

TERMS OF REFERENCE TO CONTRACT A FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM 10-CO1-009 “TO PROMOTE RURAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH LIVELIHOOD ENHANCEMENT AND VULNERABILITY REDUCTION IN ETHIOPIA”

CONTENTS:

1. Introduction
2. Objective of the evaluation and background
3. Involved actors
4. Scope of the evaluation.
5. Evaluation's criteria and questions.
6. Methodology of the evaluation and work-plan.
7. Documents and source of information.
8. Structure and presentation of the evaluation report
9. Evaluation team
10. Premise of the evaluation, authorship and publication
11. Duration of the evaluation
12. Presentation of the technical and economic offer and assessment criteria

1. INTRODUCTION

On the 30th of June 2016 the program funded by Spanish Development Cooperation Agency (AECID) through “*convenio*” funding instrument will finalize its execution. It's the interest of Oxfam Intermón (OI) and its local partner to realize a final external evaluation in order to evaluate in a comprehensive manner the achievement of the previewed results and investigate about the main changes and benefits created in the beneficiaries' lives.

Furthermore OI will accomplish the legal rules and regulation of the agreement signed up with AECID in order to confirm the relevance of AECID funds investment in the frame of the actions which deal with the promotion of rural development through the livelihood enhancement and vulnerability reduction of the target population.

The final external evaluation intends to be an important instrument of management, being a participatory and constructive process, which will let the involved actors identify either the challenges or the positive aspects of the program. The evaluation shall proposed recommendation and lessons learnt which will be used by OI and its local partner to improve the implementation of similar programs.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION AND BACKGROUND

In 2010 AECID approved a proposal submitted by the Spanish NGO Oxfam Intermón (OI) to implement a livelihood program entitled “To promote rural development through livelihood enhancement and vulnerability reduction” in Tena, Amigna, and Shirka woredas in Oromia region of Ethiopia. The program implementation started on September 2010 and will finalize in June 2016. The initial duration of the program was 4 years which has been extended twice thanks to the approval of two no cost extension (NCE) period requests by AECID. In the first NCE AECID authorized to extend the program implementation for a period of one year 3 months and twenty three days, finalizing the activities on the 31st of December 2015. The second NCE request stated the end of the activities implementation on the 31st of January 2016, six months later the first NCE approved.

The overall objective of the program is to promote rural development through enhancement and vulnerability reduction of the most vulnerable men and women landless youth.

The specific objective of the program aims to improve food and income security of vulnerable people in 11 Kebeles of 3 Woredas of Arsi zone in Oromia region.

The program has been developed through four actions which have been implemented in a comprehensive manner during the five years nine months and twenty three days execution period:

- Increase production and productivity: the action aims to increase production and productivity of high value crop through irrigation based small holder intensification in order to increase the income of smallholder farmers, improving the food security and catalyze growth in farming communities.
- Women and economic empowerment: The action aims to improve the socio economic status of women and livelihood insecure youth through income generating activities (IGA). The income-generating activities' portion of the program covers initiatives and efforts of women and youth in off-farm IGAs, small business promotion, cooperative undertakings, job creation schemes, credit and savings groups and various skill trainings. The project supports Saving and Credit Cooperative Societies (SACCOs) composed by women members through the disbursement of revolving grant fund, promoting adult literacy (REFLECT adult education) and construction of offices.
- Market development: This action intends to strengthen the capacity multipurpose cooperatives so that the economic collectives' plays significant role in accessing remunerative market for farmers agri produces by putting them at the center of the value chain. Through this action multipurpose cooperatives have been established,

supporting the cooperatives to have grain warehouses, increasing their capacity, and developing a value chain in irrigation development areas, etc.

- Institutional capacity building: This action pretends to strengthen the institutional capacity of the program implementing partners, in terms of project cycle management, strategic planning, gender awareness and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.

The total amount allocated for the program is 3.500.000 Euros of which 2.800.000 Euros is the grant funded by AECID and 700.000 is OI contribution. The project execution period started on the 09 of September 2010 and should finalize on the 7th of September 2014. After the approval of two no cost extension period, the project finalizes on the 30th of June 2016.

