

Terms of Reference for External Evaluation “Community Food and Nutrition Security and Health Promotion Programme (CFNSHPP)” in Zimbabwe

1. Introduction and Background

The Organization has been implementing integrated rural development programmes and projects in Chimanimani district for more than 20 years focusing on smart sustainable agriculture practices, HIV/AIDs and gender mainstreaming. In the past three years (May 2019 - April 2022), the organisation implemented a Community Food and Nutrition Security and Health Promotion Programme (CFNSHPP) in Chimanimani district, wards 7 and 17. The organization has successfully assisted 1200 households with agriculture seed packs, natural resource management, awareness on nutrition, gender and HIV/AIDS, Internal Savings and Lending scheme (ISALs), small livestock (indigenous chickens) and improved breed of local goats by introducing a Boer Buck in the target villages. Caritas Zimbabwe continues to assist the most vulnerable communities through an array of livelihood options under the CFNSHPP in order to reduce poverty and contribute towards improving the socio-economic conditions of selected farmers in Chimanimani rural communities.

2. Project Information

Project overall goal

The overall goal of the programme is to improve the food and nutrition security among 1200 vulnerable households and plus or minus 6000 indirect beneficiaries in wards 7 and 17 of Chimanimani district of Zimbabwe.

The project was implemented in two wards (7 and 17) of Chimanimani district in Manicaland Province, Zimbabwe. The project has sought to achieve the following specific objectives:

- a. To promote food and nutrition security of 1200 targeted households through adoption of Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices by end of 2022**
- b. To increase collaboration between research and smallholder farmers in use of indigenous knowledge system management to effective and sustainable manage crop pest and diseases**
- c. To improve access to clean water supply for drinking to the targeted households**
- d. To increase awareness to 1200 farmers, mainstream gender, nutrition and HIV/AIDS prevention. Care and support to malnourished under 5 children and income saving to the targeted population by 2022**

3. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to support learning and accountability by taking stock of what has been achieved, what has worked and what not, and by identifying the factors that contributed or hindered the success of the Misereor funded project. Findings from the evaluation will support learning and innovation and inform future programming of Caritas and Misereor while demonstrating accountability to donors and communities.

The objectives of the final evaluation are:

- a. To objectively assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, effects (outcomes and impacts) and sustainability of CFNSHPP project;
- b. To identify examples of good practice, challenges, lessons learned and critical gaps in the implementation and inclusive programming with a view of providing recommendations for program quality improvement in future project phases, as well as for general organizational learning.
- c. To identify specific lessons for Misereor’s future work with the partner.

The external evaluation will focus on the project phase of CFNSHPP implemented from May 2019 – April 2022 as well as the period of the current phase.

Key Audiences and Uses of the Evaluation

STAKEHOLDERS	STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION DATA NEEDS AND USE	STAKEHOLDERS’ ROLE IN THE EVALUATION	JUSTIFICATION FOR STAKEHOLDER ROLE
		Audience	Donor
Misereor	Accountability and learning purposes, as a basis to improve future projects and partnerships of a similar nature	Commissioner of the evaluation, Respondents, primary source of data, audience	Funding Partner
Caritas Mutare	Accountability and learning purposes, as a basis to improve future projects and partnerships of a similar nature	Commissioner of the Evaluation, Respondents, primary source of data, audience	Misereor Project implementing partner

STAKEHOLDERS	STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION DATA NEEDS AND USE	STAKEHOLDERS' ROLE IN THE EVALUATION	JUSTIFICATION FOR STAKEHOLDER ROLE
Project participants	Share perspectives and perceptions and learning relating to the value of the project, in particular how the project had affected individuals, families and communities positively and negatively.	Respondents, primary source of data	Primary recipients of assistance
Local government (Manicaland Province)	To gain an understanding/learning of the benefits of assistance given to inform recovery and risk reduction strategies and plans	Respondents, Audience	Coordinating bodies for Livelihood project

4. Questions to be answered by the Evaluation

The following table provides suggested questions and outlines the DAC criteria for evaluations to be considered for the analysis: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, effects (outcomes and impacts) and sustainability. These questions should be further refined by the evaluator(s) in consultation with the evaluation stakeholders with an aim to identify 15-20 priority questions. It is expected that the two phases of the programme – response and recovery - will be evaluated both separately and in aggregate.

