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# About the Development Fund

For more than 40 years the Development Fund (DF) has collaborated with local communities and civil society organizations in developing countries to improve the production of food and income generation of highly vulnerable and marginalized rural communities. DF’s vision is a sustainable and just world with freedom from hunger, poverty, and marginalization. Hundreds of thousands of small-scale farming households have received DF-support to develop resilient livelihoods and eliminate hunger, malnutrition, and poverty in their communities.

DF has stood steadfast in the forefront among development organizations promoting the empowerment of marginalized rural communities, pro-poor policies and appropriate solutions, particularly through approaches such as crop diversification, modern-farming, climate adaptive villages, climate-smart agriculture techniques, community seedbanks, small scale irrigation and mechanizations, natural resource management, microcredits and capacity building of civil society and grassroots organization. DF mobilizes the assets of small-scale farmers to ensure local contribution, involvement, and ownership, which is key to a sustainable, resilient and equitable development.

# Project background and context

## Project description

As part of its overall goal of DF, the Sustainable Vegetable Value Chain Project (SVVC) funded by Norad is designed to improve livelihoods and reduction of poverty for selected smallholder farmers by promoting vegetable production and business. The project has been implemented between 1st January 2019 and 30th June 2023 including a no cost extension of 6 months (from January to June 30, 2023).

DF is the lead agency and works together with two implementing partners; namely Women Empowerment Action (WE-Action) and ORDA Ethiopia and two other strategic partners (JoyTech Fresh and Netherlands Development Organization (SNV). The project is implemented in two districts of Amhara region; namely Fogera district of South Gondar zone and Guba Lafto district of North Wollo zone. WE-Action is implementing the project in Guba Lafto district while ORDA Ethiopia is implementing the project in Fogera district. JoyTech Fresh supplies high-quality seedlings to the farmers and SNV offers technical expertise to the project through training of partner staff, model farmers and Government extension workers and provision of training materials, manuals and guidelines.

## Objectives of the Project

The overall objective (the intended impact) of the project is to increase income and job opportunities for selected smallholder farmers. More specifically, the overall goal is to improve the livelihoods of target communities by increasing income of 3,500 small holder farmers and creating 2,600 jobs in the agriculture sector.

This will be achieved through two outcomes and five outputs:

**Outcome 1**: Vegetable business of smallholder farmers expanded/enhanced

Output 1.1: Supply of quality inputs locally increased

Output 1.2: Knowledge on vegetable production increased

Output 1.3: Access to market increased

**Outcome2:** Export of vegetable by medium/large scale farmers increased

Output 2.1: Production of vegetable for export Improved

Output 2.2: Capacity of medium/large scale farmers for export increased

## Project implementation modality

The project implementation approach is participatory in nature whereby the target communities and key stakeholders jointly participate in planning, implementation, and monitoring. The project is implemented by local partners with technical support of Joy Teck and SNV.

To ensure community engagement and stakeholder participation, the project has developed a joint MOU between the parties; Government, Joy Tech, SNV and DF (including the implementing partners We-Action and ORDA Ethiopia). The roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder (including the steering committee and working groups) are clearly listed in the MOU. The steering committee, consisting of members of the management of DF and Joy Tech are meeting quarterly, while the working groups consisting of experts of DF, SNV, Joy Tech, We-Action and ORDA Ethiopia meet as needed. The steering committee assigns tasks to the working groups and follows up the progress.