2.1. Problems to be addressed by the program:

The great majority of Ethiopia's population, around 83% depends on rural livelihoods and their output contributes significantly to nation's macro economy. Agriculture constitutes 90% of exports. Most of these outputs are produced by poor farmers working on small plots of land and pastoralists fostering limited flocks and herds. In many ways the condition of the country depends upon the fate of its rural workforce. The pitfall is the agriculture sector is still dependent on rainfall and only 3% of the areas are irrigated. Ethiopia is also characterized with some of the worst demographic, health and food security conditions in the world. The average population growth rate reaches 2.9/annum, sanitations coverage stagnated at 32% and about 12 million people suffer food inadequacy. Women situation in rural household is even worse. Women have the strongest burden inside the household because of the double and sometimes triple role: workforce in the plot and responsible for caring the family on top of suffering from numerous harmful traditional practices. In addition women suffer power imbalances to control the benefits of their work.

Underlying factors contributing to the challenges and problems of the proposed districts are many, among which the following are key:

- The impacts of prevailing climatic change drastically affect the people's means of production, drought and crop failure are frequent and the population is in a chronic state of food insecurity. The livelihoods do not recover from the effects of acute emergencies and require almost constant external assistance to survive. In this areas persistent production shortfalls, periodic crop failures and other factors have forced households to resort to coping strategies that may assure short-term survival but deplete household and community assets in the long-run.

- The poor health environment, as well as backward health and nutrition behaviors, causing vulnerability to food and nutritional insecurity. The health anomaly exacerbated by priority diseases prevailing in the area which include intestinal parasites, and malaria (in the lowland areas of the districts). Poor water quality for drinking and washing, household pollution (living with animals/smoke), poor hygiene/sanitation practices and poor excreta/waste disposal systems issues related to the lack of knowledge concerning preventative practices are among health and nutrition challenges.
- Subsistence cropping has become increasingly unproductive with falling yields and periodic crop failures due to severe weather events and climatic extremes. Drought resistance high value crops are not promoted in the area as an adaptation mechanism and the existed products are not earning promising values due to poor marketing systems. Farmers sell their products at their farm gates at falling prices while the middle men benefit within the poor value chain.
- The existed few traditional irrigation systems are producing limited types of crops which are not helping the communities' effort to become food insecure. Even though the area has potential of producing vegetable and other export agricultural products around the perennial rivers, the subsistence farmers are not contributing its share due to limited investment capital, knowledge, skill and alternative high value crops.
- The government extension support which is being channeled through the public machinery for several years has been inadequate to extricate the farmers from this kind of technical backwardness and investment capital shortages.
- Farmers organized approach to development challenges like in producer cooperatives have been either poor or they have bad legacy on it. The cooperatives have not been professionally established and adequately supported to maturity to ensure sustainability and/or compete in the markets.
- In this mixed agriculture system area women suffer discrimination and gender inequality, control and access of resource, and gender based violence are highly present in the target areas. Violating women's right is aggravated by the high illiteracy rate, lack of local financial institutions which provide credit and saving services and poor social services provided to the local community.

2.2. Target population:

An initial participatory vulnerability assessment conducted during the program identification works showed that 10% of the households are ultra poor, 30% are poor and 40% are middle group. The main criteria to identify the most vulnerable groups are based on their livelihood profiling and wealth ranking on land ownership (ultra poor no land, and the poor

having less than 0.5 ha of land), livestock ownership (based on the tropical livestock unit), access to basic services (such as education and health care services).

The program targets the population of the three Woredas (Tena, Shirka and Amigna) of Arsi zone. The beneficiaries of the program are small holder agricultural households and families their major livelihoods rely on agriculture. The total population of the area is 303.572 people; almost half of the community members are female. From the total population 92 % of them are leaving in the rural areas of the districts. Therefore less the direct beneficiaries the remaining communities in the zone indirectly benefits from the project.

Beneficiaries according to the different actions are the following:

Action 1: The beneficiaries in the three Woredas 39,000 people (19,890 male and 19,110 women) poor vulnerable men and women people. Out of this, 13% are female headed households (around 5,070), 67% are unemployed youth.

