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report |
| | • Executive summary of the Final Report | • Together with Final Report |
| | • Infographic | • Together with Final Report |
| | • 2-page brief | • Together with 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.

### *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 contracting authority of the evaluation is European Union Delegation to South Sudan.

The Evaluation Manager of the EUD to South Sudan manages the evaluation. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Evaluation Manager with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Delegation.

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.

### *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 and 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 placement[10]

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.

## 3.2 Location

- Normal places of posting of the specific assignment: TBC
- Missions outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): TBC

## 3.3 Start date and period of implementation

The indicative start date is 1st Feb 2024 and the period of implementation of the contract will be 120 workings days, from 1st Feb 2024 to 1st July 2024.

# 4 REQUIREMENTS

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.

## 4.1 Expertise

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

- Qualifications and skills required for the team:
  Masters in Monitoring and Evaluation, Statistics, Agricultural Economics, International Development and its equivalent.
- General professional experience of the team:
  Experience in Monitoring and Evaluation in various Professional disciplines.
- Specific professional experience of the team:
  Experience in Monitoring and Evaluation of EU funded Agriculture & Livelihoods contracts/projects that addresses agriculture, food security and rural development.

  Experience in conducting evaluations in fragile context in Africa, Eastern and Horn of Africa, previous experience in South Sudan is preferred.
- Language skills of the team: English C2-Level

## 4.2 Requested number of days per category

| Expert category | Minimum requirement concerning the category | Number of working days | Additional information |
|---|---|---|---|

[10] *As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Category I | Category I. >12 years of experience | 45 | Team Leader-01 |
| Category II | Category II. 6> years of experience | 45 | Expert |

# 5 REPORTS

## 5.1 Content, deadlines and formats of deliverables

For the list of required reports and deliverables, please refer to Chapter 2.3 of these Terms of Reference.

| Title | Content | Submission timing or deadline |
|---|---|---|
| **Inception Reports** | Introduction, Reconstructed intervention logic, stakeholders map, finalized evaluations questions, methodology for evaluation, analysis of risks related to evaluation methodology and mitigation measures, ethics rules, work-plan. | End of inception report |
| **Desk/Interim reports** | Introduction, background and key methodological elements, preliminary findings, updates of field visits, approach and work-plans, main annexes. | At the end of desk activities. |
| **Draft & Final reports** | Executive summary, introductions, findings, overall assessments, conclusions, recommendation, lessons learnt, annexes to the report. | • Draft report, 2 weeks after the end of field activities.<br>• Final report, 15 days after receiving comments on draft Final report. |

## 5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

Not applicable for interventions not managed under OPSYS.

## 5.3 Number of report copies

Apart from its submission, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 04 paper copies and in electronic versions in WORD and PDF at no extra cost.

## 5.4 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 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments will be submitted within 10 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 Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) (text provided in Annex VII).

The Contractor is given the chance to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. 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(es): William.Wolit@eeas.europa.eu and in copy to Kenyi.Kilombe@eeas.europa.eu and Sergio.rejado-albaina@eeas.europa.eu

# ANNEXES TO TOR

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

*1. Food Security in Transitioning Environment (FORESITE) in Former Warrap, Lakes, and WBG states.*

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact (Overall Objective)** | To contribute to strengthening the resilience of communities, improving governance and conflict prevention, and reducing forced displacements due to loss of livelihoods | Decrease in the proportion of internally displaced people in the targeted states | *Government of South Sudan Statics and Reports* |
| | | Decrease in the proportion of people in the targeted states falling in the IPC phase 3 and below | *UN OCHA reports and*<br>*FAO Food Security Assessment Reports* |
| | | | |
| **Specific Objective** | To improve food security of rural smallholders in Greater Bahr el Ghazal and to empower them to cope with environmental volatility and insecurity | % HHs in moderate or severe food insecurity | *Household survey at baseline, midterm and end line evaluation* |
| | | Average Coping Strategies Index (CSI) score11 | “ |
| | | % change in HH subjective resilience score[12] | “ |
| | | | |

[11] See https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp211058.pdf

[12] This indicator will be developed prior to baseline as part of an action-funded publication on building subjective resilience – see “Publication” section in Description of the Action.

