

Terms of Reference - Final evaluation

FS/BMZ PROJECT BYUMBA

***Introduction***

These Terms of Reference (TOR) serve as a request for proposals from individual or company consultants who are interested in conducting a final evaluation of Family Strengthening BMZ PROJECT BYUMBA. Details regarding contents of proposals and submission procedures are explained herein.

SOS Children's Villages RWANDA is a non-governmental social development organisation that has been active in the field of children's rights and committed to children's needs and concerns since 1979. It acts as officially registered organization which aims at supporting children without parental care and children of families in difficult circumstances. SOS Rwanda is an active member of the international umbrella organization SOS Children’s Villages International. SOS CV Rwanda has its projects and programs in four locations: Kigali, Byumba, Kayonza and Gikongoro. These projects and programs are mainly financed by SOS-Kinderdörfer weltweit, SOS Denmark and BMZ which is financing FSP Kigali and Byumba. SOS Rwanda cooperates on the project site with various governmental and non-governmental partners.

From January 2017, a project jointly funded by BMZ and HGDF has been implemented in Rukomo Sector, Gicumbi District and supported 300 families with 1,464 children. In order to identify the impact of the project to beneficiaries and community members, SOS Children’s Villages Rwanda is seeking to recruit an external consultant to conduct a final evaluation of BMZ Project Byumba. The project budget is 862,675.93Euro. The project has an overall objective of Improved household income and economic self-sufficiency of families in Rukomo.

The project has Six specific objectives:

* Specific objective1: At least 210 participants have increased their income due to vocational skills, improved competencies and access to VSLA
* Specific objective2: At least,240 participants have increased their agricultural production which improves their nutrition and income situation,
* Specific objective3: At least 300 parents have improved their parental skills,
* Specific objective4: At least 250 households are living with improved sanitation facilities, improved hygiene conditions and improved access to clean water,
* Specific objective5: 300 participants and at least 3,000 members of the community are sensitized for child rights, environmental protection and hygiene
* Specific objective6: CBO´s have improved their competencies in order to support families during project and beyond
1. **Background and rationale**

Rwanda has been shaken by the genocide against Tutsi of 1994, which led to a vast increase in the number of orphans and widows. Children and youth constitute 55 % of the population of Rwanda; Children have a harder time accessing education, they suffer psychological distress and they have poorer living conditions compared to other groups in the country.

When parents are unable to pay for the basic necessities for their children need (such as medical and school bills, food, clean water, or electricity), children are at much greater risk of leaving their families or being abandoned. To prevent child abandonment, SOS Children’s Villages has implemented Family Strengthening programs around the world to provide support to families who need it most. Oftentimes, these families are single parent households, have been affected by HIV/AIDS, or face serious financial disadvantages. Through these programs, SOS Children’s Villages aims to keep families together, while at the same time building safe environments for children to thrive in.

In this context, different interventions have been carried out in communities through various projects implemented under Family Strengthening Programme. Those projects are BMZ Byumba and Kigali, FS Kayonza and Gikongoro. Specifically, in Byumba, FSP has implemented its activities on Four-years and Four months (from January 2017 to April 2021) and was intended to serve 300 families with 1,464 children.