Evaluation criteria

DAC	Proposed draft question	OECD DAC criteria
Relevance: <i>The extent to which project objectives and design respond to the needs, priorities and policies of the target groups and of the organisation responsible for the project and its partner organisation and continue to do</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What direct and indirect target groups does the project address and why were they selected? Do they belong to particularly disadvantaged population groups? 2. To what extent is the intervention important for the target groups (for example, does it focus on an important problem/bottleneck)? 3. Is the project approach appropriate with a view to improving – either directly or indirectly – the life situation of particularly disadvantaged groups? 	Appropriateness, Relevance

DAC	Proposed draft question	OECD DAC criteria
<i>so if circumstances change.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. What framework conditions are important for the project? To what extent have they been considered? 5. Is the project strategy convincing and likely to be successful with a view to achieving the planned project objectives? 6. To what extent are the initial objectives and the design of the project still appropriate, especially in relation with government initiatives in the same sector and the relationship with wards 	
<p>Coherence: <i>The compatibility of the project with other interventions in the country, sector or institution</i></p>	<p>Internal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What synergies and links exist between the project and other interventions implemented by Partner organization? 2. Does the project comply with the norms and standards that are the basis for the work of the project executing by Caritas agency? <p>External:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In what respects is the project consistent with the interventions of other actors in the same context? 2. Where appropriate, are activities harmonized and coordinated with those of other actors and do they complement each other? 3. To what extent does the project create added value and at the same time avoid the duplication of work activities? 	Effectiveness, Appropriateness
<p>Effectiveness: <i>The extent to which a project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives (as laid out in the Project Contract) and outputs, including differential results across target groups.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent were the objectives achieved or are they likely to be achieved? Does this apply to the same extent to different social groups? What information is available in this respect with regard to the agreed indicators? What other information is available with regard to the achievement of objectives? 2. Which activities and outputs made a particularly important contribution to the achievement of objectives, and which were not so important? In which areas is still an urgent need for improvement? 3. How many people were reached through the project and how does this compare with the planned number? 	Impact, sustainability

DAC	Proposed draft question	OECD DAC criteria
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and outputs? 5. Were the initial objectives realistic? Are the objectives formulated as outcomes (i.e., direct effects?) 	
<p>Efficiency: <i>The extent to which the project delivers or is likely to deliver results in an economic and timely way.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What evidence is there to indicate that the project was implemented with due regard to economic efficiency under the given circumstances? Was the project implemented economically and cost-consciously? 2. On what parameters is this assessment based (e.g., costs per project output: costs per training course or trainee, per hectare of agricultural land converted to ecological farming, per beneficiary, etc.)? Are any benchmarks for these parameters available from other projects or institutions? 3. Were the results achieved within an appropriate timeframe? Were adjustments made, e.g. due to changed conditions? 4. What is the relation between the observed effects and the resources used? 	Relevance, coherence.
<p>Impact: (outcomes and impacts²) <i>The positive and negative changes produced by a project at a higher level. The evaluation should focus on both intended and unintended outcomes and impacts.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What exactly has changed for the beneficiaries as a result of the project? The focus here should be on social, economic, political, cultural and environmental changes with consideration given to gender aspects and other relevant social differentiations. 2. Which external factors (e.g., government and other external actors) contributed to the changes, and to what extent can the changes be attributed to the project activities (plausibility)? 3. Did the effects logic adopted in the project plans prove effective? If not, where are there deviations? 4. To what extent do the project measures contribute to socio-ecological transformation and to strengthening the resilience of the target groups, particularly in the context of climate change? 	Impact and Coherence