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome 1** | Reduced barriers to engagement in resilience building, food security and income generating activities, especially for women and youth | % of respondents who feel that their community is a safe place for women and youth. | “ |
| | | % of respondents who believe that the majority of their friends and community members currently agree with key gender attitude statements [13] | “ |
| | | % change in the measure of the likelihood of traditional court rulings on HLP being made in a woman’s favour[14] | “ |
| | | | |
| **Outcome 2** | Increased anticipatory, absorptive, and adaptive capacity with respect to climate change and disruptive events including natural disasters and conflict. | % of HH reporting good social cohesion[15] | “ |
| | | % of HH who demonstrate knowledge and use of Early Warning Systems and know what to do in case of an emergency or disaster | “ |
| | | Average value of member savings + disbursements including social funds per group member | *Savings groups records* |

[13] *See [https://www.indikit.net/indicator/78-gender-equality/325-gender-equitable-men-gem-scale](https://www.indikit.net/indicator/78-gender-equality/325-gender-equitable-men-gem-scale) and [https://www.indikit.net/indicator/78-gender-equality/315-perceived-social-norms](https://www.indikit.net/indicator/78-gender-equality/315-perceived-social-norms)*

[14] *Respondents would be asked “How likely do you think it is that traditional court rulings on HLP are made in a woman’s favour? Very likely, somewhat likely, neutral, unlikely, very unlikely”.*

[15] *% of respondents who score 'good' on 2 or more of the three Social Cohesion questions of the Adapted Community Capacity questionnaire. The three Social Cohesion questions in the Adapted Community Capacity questionnaire can be included in a Household Survey. The respondent is asked to rate their perception on a 4 point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree to the following three questions: 1. People in this community readily help each other in times of need. 2. People in this community tend to trust one another 3. People in the community actively take care of those that are poor, weak or marginalized*

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | % of households reporting a reduction in incidents/conflicts | *Household Survey at baseline, midterm and end line evaluation* |
| | | | |
| **Outcome 3** | *Improved and resilient food security and income especially for women and youth* | Median household income | " |
| | | Average metric tons produced [per hectare] in the last 12 months, disaggregated by crop type- groundnuts, maize, and sorghum | Post-harvest monitoring report |
| | | % of women and men reporting improved access to inputs needed for income generation | *Household Survey at baseline, midterm and end line evaluation* |
| | | | |
| **Output 1.1** | *Institutions, communities, and individuals have access to knowledge and skills to practice more gender-equitable relations and support a more gender-equitable enabling environment* | # of government counterparts trained in gender context and strategies | Project progress & MEAL reports |
| | | # of people reached with community-level sensitization on gender and women's rights and other gender-related topics | Project reports |

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | # of women (both already in local government structures and those motivated to take on these positions) supported with political participation training | Project reports |
| | | # of traditional leaders (who arbitrate in customary courts) trained to understand and implement relevant South Sudan law | Project reports |
| | | | |
| **Output 1.2** | *Community-based groups and actors have the opportunities and capacity to identify and pursue peacebuilding strategies* | # of safety perception mapping exercises conducted | Safety perception mapping reports |
| | | # of Payam-level peace committees provided with operational support | MoUs, project reports |
| | | # of peace clubs established for youth in cattle camps | Project reports |
| | | | |
| **Output 2.1** | *Communities plan, deliver and maintain communal assets which enhance local resilience and livelihoods* | # of functional community assets | Project reports |
| | | # of community members participating in cash for assets | Attendance sheet |
| | | | |
| **Output 2.2** | *Local institutions lead inclusive, conflict-sensitive NRM, DRR, and land use planning* | # of FMNR established (at boma level) | Project reports |