It is in this framework that, after Four years of implementation of the FS Byumba, SOS children’s villages Rwanda intends to assess the progress made towards achievements of the specific objectives of the project, its outcomes and impact.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall objective (Impact):**  | Improved household income and economic self-sufficiency of families in Rukomo |   |
| **Project objective (Outcome)** | **Indicators** |
| **Current** | **Target** |
| 300 families have increased their household income and their agricultural production which enables them to independently cater for the needs of their children in nutrition, health and education  | 60 % of families eat only once per day because they are lacking seeds, animals and competencies in radical terrace construction in order to produce more and sufficient food | 300 families are eating more than once perday and consume more healthy food |
| Families don´t benefit from non-agricultural income-generating activities because they cannot afford vocational training and they are lacking competencies and capital for self-employment | 300 families put their newly learned agricultural, vocational, entrepreneurial skills into practice which enables households to increase their income by 60% |
| Due to sensitization and improved capacities 300 families and 1,500 members of the community are able to sustainably improve the living conditions in areas of family and hygiene  | Children and youths are at risk because of child right violations, unplanned pregnancies, instable families  | 300 families and 1,500 community members use knowledge gained in family planning and parental skills in their daily practices |
| Hygiene-related diseases prevail in particular among small children due to unsecure water sources and lack of sanitation facilities | The living conditions of 300 families have sustainably improved due to the installation of sanitation facilities and the rehabilitation of water sources |
| **Sub goals** **(Output)** | **Indicators** |
| **Current** | **Target** |
| Sub goal 1: At least 210 participants have increased their income due to vocational skills, improved competencies and access to VSLA | \*Low household income of ca. 10 Euro / month \*Lack of entrepreneurial skills  | Household income of families from non-agricultural activities resulting from improved vocational and entrepreneurial skills has increased on average by 60%  |
| \*Lack of access to vocational training due to high fees of approx. 250 Euro per trade | 250 graduates of vocational trainings contribute to the income of their families by practicing their new skills  |
| \*Available VSLA´s don´t provide continuous and sufficient access to capital (less than 1 Euro per month) | Participants are members of independent and self-sustaining VSLA´s which gives them access to capital of at least 4 Euro per month |
| Sub goal 2: At least,240 participants have increased their agricultural production which improves their nutrition and income situation | \*Families only eat once per day and don´t consume variety of foods  | 70% of participating families eat twice per day and they have access to more and various foods |
| \*On average, the local hospital reports 10 cases of children suffering from malnutrition | The number of children treated for malnutrition has decreased by 60% |
| Sub goal 3: At least 300 parents have improved their parental skills  | \*Particularly single-parents and young care givers fail in using healthy parental practices (domestic violence, school dropout)\*Frequent unplanned pregnancies of girls and young women\*Lack of knowledge regarding HIV/Aids and family planning  | 300 participants are sensitized for and apply child-friendly and non-violent parental practices and follow up on the school performance of their children |
| 1,500 community members are using newly gained knowledge in Child Rights, HIV/Aids, family planning in their daily practices which leads to a decrease of child rights violations and early pregnancies in the community |
| Sub goal 4: At least 250 households are living with improved sanitation facilities, improved hygiene conditions and improved access to clean water  | \*On average, 100 children per month suffer from hygiene related diseases as a result of bad hygiene conditions  | The installation of sanitation facilities and the spread of improved practices lead to a decrease of hygiene-related diseases by 30% |
| \*On average children spend more than one hour per day on collection of water which reduces their time available for school and homework which leads to weak performances and/or school drop out | The availability of clean water sources reduces the time necessary for collection of water and enables children to improve their school performances |
| Sub goal 5: 300 participants and at least 3,000 members of the community are sensitized for child rights, environmental protection and hygiene | \*Violations of child rights (domestic violence, school dropouts) \*Unsustainable cutting of trees leads to erosion and loss of farm land  | 300 participants and at least 1,500 community members are using newly gained knowledge from campaigns in their daily practices |
| Sub goal 6: CBO´s have improved their competencies in order to support families during project and beyond  | \*Lack of knowledge and skills in management of CBO\*Lack of knowledge in project planning and social work with vulnerable families | The capacities of 6 CBO´s have been built. They implement their individual community development plans, host monthly community meetings and, have submitted at least one proposal for a development project to the local authorities |

The evaluation will also gauge the level of stakeholder’s participation and the ownership of the implementation by the participants. It shall identify the intended and unintended outcomes, best practices, lessons learnt as well as challenges arising from programme implementation. In addition, the evaluation will come up with conclusions, recommendations that will support SOS Rwanda in continually developing and adjusting its Family Strengthening Programmes, which have become one of the core activities of SOS Rwanda, to achieve the best possible impact in families and communities.”