DAC	Proposed draft question	OECD DAC criteria
<p>Sustainability: <i>The extent to which the net benefits of the project continue or are likely to continue.</i></p>	<p>Benefits are intended to be socially, environmentally, economically and technologically sustainable. The review is also intended to include institutional aspects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue at various levels? 2. What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project? 3. What role do risks, potential conflicts of interest and resilience (e.g., of target groups and partners) play in this context? 4. Is there any local funding to Caritas activities in general? 5. What measures have been put in place to guarantee some sort of continuation of Caritas activities and maintenance of structures put in place amid funding reductions and possible withdrawal of Misereor funding? 6. Does the project (-1054) sufficiently address and build on the lessons learnt from a natural disaster (Cyclone) to preserve the current and future achievements and progresses made in the communities and can it be replicated for future project proposal? 	<p>Relevance, efficiency, sustainability, coverage, coherence.</p>
<p>Other questions:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is Partner organizational capacity in the following areas: management and administrative systems, communication structures? 2. What is the viability of the organization's monitoring and evaluation system? 3. What specific measures have been implemented to help the most vulnerable, in particular women, children and the disabled? 	

5. Methodology

The evaluation should follow an appreciative enquiry approach. The evaluation questions identified in the ToR will serve as a basis for key areas of inquiry, data collection and corresponding evaluation tools. The evaluator(s) will provide a description of their selected methods to answer the questions and rationale for choosing them. The following are some of the requirements expected to be considered during this evaluation:

- ✓ Various approaches and frameworks will be used including the DAC evaluation criteria, Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA) and the Theory of Change (ToC). These should guide the design of the evaluation methods and execution of the final evaluation.

6. Required qualification and experiences

The evaluation is to be conducted by a team of two experts: one international consultant to be appointed directly by Misereor and one local expert to be appointed by the Caritas Mutare.

The international consultant should have the following qualifications:

- Hold a postgraduate degree in Livelihoods, Social Sciences, Agriculture, or a related field or equivalent relevant professional experience,
- Significant experience in Monitoring and Evaluation,
- Significant experience in the humanitarian sector, Sustainable Agriculture/Agroecology, Rural Development, water issues (added advantage), Gender and Conflict Sensitivity,
- Substantial professional research experience specifically in the evaluation of participatory projects,
- A proven track record in conducting different types of evaluation and knowledge of various participatory methods,
- Strong qualitative and quantitative (statistical) methods, and analytical and facilitation skills,
- Understanding of Core Humanitarian Standards and program quality approaches,
- Excellent English report writing skills.

Candidates will be selected on the basis of their CVs. Please send us your CV with details of your experience and qualifications and your proposed daily fee.

Applications for the consultancy should be submitted by e-mail to: <mailto:evaluation@misereor.de>. The deadline for application is **April 30, 2024**. The mission will start immediately and last 30 days.

7. Schedule and Logistics

Activity	What is expected?	No. of consultant days
<i>Inception phase</i>	Initial desk review of project documents, on which basis an inception report will be submitted. This should include: evaluation approach, methodology, key questions and foreseen limitations. DAC quality criteria should be used to develop data collection tools.	<i>To be determined with the international evaluator. Max. 30 days.</i>
<i>Data collection and analysis phase</i>	Implementation of the evaluation mission and the synthesis of findings. Data collection will take place in Chimanimani district, Manicaland Province and should be undertaken in Mai 2024.	
<i>Reporting phase:</i>	<p>A draft report written in English will be submitted for review and validation by Misereor and Caritas Mutare prior to the submission of a final report. It should include an overview of the project and its context, and details regarding the analysis, evaluations findings and recommendations, as well as all relevant information to help the project achieve the objectives of the evaluation. The core report (without annex) should comprise of 30-40 pages. All data sets are required to be submitted along with the final report.</p> <p>In addition to the project report, a ‘nameless’ summary is to be prepared for Misereor’s annual evaluation statement in German language or in English by the international evaluator.</p>	
<i>Debriefing:</i>	Findings of the evaluation will be presented by the evaluation team to Caritas Mutare at the end of the field phase and afterwards to Misereor.	