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | # of communities with Early Warning Early Action plans in place (1 in each Boma) | Project reports |
| | | # of the relevant county, Payam, and boma staff trained in conflict resolution | Project reports |
| | | | |
| **Output 2.3** | *HHs have access to savings and loans and social networks, and knowledge of positive coping strategies* | # of functional Savings Groups | S4T health survey |
| | | # of Savings Group Members by gender | *Savings groups registers*<br>*Records* |
| | | | |
| **Output 3.1** | *FGs intensify and diversify sustainable and market-oriented agricultural production of nutritious food* | *# of FG with access to information on marketing and opportunities* | KII, project reports |
| | | *# of marketing associations (producer groups) formed* | Project reports |
| | | *The volume of LVCD products sold collectively by producer groups* | *Producer group records* |
| | | *The volume of quality assured seed produced by producer groups* | Certificate of quality assurance |

| | Results/Outcome<br>Outputs | Indicators | Means of Verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | # of blacksmiths trained in production/repair of ploughs and other tools | Project reports |
| | | # of "ploughing master trainer" and "ploughing service provider" trained | Project reports |
| | | # of private sector extension agents/ "sales agents", commissioned or employed by agricultural input dealers or value addition facilities | Project reports |
| | | | |
| **Output 3.2** | *Increased and diversified income-generating activities especially for women and youth* | # S4T groups trained in business skills | Project reports |
| | | # businesses established by S4T groups or individual members | Project reports |
| | | # individuals completing TVET courses | Project reports |
| | | # mother gardens established | Project reports |
| | | # TVET graduates supported to start businesses/ employment (through start-up kits or link to the employer) | Project reports |
| | | | |