1. **Purpose, Objectives and Use**

The overall objective of this evaluation will be to determine the impact of the FSP Byumba implemented with BMZ support in the period from 1 January 2017 to 30 April 2021. This will be done through provision of information on whether the objectives of the project have been achieved, by collecting quantitative and qualitative information on the objectively verifiable indicators in the matrix indicator/log frame.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

* To assess what changes has the programme made in the lives of the participating children within our target group, their families and their communities
* To assess how relevant, effective, efficient sustainable and participatory are the programme interventions.
* To document what lessons can be drawn from the programme that can be taken to further develop the programme
* To evaluate what changes have happened due to programme interventions in the wider community.
* To evaluate the efficiency of the project in relation to beneficiaries, cost and timeframe of the project.
* To assess achievements against the target set using the indicators
* To assess the sustainability of the project (institutional, social, financial, etc.) especially related to activities of the project
*
* T o analyze the design and logic coherence of programme and programme intervention including the design of logframe and how the intervention is embedded into the strategy of SOS Children’s International.

The desired results of the evaluation are:

* To provide commentary on the overall project design, the intervention logic and an analysis of the strategy and methodology used in BMZ Project Byumba.
* To document the impact of the project with special emphasis on the impact the project has had on families in general and children in particular.
* To critically examine the impact matrix and verifiable indicators found in the original proposal and provide post-project figures along with a narrative explaining the reasons for under/over performance achievement.
* To draw conclusions, make recommendations and state lessons learnt for future strategy and improvements in implementation of the project.
* To provide commentary on the current political, social and cultural factors impacting the implementation of the project.
* To document the communities’ attitude towards the project

Key persons:

* + Children and families participating in the project
	+ Families who are not participating but might be somehow affected by the project (e. g. from neighborhood)
	+ Children, young people and families who left the project
	+ Project team
	+ Project partners, community members, local partners and main stakeholders including local government,
	+ Project management on National level

Key users of evaluations results:

* + Project level: Project team and implementing partners
	+ Management level: National Director (ND), National Programme Development Director (NPDD), Fund Development, IPD Manager, M&E Manager,Communications and Brand, Head of Location etc.
	+ Regional level: SOS international Office Region (IOR)
	+ Global level: SOS international (IO).
1. **Scope of work**
* **Geographical reach and evaluation time span**

The final evaluation will cover the intervention zone of the FSP Byumba comprising one Sector of Gicumbi District namely Rukomo. The evaluation is intended to be carried out within **Eight weeks** from the date of signing contract as it is detailed in the table below.

* **Criteria for the Final Evaluation of the project**

The evaluation questions should be revolved around the following criteria: Relevance, Impact, Sustainability and Project management and coordination, as given in the ToR. On the basis of the above evaluation criteria, instruments /questionnaires for the field mission should be prepared for stakeholders. The evaluation should also analyse the progress the programme has made against the agreed set of global minimum indicators which can be found in PDB:

 \* Children who are at risk of losing the care of their family are enable to grow within a caring family environment,

- % of the families who have exited from the programme who became self-reliant,

-% of children separated from their family by the time they exit from the FSP,

-% reduction of incidence of child separation at the programme location,

-% of children participants within the specified target group,

\* Children of participants families realise their developmental need and rights by accessing essential services:

-% of children with stable and adequate shelter,

-% of children with vital registration,

-% of children received immunization as per national standards,

-% of school-going age children regularly attend formal or informal education.

\* The family of children participants have the capacity and commitment to take care of their children.

- % of primary caregivers who ensure that the child gets 3 meals a day

-% of primary caregivers who ensure the child’s access to health care and treatment as required.

\* Communities and /or local authorities /government’s commitment and/or capacity are strengthened to promote and protect the rights of children to grow within a caring family environment.

- % of communities where community structure have improved capacity to sustain programme intervention.