Action 2: The beneficiaries of this action are women members of SACCOs and landless youth groups of the three Woredas (Tena, Shirka and Amigna). The targeted women are identified based on the vulnerability criteria such as being women headed household, poor access to land and other social services, women headed household and other vulnerable groups including those who are discriminated by occupation and other social criteria's from all forms social and economic life.

Action 3: Farmers of the three Woredas (Tena, Shirka and Amigna) selected based on their vulnerability for shocks/stress e.g. Drought Small-holder farmers/ women agricultural workers/ women food processors/private traders represent the target population of this action.

Action 4: The target population for the action number four are local government officials of the three Woredas (Tena, Shirka and Amigna) and local partner's staffs which need to improve their capacity in project management, gender, monitoring and evaluation, coordination and strategic planning.

2.3. Organization involved

Oxfam Intermon implements the program with a local partner:

ECC-SDCOM (Ethiopian Catholic Church- Social Development Coordination Office of Meki): Ethiopian Catholic Church- Social Development coordination office of Meki (ECC-SDCOM) is one of the key local NGO operating in the areas, addressing effort to improve the food security of vulnerable people and fighting poverty for the last 20 years. The working area of the organization includes part of East Shoa, the whole of Arsi and Bale Zones of Oromiya National Regional State.

ECC-SDCOM has previous experience in the implementation of similar livelihood and food security program funded by AECID. Currently they are managing a *convenio* program with CARITAS Spain.

2.4. Intervention logical framework

The logical framework is composed by four results which correspond to the four actions mentioned in the section 2. The approved logical framework is attached.

3. INVOLVED ACTORS

Actors	Entity	Participation	Relevance on the execution process	Priority
Local partner	ECC-SDCOM	Active participation in all the evaluation process, from the design up to the evaluation of results. The evaluation team has to include them as key informant actor and interview them during the evaluation.	Essential actor as collaborator and addressee of the evaluation results and learning. ECC-SDCOM will provide essential information in order to guarantee the usefulness of the evaluation and they will provide relevant information about the context in which the program has been implemented.	4
Donor and manager organization	AECID/OTC Intermón Oxfam	Define objectives of the evaluation and facilitate the access to the information.	Essential role for the successful of the evaluation and for the collection and capitalization of the evaluation's results. They are the addressee of the evaluation's results.	4
Local authorities	To be defined with local partner	Opinion regarding the food security and Livelihood situation	Important as informant actor	3

		in the three target wordas and the implementation of the action number 4.		
Local beneficiaries' organization	SACCOs, Youth group, Multipurpose cooperative	Opinion about the implementation of the action 2 and 3, regarding the women empowerment and market development, etc.	Important informant actor as	3
Other beneficiaries	Farmers	Opinion about the implementation of the action 1, regarding the increase of production and productivity.	Important informant actor as	3

➤ **In the evaluation:**

Evaluation Monitoring Committee:

The Monitoring Committee is composed by the local partner (one person of ECC-SDCOM) and two member of Oxfam Intermón (MEAL advisor and FSL coordinator).

The Monitoring Committee will guarantee the coordination in the communication in order to facilitate the participation of the key informant actors during the evaluation's process. The Monitoring Committees will play a role during all the phases of the evaluation:

- Facilitate the participation of the involved actors in the evaluation design of the evaluation: needs' identification of the information, definition of the objectives and limits of the evaluation.
- Approve the evaluation planning document: evaluation plan, workplan and communication.
- Participation in the Terms of Reference composition for the contracting of technical assistance for the evaluation.
- Facilitate the access to the relevant information for the evaluation team: program documents, agreements, list of key informant actors, etc.

- Supervise the quality of the evaluation process, tools, the documents and report produced, contributing with quality and relevant inputs, ensuring the scope of the evaluation.
- Disseminate the results of the evaluation, especially among other organizations and groups of interest.