**2. Logframe Matrix- Strengthening Small Holders' Resilience in Greater Upper Nile States, Project**

| | Results chain | Indicators | Source & mean of verification |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact (Overall Objective)** | To contribute to strengthening the resilience of communities, improving governance of natural resources & conflict prevention & reducing forced displacements due to loss of livelihoods in the GUN region | Decrease in the number of internally displaced people in the selected States during the project period | IOM and UNOCHA Reports |
| | | Decrease in the number of HH in IPC 3 and above | FAO/UNOCHA IPC Reports,<br>FSL Assessment reports |
| | | The decrease in conflict incidences in the selected States | UN OCHA Reports, GoSS Data,<br>UMISS reports,<br>SSRGUN Conflict incident tracker |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | To improve the food security of rural smallholders in the Greater Upper Nile & to empower them to cope with environmental volatility & insecurity | Average Coping Strategy Index (CSI) Score | BL report,<br>MTE report,<br>ETE report, FSNMS Reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | % of targeted HHs with acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS) (Disaggregated by State) | BL report,<br>MTE report,<br>ETE report,<br>FSNMS Reports |
| | | The decrease in the number of months HH report food shortage after harvest | BL report,<br>MTE report,<br>ETE report,<br>FSNMS reports,<br>Rapid FS assessment |
| **Results /ST Outcome (s)** | **Result 1:** Increased food production and productivity | The average number of hectares cultivated per HH disaggregated by state & crop type | Post Distribution reports, MTE and Annual Report |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | Number of farmers adopting climate Smart agriculture practices disaggregated by gender | Monitoring reports |
| | | Average yield (kg) per hectare, desegregated by crop type | Post-harvest reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Result 2:** Increased dietary diversity | Number of HH with access to at least 4 different types of foods including fruits and vegetables | Outcome monitoring reports,<br><br>BL report<br><br>MTE report,<br><br>ETE report |
| | | % increase in Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) of target beneficiaries | Outcome monitoring reports,<br><br>BL report,<br><br>MTE report,<br><br>ETE report |
| | **Result 3:** Enhanced households' income & access to market systems | %of farmers (crop/livestock/fisheries) reporting increased access to markets | BL report,<br><br>MTE report,<br><br>ETE report |
| | | % of farmers increasing agricultural and livestock income on an annual basis | Monitoring reports,<br><br>Baseline, midterm, and end line reports |
| | **Result 4:** Increased community capacity to mitigate & enhance resilience to natural shocks and stresses | Number of DRR plans adopted by the communities | Monitoring reports' BL, MTE, ETE reports |
| | | Number of HHs reporting reduced incidences of conflict. | BL report,<br><br>MTE report, |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | ETE report |
| | | % increase in households reporting improved ability to cope with future shocks and stresses. | BL report,<br>MTE report,<br>ETE report |
| | | % of HH reporting increased ability to access affordable financial services (loans and savings) | BL report,<br>MTE report,<br>ETE report |
| Outputs | **Output 1.1:** Farmer knowledge of good agricultural practices & animal husbandry improved | Number of Agricultural Extension Agents/CAHWs trained, disaggregated by gender | IP Annual Reports,<br>Activity Reports,<br>Attendance lists |
| | | Number of farmers trained, disaggregated by gender and type of training (agronomy & animal husbandry) | Distribution lists,<br>Training Activity Reports |
| | **Output 1.2:** Access to agricultural extension services enhanced | Number of seed production /multiplication centres established | Activity Reports,<br>Annual Reports,<br>BL and END reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | No of seed producers certified, disaggregated by gender | Producer Certificates,<br><br>IP Annual reports,<br><br>Baseline and end line reports |
| | | # of producer farmer groups established (FFS/FFFS/PFS) | Activity Reports, Annual Reports, Groups Lists |
| | **Output 1.3** Access to agricultural inputs for farmers/fisher folk enhanced | Number of farmers receiving agricultural and livestock inputs broken by type of inputs | Distribution lists, Training Activity Reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | Number of livestock vaccinated and treated | Activity Reports |
| | **Output 2.1:** Access to dietary practices and information enhanced | Number of nutrition demonstration farms established | Activity specific reports,<br><br>Annual and Monitoring missions' reports |
| | | Number of lead farmers and fellow farmers trained on horticultural production | Activity specific reports,<br><br>Annual and Monitoring reports |
| | **Output 2.2:** Support IYCN and CMAM activities through | Number of women groups trained on nutrition innovations | Activity specific reports,<br><br>Annual & Monitoring reports |
| | | Number of cooking demonstrations held | Activity specific reports, |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Annual & Monitoring reports |
| | **Output 3.1:** Access to markets and market information improved | Number of collective marketing committees established | Activity specific reports,<br>Attendance lists,<br>Input distribution lists |
| | | Number of farmers organizations/ farmers linked to markets | Activity Reports,<br>Groups lists,<br>Annual Reports |
| | | Product marketing and information systems developed. | Activity Reports,<br>Annual Reports,<br>Groups Lists |
| | **Output 3.2:** Knowledge of livelihoods diversification opportunities enhanced | Number of trained and practicing animal traction promoters | Training Activity reports |
| | | Number of community drying facilities established | Activity reports |
| | **Output 3.3:** Promotion of non-agricultural activities | Number of market and livelihood assessments conducted | Assessment reports |
| | | Number of beneficiaries trained on alternative IGAs planning | Training Activity reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | Number of trained beneficiaries supported with alternative IGA start-ups & remain operational 6 months after | Activity attendance lists,<br><br>Start-up kit distribution lists,<br><br>IP Annual reports |
| | **Output 4.1:** Resilience enhanced through knowledge and appropriate measures | Number of CMDRR established | Attendance lists,<br><br>BL & EL reports,<br><br>Activity specific reports |
| | | Number of DRR plans developed | Activity specific reports |
| | | Number of the local authority and CMDRRC members trained on PDRA, DRR planning, and peacebuilding skills | Activity reports,<br><br>Attendance lists,<br><br>Annual report,<br><br>Peace agreements adopted |
| | | Number of county-based early warning systems (CBEWS) developed | IP activity and annual reports,<br><br>BL & ETE reports, |
| | | Number of water reservoirs constructed | IP activity and annual reports |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Output 4.2:** Social capital developed | # of VSLA created | Activity specific reports,<br><br>VSLA records,<br><br>monitoring/annual reports |
| | | # of seed banks created | Activity specific reports,<br><br>VSLA activity, Monitoring reports,<br><br>BL & EL reports |
| | **Output 4.3:** Reinforcement of agricultural statistics. | # Contributions to IPC (food security data), disaggregated by location | IP annual reports, Statistical bulletins, referenced reports uploaded into CIIS |