- % of resources (Financial, human, material) allocated from the government and other stakeholders to the programme

\* An active network of stakeholders contributes to ensure that all children can grow within a caring family environment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation issue | Key guiding questions | Sources of information |
| **Relevance**Does the project address the situation of the specific target group? | * To what extent is the project focused on the intended target group - i.e. caregivers, youth, children?
* What have been the specific criteria for the selection of the beneficiaries?
* To what extent the caregivers (families) and children admitted to the project have met the selection criteria?
* To what extent the project responds to the needs of the communities it addresses and its capacity to respond to the needs of their habitants
* To what extent, the project interventions respond to the needs and priorities of the project participants?
* To what extent project design addresses locally defined needs and priorities?
* To what extent, the project adjustments that have been made so far, were relevant?
 | Documents * BMZ Project Proposal
* Quarterly FSP Byumba reports
* Annual monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Self-evaluation report
* Family cases
* Family Development Plan

People* Project participants, former project participants
* Project’ staff

SOS FS data base |
| * To what extent are the objectives of the project being attained?
* What is the percentage of the project fulfilment against the set indicators?
* To what extent the project strategies, methodologies, tools and processes contributed to the achievement of the planned results?

Building sustainable community-based responses * To what extent the project objectives and activities are in compliance of the needs of the target group?
* Does the support system being built in the target communities effectively respond to the situation of children at risk of losing parental care?
* To what extent the community demonstrates interest to the project outcomes?
* To what extent local authorities are involved and provide support to the project?

Building self-reliance in families where children are at risk of losing parental care* How many families have participated in the project? Are all of them in need of the project services?
* To what extent the target groups are aware of the project and the services it provides? Do all families of the target group receive services by the project?
* To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the project interventions?
* To what extent the amount, type and quality of the services correspond to the needs of the target group?
* To what extent have children from families of origin participated in the project remained in the care of their families? To what extent has the quality of care and protection and living conditions of the child participants, improved in families of origin? Are they satisfied with the services they received and its quality?
* To what extent the results which they reached are sustainable and is effective after they left the project?
* What are the reasons for other families to fail in achieving self-reliance by the end of the evaluated period?
* What approaches and strategies defined in family development plans have been the most efficient and contributing in achieving self-reliance?
* To what extent does the approach of working with families contribute to the families’ self-reliance?
* Is replication or removal of certain approaches required to increase efficiency?
 | Documents * Quarterly progress reports
* Annual FSP project plan
* Self-evaluation report
* Family cases
* Feedback questionnaires
* Annual monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Statistics
* Partnership agreements

People* Children, families and state specialists who are participating or have participated in the project
* Partners (key implementation partner, public bodies and private partners
* Preject staff

SOS FS data base |
| **Impact**The systematic analysis of the changes in the lives of children, families, communities and other stakeholders brought by the project | * What has been the impact in line with the planned results of the project, in terms of changes brought about in the situation of children, families and communities?
* What has been the impact beyond the planned results of the project, in terms of changes brought about in the situation of children, families and communities? (positive and/or negative)
 | Documents * Log-frame/Indicators as per BMZ Project proposal
* Project progress reports
* Self-evaluation report
* Family cases
* Feedback questionnaires
* Annual monitoring and evaluation of the project

People* Children and families who are participating or have participated in the project
* Partners (public bodies, government, key implementation partner
* Other stakeholders
* Project’ staff

Data of SOS FS data base |
| **Sustainability** | * To what extent can activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project (BMZ/HGFD financing) has ended?
* Has the capacity of the implementation partner been developed? If so, in what areas and how?
 | People* Children, caregivers (families) and state specialists who are participating or have participated in the project
* Partners (public bodies, government, key implementation partner)
* Volunteers participated in the project
* Project’ staff
 |
| **Project management and coordination**Does the project management and coordination ensure the quality implementation of the project | * To what extent does the project have appropriate management and coordination structures and organization of the process? Are these structures aimed at quality of the project implementation?
* Who else from the local partners are involved in the process of management and coordination and how it affects the quality implementation
 | Documents * Project progress reports
* Partnership agreements