**Project Outcome and Output Indicators**

|  |
| --- |
| **RESULT / INDICATORS** |
|  **Income and Job opportunities Increased** |
| 1. Average annual income of small holder farmers from vegetable production
 |
| 1. Average annual income per hectare from export of Vegetables (USD)
2. Local people employed in medium/large scale farms and in satellite hub
 |
| **Outcome 1: Vegetable business of smallholder farmers expanded/enhanced** |
| 1. % of volume of vegetable products of smallholder farmers sold in the market
2. Vegetable productivity (kgs/ha)

**Output 1.1: Supply of quality inputs locally increased**Annual # of quality seedlings produced and supplied by Joy Tech**Output 1.2: Knowledge on vegetable production increased**1.2.1. Annual # of experts/extension workers who receive ToT and close follow up on vegetable production1.2.2 Annual # of model farmers who receive ToT and close follow up on vegetable production1.2.3. # Of smallholder farmers who receive training and close follow up for producing vegetable using improved practices1.2.4. # Of SSPs (Spray service Providers) and Kebele pesticide agents who receive training and inputs on pesticide application**Output 1.3: Access to market increased**# Of farmer cooperatives/Argo-dealers established/strengthened for collective marketing |
| **Outcome 2: Export of vegetables by medium/large scale farmers increased** |
|  # Volume of Vegetable products of medium/large scale farmers exported (tons) |
| **Output 2.1: Production of vegetables for export increased** |
|  Ha of land for exported Vegetable by medium/large scale farmers (ha)2 |
| Output 2.2: Capacity of medium/large scale farmers for export increased |
| # Of medium/large scale farmers accredited for export of vegetables |

*Source:* Updated logical framework (2019)

# Purpose of the end-term evaluation

The overall purpose of this end term evaluation is to assess and document the performance of the project and the extent to which the outputs and outcomes have been achieved, determining relevance, coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness. The Evaluation is forward-looking and will assess whether and to what extent results (I) are sustainable, and (II) may contribute to achieving the intended impact. On this basis the Evaluation will provide clear (actionable) recommendations for improvements. The Evaluation is also intended to assess success factors and constraints, capture lessons learnt, and document new knowledge and important topics for further enquiry, action, lobbying and/or influence.

The Evaluation will ensure accountability towards Norad as a donor as well as the target beneficiaries of the project. As such, it fulfils a prescribed obligation set forth in the agreement with the Norad and may form part of the basis for an assessment regarding possible continuation of the current partnership, and/or support for new Project concepts presented by DF.

# Specific objectives

The specific objectives of this Evaluation are to:

* Ascertain results as stipulated in the logical framework
* Assess relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, in addition to project and risk management and relevant cross-cutting issues
* Provide findings, conclusions, key lessons learned and clear recommendations for future design and implementation
* Identify any challenges the project faced and formulate appropriate recommendations for future actions, and
* Assess whether the collaboration between DF, its implementing and strategic/private sector partners have added value to the interventions with a positive effect on beneficiaries and other stakeholders (including what factors contributed to or detracted from added value).

# Evaluation questions

In order to achieve the specific objectives of the Evaluation, the Consultant shall employ the six standard [DAC evaluation criteria](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)[[1]](#footnote-1), with special emphasis on sustainability. The consultant is encouraged to further develop the evaluation questions listed below.

## Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?

1. To what extent were the objectives and activities implemented by the project relevant in addressing the needs of the beneficiaries?
2. To what extent was the project relevant for needs, priorities, and objectives of DF, its partners, the donor, and the governments of Ethiopia?
3. How has the collaboration between DF, partners, relevant line ministries and other stakeholders contributed to the specific needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?
4. To what extent was the project relevant to the Ten Years Development plan and related sector plans of the country?
5. To what extent was the project able to adapt and provide appropriate response to context changes and emerging local needs, and the priorities of beneficiaries?

## Coherence: How well does the project fit?

1. To what extent has the project created synergies and collaboration between Project stakeholders?
2. What has been the particular added value of DF’s various project partners, including Joy Tech, SNV and Farm Force?
3. To what extent has the project been complementary and coherent to national policies as well as other donor-funded development projects in the areas where it has been implemented?