Convenio Program Monitoring Committee: The Committee will be composed by members of AECID in Ethiopia and Oxfam Intermón. The member will meet during the designing process, if necessary and obligatory during the discussion of the final evaluation report. The member of the Committee could be the same as the ones of the Evaluation Monitoring Committee.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will be conducted after the execution ending date of the program, after the 30th of June 2016. The intervention has been developed in four actions as already mentioned before in three Woredas (Tena, Shirka and Amigna) of Arsi zone in Oromia region.

The main objective of the final evaluation is to assess the achievements of the program in a comprehensive manner, considering the relevance and quality of its process, appraising the achievement of the expected results.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Assess the level of achievement of the expected results of the program, identifying the factors which have influenced and created not expected potential result, changing in the program design and the implementation.
- Evaluate the relevance and efficiency of the program according to the context.
- Assess the participation of the beneficiaries during all the cycle of the program.
- Assess the relevance of the program design.
- Submit recommendation and lessons learnt regarding the program.

5. EVALUATION'S CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

Criteria and guiding questions for the evaluation are specified below.

RELEVANCE:

- Is the program in line and relevant according with the priority and needs of the target population?
- Have the priority of the beneficiaries changed since the design of the intervention?
If yes: has the intervention been adjusted according to the changes?

- The stakeholder participation in the design and in the planning, management/implementation/monitoring of the project, the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
- The quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators; analysis of assumptions and risks;
-

EFICIENCY:

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results/outputs, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.

- Have the expenses been executed according to the approved budget?
- Availability and of means/inputs provided or available on time and at planned cost to implement activities as well as monitored regularly to allow cost-effective implementation of activities;
- Have activities been implemented as scheduled, and to what extent they are implemented at planned or below planned cost;
- How regularly and well are activities monitored by the project and corrective measures applied as necessary? Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
- Are the inter-institutional structures adequate to allow for efficient project monitoring and implementation, and are all partners been able to provide their contributions to the project, and are there good relations between the project management and with existing partner institutions?
- Have the costs of the project been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions?
- How did the collaboration among OI, ECC-SDCOM and Local authorities and the mechanism of management contribute to the achievement of the results?
- How was the quality of day to day management:
 - ✓ Operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), budget management (cost control);
 - ✓ Management of personnel, information, property, etc;
 - ✓ Relations/coordination with local authorities, target beneficiary community institutions, other relevant actor such as NGOs operating in the respective intervention woredas, etc;
 - ✓ The quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project implementation progress (including target beneficiaries/target groups);
 - ✓ The respect for deadlines as per the action plans for implementation.

EFFECTIVENESS:

The effectiveness criterion intends to measure how far the project's results were attained, and the project's specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved.

- The extent that the project achieved results in terms of defined project OVIs
- Whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders;
- Are the beneficiaries and local government stakeholders satisfied in terms of timely availability and quality of project inputs (materials, finance, and human resources); quality of results (respect for standards)?
- If the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would achieve the purpose;
- Was the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders appropriate?
- How unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and could have been foreseen and managed?
- Whether any shortcomings were observed due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;

COHERENCE:

- Do the identified problems correspond with the objectives proposed?
- Has the structure of logical framework been defined correctly?
- Have the activities been appropriate to achieve the expected results?
- Is the project complementary to the country's policies and other actors/donors' similar interventions?

PARTICIPATION:

- Have the participation of different stakeholder been clearly defined in the program, and how?
- Have canal of participation been established during the program?
- Does the program include measures to increase the empowerment of the beneficiaries and the local partner?
- Have the beneficiaries, local partner and local institution been empowered.

IMPACT:

- Extent to which the objectives of the program have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.
- What significant changes can be observed and attributed to the project?
- Whether the effects of the project have contributed to the food security situation and in general poverty reduction in the respective intervention wordas and also made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, etc;
- The likelihood of the assumptions at project purpose level realized, and the extent that project impact jeopardized by external factors?

- Evidences of innovative ideas, behavior or action amongst the target beneficiary group, and examples of government replicating and/or scaling up project initiatives?
- The extent that the project enhanced the role of SACCOs in local socio-economic development?
- Any unexpected result arising from this project, and any ways of reducing the impact of any undesirable results?