People* Project management
* Partners (public bodies, government, key implementation partner)
* Project’ staff
 |

* **Methodology to be applied in the evaluation**

The External Evaluation should be based on a participatory approach involving and engaging a wide and diverse range of stakeholders. Stakeholders` participation is necessary for accountability, promoting ownership and sustainability, facilitating buy in, and further use of the evaluation recommendations. The participatory approach is very useful in engaging stakeholders and gaining their insights, experiences with the programs and the benefits accrued to them as a result of the programs. The evaluation implies inclusion of various 'rights holders' or care givers and children who benefit from the project, as well as the 'duty bearers' or those responsible and accountable for providing services, such as guardianship bodies. This is necessary to assess whether benefits and contributions are fairly distributed by the interventions being evaluated.

In general, evaluation methodology is concentrated on the description and explanation of changes that have happened in participating family’s lives due to their participation in the project.

The evaluation approach should be also result-oriented to provide evidence of both quantitative and qualitative achievements and the outputs and outcomes obtained by the programs (or not).

The external evaluation work should be guided by the Ethical Code of Conduct. Governing SOS Children’s Village Rwanda

**4. Process of evaluation**

The external evaluator will plan and design data collection methodology and process and agree on site visits to the project areas to meet project participants (children, families, state specialists, project team and project stakeholders, and collect information in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the evaluation design)

**The methodology of evaluation will include the following:**

- Document review including analysis on key reference documents listed in Terms of Reference; and other relevant non-SOS CV documents as well.

- Case study of randomly selected beneficiaries’ fil

- Interviews (structured and/or semi-structured; in person and/or by telephone) with key informants listed in Terms of Reference

- Focus groups with selected key informants – children, care-givers, partners, community members

- Other methods relevant to evaluation objectives and scope

**Data collection process includes:**

- Reviewing the project documentation and other sources of information at project level

- Field observation of the project’s activities and the changes they have brought to beneficiaries and the community

- Identification of the major stakeholders who are associated with the project to be interviewed, such as the direct participants of the project (children, care-givers) implementation partners, key local government representatives, and other service providers

- Selection of representative sample of communities or groups to be interviewed on the basis of agreed criteria

- Selection of sample size in this evaluation will be done in the range of 10-20% of the target group,

- Agreeing on the type of information to be collected

- Preparation of checklists and other tools for data collection

- Develop methodological tools for data collection and consult with project staff on project/national level

- To fill in questionnaires and conduct interviews with co-workers, beneficiaries, representatives of partners, local authorities and community, focus groups and analysis of data, SWOT Analysis

**Data analysis and elaboration of evaluation report:**

The external evaluator will analyse, collected data and will prepare an evaluation report that describes the main evaluator’s findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The final report should follow the structure and content as outlined in the terms of references. That stage includes:

- Analysis of the data and elaboration of conclusions and recommendations

- Preparation of a draft report

- Present the findings to the respective project staff on local/national and regional level to ensure triangulation

- Finalise the report after inputs from various stakeholders

The evaluation should use quantitative (e.g. surveys) and qualitative data collection methods such as semi-structured interviews (for example with focus groups, key informant, large groups, individual interviews, etc.) as necessary.

The main participants of the evaluation are:

- Direct project beneficiaries (children/babies, pregnant women/young mothers, employees of local authorities)

- Project staff (social workers, psychologist, coordinator and other hired specialists)

- Project staff on the National level

- Direct stakeholders (CBOs)

**5. Outputs and Deliverables**

The external evaluator should prepare the following key deliverables:

* Evaluation design – contains the evaluation framework; detailed evaluation methodology; work plan and budget
* Developed evaluation tools
* Draft evaluation report – Draft report will be prepared in line with the proposed structure outlined in section 10 of this document and should be submitted to the location level, electronically via e-mail
* Final evaluation report - The findings of the external evaluation shall be presented in a written report following the proposed outline. Attachments – Templates of applied evaluation tools (questionnaires; main areas for focus groups and etc.). Final evaluation report should be submitted to National Director in English, in electronic and hard formats.