## 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:

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the intervention(s) to be evaluated.
- Country Strategy Paper South Sudan, and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered.
- Relevant national/sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors.
- Intervention design studies.
- Intervention feasibility/formulation studies.
- Intervention financing agreement and addenda.
- Intervention's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports.
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the intervention.
- Intervention's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports.
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors.
- Guidance for gender sensitive evaluations.
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the intervention(s).
- Any other relevant document.

***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: "Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx?"** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation criteria covered** [16] | | | | |
| **Judgement criteria (JC)** [17] | **Indicators (Ind)** [18] | **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 - | | | |

*[16] What evaluation criterion/criteria is/are addressed by this EQ?*

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

*[18] 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[19] | Baseline data[20] | Evidence gathered/analysed | Quality of evidence[21] |
|---|---|---|---|
| I 1.1.1 | | | |
| I 1.1.2 | | | |
| I 1.1.3 | | | |
| I 1.2.1 | | | |
| I 1.2.2 | | | |
| I 1.3.1 | | | |

[19] *Use the same numbering as in Part A; no need to describe the indicators.*

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

[21] *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:<br>o Overview of entire evaluation process and tools<br>o Consultation strategy.<br>o Case studies.<br>o 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 from (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. *DESK/INTERIM REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the desk activities)*

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Introduction | |
| Background and key methodological elements | With an indication of:<br>o Overall evaluation approach<br>o Desk activities:<br>▪ Data collection and analyses<br>▪ Overview of tools and techniques used<br>o Challenges and limitations |

| | |
|---|---|
| Preliminary findings | Preliminary answers to each EQ**,** with an indication (in tabular form) of the hypotheses to be tested in the field and information gaps |
| Update of field visit approach and work plan | |
| Main annexes | ○ Preliminary answers by judgement criteria<br>○ Updated evaluation matrix (Part A + Part B) |

### 3. ***INTERMEDIARY FIELD NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the field activities)***

The format of the Intermediary Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 10 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

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

### 4. ***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) |

### 5. ***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 *(optional)* | 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.<br>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.<br>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 | The report should include the following annexes:<br>• Terms of Reference of the evaluation<br>• names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)<br>• detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties |

| | |
|---|---|
| | encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses<br>• detailed answer by judgement criteria<br>• evaluation matrix with data gathered and analysed by (EQ/JC) indicator<br>• Intervention Logic/Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)<br>• relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place<br>• list of persons/organisations consulted<br>• literature and documentation consulted<br>• other technical annexes (e.g., statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant. |

## 6. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (in EVAL Module except for EUTF interventions)

An Executive Summary is to be prepared using the specific format foreseen, inspired by the one in the EVAL module. Its format will be available to evaluators at the time of submission of the Final Report. For evaluations of EUTF interventions, it will therefore be written as a stand-alone document outside the EVAL module.

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[22] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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)** | | | | |

[22] *Add one column per each evaluator*

## ANNEX VII: EVALUATION 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. 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. (Not applicable to** for EUTF) | |
| **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:<br>• are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers;<br>• highlight the key messages;<br>• have various chapters and annexes well balanced in length;<br>• contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding;<br>• contain a list of acronyms (only the Report);<br>• avoid unnecessary duplications;<br>• have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors.<br>• 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:<br>• data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology;<br>• the report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations;<br>• 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:<br>• findings derive from the evidence gathered;<br>• findings address all selected evaluation criteria;<br>• findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources;<br>• when assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts;<br>• 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**

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- 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**

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- 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)***

**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:**

- lessons are identified;

| | |
|---|---|
| • 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** |
| | |