## Effectiveness: Has the project achieved its objectives?

1. To what extent have results in the log frame been achieved, per indicator, disaggregated by gender?
	1. What are the main results (most significant changes) achieved by the project so far?
	2. Were there any unexpected results/impact (positive or negative) because of implementing the project?
	3. What was the impact of overproduction of the different types of vegetables? What effects did overproduction have on nutrition levels of project farmers and their families?
	4. Was there food loss in the value chain as a result of vegetable overproduction or is there evidence of any pre- and post-harvest management related problems?
2. Were activities implemented effectively?
	1. How effective were the implementing partners in mobilizing and engaging different target groups in different interventions (including marketing system, skills on extension service and linking grass-root organizations to relevant district level government institutions)?
	2. How well has knowledge generated by the project been used? E.g., the use of fertilizer, chemicals, effective use of irrigation water, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) etc?
	3. How effective were actions to reduce or mitigate potential adverse effects of Covid-19 and war in northern Ethiopia?
3. Were adequate arrangements made for effective MEAL, including a viable Results Framework, monitoring and evaluation plan, results-based reporting, and routine/systems for measuring performance against the Results Framework?
4. To what extent has DF contributed to the capacity of implementing partners?

## Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

1. To what extent was the project implemented in a cost-efficient manner?
	1. How efficiently were inputs converted to outputs, outcomes, and impact (i.e. were inputs converted into results in a timely and cost-effective manner)?
	2. How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
	3. Were alterations made to project design in terms of collaboration during the implementation phase based on the reality on the ground?
2. Was expenditure justifiable when compared to the plans, progress, and output of the project, or could the project have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality or quantity of the results (e.g., areas of non-priority, wasteful or unnecessary expenditure, or alternative ways to achieve same results)?

## Impact: What difference does the project make?

1. To what extent is the overall objective (intended impact) likely to be achieved?
	1. To what extent has project design and the implementation approach contributed the income, livelihoods and job creation?
2. What are the significant effects of the intervention (positive or negative, expected, or unforeseen) on the beneficiaries?
	1. What stories of success can be highlighted?
3. Are there hindrances to actions (constraints, binding or otherwise) that have not been adequately addressed by the project?
4. What were the main challenges towards achieving intended results and how might these be addressed in the future? (This question will also be examined regarding effectiveness.)

## Sustainability: Will the benefits last?

1. To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after its completion?
	1. Are there adequate and effective mechanisms (input supply, irrigation systems, etc.) in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits?
2. Were project results achieved in a manner that built ownership and capacity of the beneficiaries?
3. How effective were the exit strategy and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the Project, including contributing factors and constraints?
4. How has DF worked with local partners to increase their capacity in a sustainable way?
	1. What motivations/mechanisms exist for partners to continue playing these roles?
5. What are the key factors that will require attention to improve sustainability?
6. Has a “Do No Harm” approach been sufficiently implemented? If not, what measures should be taken to improve its implementation in the future?
7. Should the project be continued? If so, provide recommendations for improving the execution of the project in a possible second phase.

## Project and risk management

1. Is there scope to improve coordination amongst and between the many stakeholders and partner institutions? (Related to coherence)
2. Have implementation delays occurred? If so, have the partners identified effective countermeasures?
3. Was the risk management strategy adequate to cope with the identified risks (internal and external) and/or cope with unexpected impacts or opportunities?
	1. How well have identified and/or realised risk factors been managed/mitigated?
	2. Apart from Covid-19 and war, have other unanticipated risk factors arisen? If so, how well were they addressed by project partners?
4. What is the veracity of the project’s systems and capacity for financial management and auditing?
	1. Have project partners managed to control expenditure in line with the budget? (Related to efficiency)

## Cross-cutting issues

1. To what extent did the project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation framework take relevant cross-cutting issues into consideration? Specifically,
	1. To what extent have efforts to promote gender equality changed discriminatory attitudes/behaviour?
	2. To what extent and how are we delivering appropriate and effective programming for persons with disability?
	3. To what extent have good environmental practices been followed in implementing the project?

## Lessons learned

The articulation of lessons learned must be clear, relevant, targeted, and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended learning and accountability objectives.