**6. Expert profile of the Evaluation team**

Individual consultants or firms with competences in this domain who fulfil all requirements to carry out this study are eligible.

* The consultant must have:
1. Proven competency in monitoring and evaluation, including impact assessment or project evaluation
2. A university degree in social sciences, development studies or economy, project planning and management background
3. A good understanding of development work
4. A good understanding of child rights and issues affecting vulnerable children
5. Good facilitation and interpersonal skills
6. Proven experience in participatory processes and data collection methods
7. Strong skills in coordinating teamwork
8. Strong analytical and conceptual skills
9. Excellent written communication skills
10. Ability to transfer complex concepts and ideas into practical and simple language
11. Ideally experience in organising research processes with/for SOS Children’s Villages

Individual consultant or company consultant of the evaluation is responsible for:

1. Quality and timely fulfilment of the ToR with expected results of the evaluation
2. Overall evaluation design of the process
3. Elaborated evaluation plan indicating each step of the process
4. Effective distribution of the responsibilities among evaluation team members
5. Quality and timely implementation of the evaluation plan
6. Effective and quality data collection
7. Data compilation and analysing aimed at reaching goal of the evaluation
8. Preparation and submission of high quality and consistent evaluation report in due course
* External evaluators should not be biased and have any reason for conflict of interests. Evaluation team must respect participating communities’ culture, social norms, values and behavior; and maintain appropriate relationships with participants to this evaluation.

**7. Tentative time table**

Detailed description of milestones and deadlines from the first activity until the end of the contract

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | # of weeks and Dates | Actions | Success indicator | Comments |
| 1 | 1st week 3 -7 May 2021 | Hold first meeting with the client and defining of the contracted volume of work  | The volume of work agreed and the contract is signed by both parties |  |
| Prepare the action plan for the evaluation process indicating the exact dates of visiting the location  | Plan is prepared and approved by SOS Rwanda |  |
| Finalise the list of the basic documents to be provided to the evaluation team. If translation is needed define the documents for translation | List of the documents to be translated is finalised and sent for translation |  |
| Analyse all available basic project documents (BMZ-proposal, reports, BMZ-guidelines, concepts, etc.) | Evaluation team received the documents in time |  |
| 2 | 2nd week10- 14th May 2021 | Develop set of tools (interviews, questionnaires, focus group scenarios etc.) | The set of tools is defined and approved by SOS Rwanda |  |
| 2nd meeting with the client and discussion of the methodology and tools to be used during evaluation | Methodology and tools are defined and approved by SOS Rwanda.  |  |
| Prepare and submit to NO schedule of site visits mentioning all required documents to be prepared in the location. | Schedule is approved by SOS Rwanda and received by the location. All required documents are prepared by the location.  |  |
| 3 | 3rd week and 4th week17-28th May2021 | Develop and finalise with the location the visit plan with the defined local stakeholders, SOS location workers, stakeholders in the location, beneficiaries in the location. | Visit plan is agreed with the location, final visit plan (if needed) is received by the evaluators |  |
| Make visit to the project location | Evaluators are in the location |  |
| Hold meetings with all relevant parties as per the visit plan  | Questionnaires are filled, focus groups and interviews are documented |  |
| 4 | 5th week 2021 31 My-4 June 2021 | Provide and analyse project documents in the location | Evaluators possess all required documents in the location |  |
| Analyse all data and prepare the draft report indicating the findings, recommendations, lessons learnt | Draft report is prepared and shared with SOS Rwanda |  |
| 3d meeting with the client and discussion of the preliminary results of the evaluation | Feedback from NO is received by the evaluators |  |
| 5 | 6th week 7-11 June2021 | Make the final draft report  | Final draft report is received |  |
| 6 | 7th week 14-18th June 2021 | Provide feedback for the final draft report from SOS Rwanda and insert in the final draft | Feedback is received by evaluators and inserted in the final draft |  |
| Prepare and send final draft to SOS Rwanda | Final draft received and approved by SOS Rwanda in the final draft and final draft received by SOS Rwanda |  |