SUSTAINABILITY:

The final evaluation will make an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:

- Policy support - how far the national, regional strategies and priorities are affecting project results positively or adversely; and level of support expected from local government and other actors;
- Institutional capacity - the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating a new institution (women saving and credit cooperatives, etc), how far good relations with existing institutions have been established; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, can run value adding market, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
- Socio-cultural factors - whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power- structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.
- Financial sustainability - whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remain so after funding will end; and economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated. The adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
- Technical (technology) issues - whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies are being considered, where possible; and (iii) the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.

6. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION AND WORKPLAN

The selected evaluation team will design the evaluation's methodology and the tools for data collection according to the objective of the evaluation and questions according to criteria.

The evaluation team should use both quantitative and qualitative data collection, using a participatory approach which would bring the learning of all stakeholders together and considering the gender approach.

The candidates should present a clear plan of evaluation including methodology to be used, work-plan and tools for the key Informants interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussion (FGD), observation, case study development and survey.

The evaluation team will submit a proposal according to the template format specified in the Terms of Reference document.

Evaluation Timetable:

Phase 1: Inception phase. Estimated duration: two weeks.

- **Recollection of available documentation:** The OI staff in Ethiopia will be responsible to provide and facilitate the required documentation to conduct the evaluation.
- **Analysis of the documentation:** Revision of existing sources of verification, social and economic program context analysis, logical frame work, interim progress report, implemented activities, work-plan, budget and results.
- **Design and improvement of the tools for the data collection:** The evaluation team will submit an inception report and the tools for data collection. The Evaluation Monitoring Committees will supervise the tools and inception report. Definition of main key informant actors to interview.
- **Preparation and submission of work plan:** The evaluation team will include a route map, beneficiaries to be visited, tools and techniques for data collection as agreed with the Evaluation Monitoring Committee, visit agenda to the local partner offices and definition of main key informant actors. The plan should be approved by OI in order to guarantee the achievement of the evaluation objectives. The plan would also include an estimation of timing for the submission of the draft zero report and a restitution meeting with the Evaluation Monitoring Committee in order to receive feedback and inputs for the final report.

Phase 2: Fieldwork. Estimated period: three weeks

- Field visit and interviews: visit to the implementing program areas in which the different actions of the *convenio* have been developed (Arsi zone: Tena, Amigna, and Shirka woreda), key informant interviews to beneficiaries, representative of local authorities, donor, local partner, which can be individual or group interview depending on the case.
- Debriefing workshop of preliminary results: The evaluation team will submit the preliminary results of the fieldwork in a workshop in the field. The main stakeholder involved in the program and the evaluation will attend the workshop. The site of the workshop has to be discussed with the Evaluation Monitoring Committee.

Phase 3: Drafting the final report. Estimated time: 10 days

- Submission of first draft report: The first draft report has to be submitted four days after the end of the debriefing workshop. A meeting with the Evaluation Monitoring Committee shall be organized in order to discuss about the report and give the possibility to the committee to present their suggestions, feedbacks, inputs, comments and observations in order to reach a consensual version of the final report.
- Final report: Once the evaluation team received the comments from the Committee, the evaluation team will have six days to write and submit the final evaluation report in the format established in Term of Reference. The evaluator should first submit the soft copy of the report by email and after 5 signed up hard copies as final version and 5 CD in which the final evaluation report in pdf. and a PPT presentation should be recorded. OI will be in charge to distribute the report. The report shall be disseminated among the main stakeholder (local partners, etc.). A **Spanish version** shall also be submitted once the final report will be approved.

7. DOCUMENTS AND SOURCE OF INFORMATION

7.1. Documents

Document	Main contents	Location
Covenio proposal	Pre <i>convenio</i> document, logical framework and budget according to AECID template	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa.
Agreement with Donor and Local Partner	AECID – OI agreement MoU between OI - ECC-SDCOM	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa.
Baseline study	Baseline document of <i>covenio</i>	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa

Interim report	Narrative and financial report according to AECID template.	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa
<i>Convenio</i> Annual Planning (PAC)	Planning document for each implemented year, up to PAC 7.	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa
Final report	Financial and narrative, depending on the evaluation period could be a draft.	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa
Interim evaluation	Interim evaluation report	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa
AECID communication	Two NCE letter approval Budget Modification letter	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa
Agreement with authorities	Project agreement	ECC-SDCOM (Ethiopian Catholic Church- Social Development Coordination Office of Meki)
Other documents of interests	Food security government strategy, etc.	Oxfam Intermón office - Addis Ababa

7.2. Sources

- ECC-SDCOM (Ethiopian Catholic Church- Social Development Coordination Office of Meki) representative.
- Expert of regional, zonal and *woreda* offices.
- Kebeles representatives.

8. STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation team shall submit a final evaluation report according to the following structure:

0. Executive summary (max. 5 pages) including:

- Brief project description and context;
- Purpose and expected use of the evaluation;
- Objectives of the evaluation;
- Summary of the evaluation methodology;

- Principle findings and conclusions, especially relating to project goals / targets;
- Key recommendations;
- Summary of lessons learned.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Introduction

- Evaluation objectives and background.
- Main evaluation's questions and criterions: definition.

2. *Convenio* description, including: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries, conceptual model, results chain or logical framework, and project monitoring system.

3. Evaluation methodology, including:

- Applied techniques and methodology.
- Major limitations of the methodology and conducted study.

4. Analysis of the collected information and data, evidence of the defined questions according the criterions (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, participation, impact and sustainability). Interpretation of the evidence related to the agreed questions of the evaluation.

5. Evaluation findings, documented by evidence: Main findings of the evaluation according to the questions defined by criterions.

6. Evaluation Conclusions related to the criterions of the evaluations.

7. Lessons learned with wider relevance and that can be generalized beyond the project

8. Evaluation's recommendations (based on evidence and insights) classified according the criterion selected by the evaluation team, mentioning the actor to whom the recommendation is addressed to.

9. Annex including:

- Terms of Reference of the evaluation.
- Work plan, logical framework, etc.
- Proposed methodology, technical proposal and sources and tools used for the data collection.
- Document reviewed: List of supporting documentation reviewed.
- Interviews: List of individuals interviewed and of stakeholder groups and/or communities consulted. Key informant interview template, transcription and note.
- Questionnaire: Template, collected data and statistical analysis.
- Focus Group Discussion: questions for FGD and data transcription.
- Report and minutes of debriefing workshop.

- Feedback and comments of the different stakeholders to the draft report, if relevant, especially if there is not a common understanding.
- Summary of the evaluation according to AECID template (template CAD24).

The evaluation final report will have maximum 50 pages including the executive summary.

9. EVALUATION TEAM

Evaluation is expected to be led by at least two external consultant/s with appropriate experience in the livelihood and food security, saving & credit scheme, adult education, gender issues and cooperatives in particular. The team shall have a coordinator, who will be the final responsible for the final evaluation and will be the contact with the contractor's organization (OI).

The composition of the team of experts should be balanced to enable complete coverage of the different aspects of project evaluation and considering the gender approach.

The evaluation team has to be part of **private consultancy firm** and the team has to have the following characteristic:

- S/he has a post graduate University in relevant studies for the program evaluation, such as Agricultural economics, Rural Development, Development Economics and related disciplines;
- S/he has minimum 10 years experience in the relevant sector and minimum 5 years experience in conducting evaluation of similar projects/programs funded by institutional donors;
- S/he is expected to have an experience in planning, implementation and review/evaluation community based integrated rural development projects/programs;
- S/he will have consolidate experience of Ethiopian context, especially Oromia region;
- S/he should be well acquainted with women economic empowerment and gender;
- S/he should be analytical and also need to have outstanding skill of writing reports;
- The evaluation team has to be identified external of Oxfam Intermon and independent from the local partner.
- Previous experience in evaluating convenios/projects funded by AECID and knowledge of AECID rules and regulation.
- The consultancy firm has to have a minimum of five years of experience in the related field.

* According to the III Director Plan of AECID and the approach to improve the capacity of the local partner, it would be given preference to Ethiopian consultancy firm, evaluators.