1. What are the key lessons emerging from the project – both positive and negative lessons – that can inform future design and implementation of similar interventions?

# Scope and methodology of the Evaluation

**6.1. Scope**

The scope of the Evaluation comprises the entire implementation period (1 January 2019 to 30 June 2023), all the project components implemented in South Gondar Zone and North wollo Zone, the project partners (DF and the implementing partners), as well as the relevant government stakeholders. To make the evaluation more representative, the consultant shall consider sufficient samples from each district considering 95% confidence level with 5% margin of error. Although a mid-term review was not carried out, which could have served as a reference for the Evaluation, periodical progress and reports are highly relevant to the Evaluation.

## Evaluation methodology

The evaluation approach and methodology design should be developed by the Consultant in consideration of the information outlined in this ToR to ensure accuracy and rigour. The evaluation methodology should be aligned with a participatory *mixed-methods approach* that draws on both quantitative and qualitative data to enhance the validity of findings and their consequent contribution to recommendations on improvement. A detailed methodology, including data collection methods and tools, should be included in the proposal, which may be further improved in consultation with the Client during the inception phase. Questions about causality and the impact of contributions relative to other factors and alternative explanations must be analysed carefully.

The evaluation methodology, process and outputs must adhere to the OECD Development Quality Standards for Development Evaluation (OECD 2010). These standards include a requirement for the Consultant to be mindful of gender roles, ethnicity, ability, age, sex, and other differences (such as power dynamics) when designing and carrying out the Evaluation.

The Consultant is free to choose suitable specific methodologies, although scientific methodology must be used to ensure reliable, evidence-based conclusions and a high degree of transparency. At a minimum, the data collection methodology should include:

* Desk review of background documents (project application, baseline report, annual reports, progress and performance evaluation report, field visit reports, etc).
* Key informant interviews (KIIs) to gather substantial anecdotal evidence on the effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance of the project activities implementation and delivery.
* Quantitative surveys (at a minimum stratified sampling and advanced statistical analysis); and
* Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

**Intervention areas**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region | Intervention zone | intervention woreda | # Kebeles  | #Beneficiary HHS | Remark |
| Amhara | South Gondar | Fogera | 5 | 2000 |  |
| Amhara | North wollo | Gubalafto | 5 | 1500 |  |

# Qualifications of consultant(s)/Team

The evaluation team should comprise at a minimum two consultants. The lead has overall responsibility vis-à-vis the Client. Collectively, the consultancy team should possess the following set of competencies, experience, and skills:

* Master’s degree in agriculture/Natural resource management, Rural Development, social science, development studies/economics, statistics, or related field
* Demonstrable experience (at least 5 years) in conducting independent reviews/evaluations of interventions related to agronomy, agricultural production and vegetable value chain development.
* Knowledge and familiarity with the sociopolitical and socioeconomic context of Ethiopia
* Practical and theoretical expertise related to development work in Ethiopia is desirable
* Excellent track record in designing and conducting quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis (Familiarity with advanced statistical analysis is required)
* Familiarity with international quality and accountability standards applied in development cooperation
* Experience in the use of participatory methodologies and developing *gender-sensitive* evaluation
* Strong analytical and conceptual skills to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner
* Demonstrated excellent written and spoken communication skills in English and Amharic
* Practical experience on inclusion, gender issues, gender integration and analysis

# Award Criteria

## Technical award criteria

DF will evaluate bids according to the below technical award criteria and their respective weights.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical score (max 80 points) | Points |
| 1. Methodology for service delivery: Quality of proposed method and approach | **40** |
| 1.1 Understanding of purpose of the Evaluation TOR | 10 |
| 1.2 Description of the proposed approach and method | 15 |
| 1.3 Organization, distribution of tasks, coordination within the team and with DF for the successful completion of the Evaluation  | 5 |
| 1.4 Identification of challenges and mitigation measures for successful completion of the Evaluation  | 10 |
| 2. Proposed team | **40** |
| 2.1 Relevance of qualification and experience of Team Leader, as showed in section 7 | 15 |
| 2.2 Relevance of qualification and experience of other [no, as applicable] experts, as shown in section 7) | 15 |
| 2.3 Adequate coverage of technical experts of the team, as shown in section 7 | 10 |
| Evidence to be provided by compliant CV(s) |  |
| Financial score (max 20 points) | 20 |
| Total score | **100** |

To qualify, bids need to score at least 50% on each of the two technical criteria (minimum of 40 points in total).