* **Time line**

The evaluation will be conducted within one month and two weeks. The final report should be submitted not later than 26 April 2021However, upon signature of contract, the client and the consultant may agree upon new deadline depending external factors that may influence the work. This shall be done into consideration of the urgency of this evaluation. Applicants will use the following Email: bnc@sos-rwanda.org

**8. Evaluation report structure**

The evaluation report should be structured in the following way:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Table of contents

- Figures and tables

- Acronyms

SUMMARY

- Background and project context

- Findings and conclusions

- Recommendations and lessons learned

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

- Brief project description

1.2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

- Reason and justification for evaluation

- Aim and purpose of evaluation

- Key guiding questions

1.3. EVALUATION MISSION

- Time span and process of evaluation

- Profile, composition and independence (non-bias) of evaluation team

- Participation of partners and target group in evaluation

- External factors influencing the evaluation process and respective consequences

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

- Methodology and instruments

- Measures ensuring the protection of the stakeholders involved

2.2 CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

- Measures ensuring the protection of the stakeholders involved

3. CONDITIONS FOR EVALUATION

- Local context, problem statement, initial potentials of project and important changes throughout project period

- Presence and actions of other stakeholders

- Risk factors for achieving project objectives

4. PERFORMANCE OF GERMAN AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

- Staff qualification

- changes at German and implementing partner organization

5. EFFECTIVENESS

5.1. RELEVANCE

- needs of the target group are addressed and the objectives of the donor (BMZ), German and implementing partners are attained

- adequate developmental approach and conceptualization

5.2. EFFECTIVENESS

- Quality of project planning

- Quality of system of indicators and objectives

- Quality of project implementation

- Motivation, ownership and legitimacy of implementing partner

- Quality of project management

- Achievability of project objectives

- Other effects on output and impact level (incl. negative, if any)

5.3. EFFICIENCY

* + Cost effectiveness of the project

5.4. DEVELOPMENTAL IMPACTS

- Achievement of overall objective

- Model-character, structural changes and broad effect

- Other effects of overall, developmental impact (incl. negative, if any)

5.5. SUSTAINABILITY

- Viability and durability of positive impacts (once BMZ-funding has ceased); include developments in surrounding areas.

- Risks and potentials of sustainable impacts for the target group as well as on organisational level

6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

- Cross-cutting topics of development cooperation

- Contribution to organisational goals

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 CONCLUSIONS

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.3 LESSONS LEARNED

ANNEXES

- Terms of Reference

- Composition and independence (non-bias) of evaluation team

- Evaluation matrix

- Evaluation plan and time diagram

- List of stakeholders consulted

- Bibliography/reference

- Questionnaires/other data collection instruments

- Debriefing Protocol

- System of objectives and indicators

- others if necessary

**11. Selection criteria**

* *Selection criteria of successful consultant*

The criteria that will be used for selection are as follows:

* Method: The proposed method for evaluating the impact of the project is suitable.
* Timetable/work plan: The timetable/work plan are realistic and meet the needs of the project
* Cost: The cost of the proposal given the availability of data, analysis, method, and other aspects of the proposal are reasonable and feasible.
* Experience: The level of training and experience of the consultants in undertaking impact evaluations and recommendations from organizations for which the consultant(s) have worked previously.

Proposals should include details on data use, indicators of impact, method, strategy for institutional analysis, work plan, costs, and CV of the consultant(s).

**12. Mode of payment**

* 1st phase: The consultant shall receive 30% of the total agreed amount at the time of signing this contract.
* 2nd phase: The consultant shall receive 30% of the total agreed amount after the submission of the draft report, and after having received feedback from relevant stakeholders. This phase includes presentation of the draft report.

3rd phase: The consultant shall receive the remaining 40% of the total payment after incorporating all of the feedbacks received from various stakeholders and the submission of the final report.