10. PREMISE OF THE EVALUATION, AUTHORSHIP AND PUBLICATION

- Anonymity and confidentiality: The evaluation shall respect the right of interviewer ensuring confidentiality and their anonymity.
- Responsibility: If any differences or disagreement occurs during the evaluation, especially in regards with the conclusions and/or recommendations, this has to be mention in the evaluation report.
- Integrity: The evaluation team will have the responsibility to express issues which are not mentioned in the Terms of Reference if it would be necessary, in order to have a comprehensive analysis of the program.
- Independency: The evaluation team has to guarantee its independency from the evaluated program.
- Convalidación de la información: Corresponde al equipo evaluador garantizar la veracidad de la información recopilada para la elaboración de los informes, y en última instancia será responsable de la información presentada en el Informe de evaluación.
- Incident: In case there would be problems or incidents during the evaluation field work, OI should be immediately informed and if it's the case OI will inform AECID. If the problem haven't be communicate as mentioned before, those cannot be use to justify the unsuccessful results of evaluation report.
- Copyright and dissemination: The copyright passes to the entity contracting the evaluation. OI will be responsible for the dissemination of the evaluation findings. However AECID has the right to distribute, reproduce the evaluation report without the previous agreement with OI, if it requires by the administrative process.
- Penalty: In case of delay in the evaluation report submission or regarding the quality of the report a penalty can be applied according to the agreement signed up with the evaluation team.

11. DURATION OF THE EVALUATION

The selection process of the evaluation team will start immediately after the validation of the Terms of Reference from AECID. The appeal will be spread through publication in the newspaper and local network of NGOs.

The evaluation would be carried out according to the following timing:

- **Start date field work: 1st of July 2016.**
- Submission and presentation of the first draft to the Evaluation Monitoring Committee: **6th of August 2016**

- Submission of observation, comments and inputs from the Evaluation Monitoring Committee to the evaluation team: **10th of August 2016**
- Submission of final evaluation report: **16th of August 2016**

* If external conditions hamper the evaluation process, affecting the work plan, the evaluation team will work with OI team to find possible relevant solutions in order to guarantee the accomplishment of the evaluation objectives.

12. PRESENTATION OF THE TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC OFFER AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Interested applicants should submit their letter of proposal, profiles and CVs together with technical and financial proposal until 20th of April 2016 to Oxfam Intermon. The bid submitted by the bidder has to fully comply with the Terms of Reference (TOR) and must contain a brief technical and a financial part. The technical and financial proposal must be sealed separately. Financial proposal must be in ETB.

The proposal shall include:

1. Introduction of the evaluator (team coordinator): Name, country, summary of experience and background.
2. Introduction of the team work: List of the evaluator team members and their CV.
3. Consultancy firm's experience and portfolio.
4. Methodological proposal to conduct the evaluation, according to the Terms of References, including evaluation logical framework designed according to the evaluation's questions.
5. Financial proposal: including consultancy fee, proposed person-days and rates, accommodation, Spanish translation of final report, data entry and analysis, stationery, printing, binding, and photocopying, taxes, etc.
6. **IO will cover the expenses relates to travel within the country during the period of field work (three weeks according to the Phase II of the evaluation). All other expenses related to the evaluation have to be incurred by the evaluators and shall be included in the financial proposal.**
7. Any other relevant information as annex.

The complete bid document shall be submitted in soft copy with the reference Proposal for Final Evaluation of Program **"TO PROMOTE RURAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH LIVELIHOOD ENHANCEMENT AND VULENRABILITY REDUCTION IN ETHIOPIA"**. The technical proposal includes taxpayers identification number (TIN) and copy of 2015 renewed licenses.

Proposal shall be submitted to the following contact email:

recruitment@OxfamIntermon.org

The selected proposal can be submitted to AECID for its validation.

Only the selected firm/evaluation team will be informed about the final results of the selection process.

The following criteria will be taken into account for the evaluation and selection of the proposal: clarity, viability of the proposal, technical capacity and experience to apply the methodology and knowledge of the context, intervention sector of the program and experience in the sector.

The proposal will be evaluated according to the following:

- Cost/financial proposal: 40%
- Technical proposal: 40%
- Evaluation team profile: 20%