# Responsibilities

The division of responsibility for the Evaluation is defined according to the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Responsibilities** |
| Consultant team | Full implementation of the evaluation, including practical arrangements such as: organising appointments, interviews and plan for travels/logistics both internationally and locally ; lead development and implementation of evaluation methods and write-up; conduct fieldwork and synthesize findings; organise verification workshops; ensure timely submission of Inception Report, Draft Evaluation Report, and Final Evaluation Report); timely incorporation of Client comments; and presentation of findings and recommendations to specified DF staff and partner organization on a validation workshop. |
| DF Country Programme | **Contract management**: Assist in providing contact details for key informants and relevant stakeholders to be consulted/interviewed; assist in planning fieldwork (in consultation with partners); provide inputs and documentation to the consultancy team; review inception report and draft evaluation report. Link consultants to partner organization and other relevant stakeholders and set up meetings as required.The Consultant will report to Sisay Kassahun, Country Program Coordinator. Modalities of communication, feedback mechanisms and contact with stakeholders will be agreed during the inception phase.Contact details:Sisay Kassahun, Country Program Coordinator.Development Fund of Norway, Ethiopia Country OfficeAddis Ababa, Ethiopia |
| Project implementers | Provide inputs and any required documentation to the consultancy team, logistical assistance with field trips. Assist in arranging meetings with project stakeholders when necessary. Provide inputs and any required project documentation. Arrange interviews, focus groups discussions, meetings, project site visits as requested |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Schedule, deliverables, and resourcing

## Schedule

The duration of the Evaluation is estimated to 4 calendar weeks, with the assignment tentatively set to commence on **1st June 2023** and be completed by **30th June 2023**.

The table below sets out evaluation activities and delivery of expected outputs. The timeline should be proposed by the consultant in the application and agreed with DF as part of the contract.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Delivery Dates** |
| Start-up – Preparatory/Contract signing |  |
| Start-up meeting (kick-off) |  |
| **Phase 1 – Inception / desk study** |  |
| * Submission of Draft Inception Report
 |  |
| * Client review and comment
 |  |
| * Submission of Final Inception Report
 |  |
| **Phase 2 – Data collection** |  |
| * Fieldwork (data collection)
 |  |
| * Debrief
 |  |
| **Phase 3 – Analysis and Reporting** |  |
| * Submission of Draft Evaluation Report
 |  |
| * Presentation of draft reports and presentation of initial findings and recommendation
 |  |
| * Client review and comment
 |  |
| * Submission of Final Evaluation Report
 |  |

## Deliverables

**Inception Report:** The Inception Report will not exceed 15 pages in length and will comprise detailed methodology, including data collection tools, indicative survey questions, and interview protocol; initial findings based on a desk study (document/literature review), a work plan and comprehensive list of stakeholders and key informants; list of relevant documents and references; and any other issue of importance.

**Draft report:** The Draft End-term Evaluation Report shall be delivered in English and shall not exceed 30 pages with standard font and spacing, including the executive summary, and excluding annexes, with the following sections (illustrative, not exhaustive):

* Executive Summary presenting main findings, conclusions, lessons learned, an assessment of what worked well and recommendations.
* Introduction and background, including evaluation purpose, objectives, and scope.
* Description of methodology
* Limitations
* Evaluation Results
* Findings, conclusions, and recommendations
* Lessons learned.
* Annexes (to include updated Logframe with results, evaluation ToR, Inception Report, maps, list of Key informant interviews /stakeholders, documents/literature reviewed, raw collected data and research tools (if applicable).
* The consultant must comply with global and DF Data protection policy, such the GDPR. Lists of key informants/interviewees shall only include personal data if deemed relevant (i.e., when it is contributing to the credibility of the evaluation) based on a case-based assessment by the evaluator. The inclusion of personal data in the report must always be based on a written consent.
* Evaluation findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation questions shall be clearly stated and answered in the executive summary and in the conclusions. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. They must be clear, relevant, targeted, and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended learning and accountability objectives.

The structure will be agreed at the inception stage. The report will be presented both in hard copy and in electronic version and be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing. The

**Presentation:** The consultant will present initial findings to DF, partners, and key stakeholders for validation.

**Final report:** The Final End-term Evaluation Report in English shall incorporate Client comments and shall not exceed 30 pages including the executive summary and excluding annexes. It shall be submitted in hard copy and digital form.

## Limitations

The Evaluation will be undertaken with the following possible limitations:

* Some targeted individuals may refuse to be interviewed
* Some beneficiaries may forget to recall relevant information for the evaluation.
* Local Government bureaucracy may challenge consultants.

# Reference documents (secondary data for desk study/literature review)

DF and the implementing partners will provide the Consultant with all available project documentation upon signing of the contract. The Consultant is encouraged to identify any other sources for appropriate additional information that may be required to supplement what is provided by the project. Project documents available include:

* Project proposal document
* Log frame (original and updated)
* Implementation plan / annual work plans
* Baseline report
* Project progress reports
* Project annual reports
* Monitoring reports
* List of project locations and participating communities
* List of key stakeholders

# Tender submission and contact details

Tenders/offers to conduct the Evaluation will be accepted from consultants as well as firms, and must be submitted in two separate documents, one containing technical proposal and the other financial proposal clearly marked “Consultancy Service for SVVCP Review” and sent by email to Lidia Bekele, Administration Assistant at DF Ethiopia df@utviklingsfondet.no

Please note that the bid must contain CVs of the proposed evaluation team. Financial proposal shall disclose all pricing information related to consultancy service as described in this Terms of Reference with USD for international consultants. Fee (non-recurring and recurring costs), Travel cost, and other out of pocket expenses should be given separately as a lump sum. Conditional cost is not acceptable.

For further details or questions regarding this ToR for the Evaluation, kindly contact Sisay Kassahun, Country Program Coordinator: sisay@developmentfund.no

# Annexes

Annex 1: Letter of tender form

**Re. Letter of tender: “End-term Evaluation for Sustainable Vegetable Value Chain Project (SVVC)**

 **QZA-0746 ETH 18\_0005**

We hereby confirm that:

We have fulfilled our obligations concerning payment of taxes and social contributions to the country of legal registration for our organisation/firm.

[ ]  Our organisation/firm has not been convicted of participation in a criminal organisation, corruption, fraud, money laundering. Furthermore, it has not been convicted of any criminal offence related to its business conduct and has not in the pursuit of its business activities committed any serious breach of professional or ethical standards in the industry concerned.

[ ]  We have experience from performing similar assignments.

[ ]  The tender is in a compliance with the minimum requirements specified in section 8 of the tender/ToR.

[ ]  No potential conflicts of interest are foreseen, nor are we aware of any factors that potentially could create a conflict of interest in connection with carrying out the assignment.

[ ]  The individual consultants who have been proposed for this assignment, and who will be travelling to high-risk areas, possess sufficient knowledge and training prior to travel to high-risk areas.

We have *[please select]*:

[ ]  **No deviations** to the tender document/ToR

We confirm that the tender is binding for ----------calculated from expiry of the closing date for submission of tenders.

Contact person for the tender: *[name and position / email / telephone]*

Signed by authorized representative:

Stamp

(If a firm)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 (Name and position)

1. Ref report: *OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria, Updated* (OECD, December 2019) https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-1)