

Terms of Reference (TOR)

For (evaluation/baseline survey/context analysis / etc.)

Final Evaluation of the project “Promoting Climate Resilient Agriculture for Sustainable Livelihoods in Multi-ethnic Marneuli Municipality in Georgia” (PRAISE MARNEULI) (Project 918051)

Made (internally/independently/externally)

Externally

Of (start / mid-term/final/ex-post/other)

Final

In (country)

Georgia

ToR for EVALUATION was reviewed by the M&E team?

Signature of M&E: Eitan Reich

1 DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

The overall objective of the HEKS-EPER funded project (2021 – 2024) - **Promoting Climate Resilient Agriculture for Sustainable Livelihoods in Multi-ethnic Marneuli Municipality** (PRAISE MARNEULI) is to support income generation opportunities and sustainable economic growth in favour of the vulnerable population in Marneuli Municipality via inclusion, capacity building and introduction of climate resilient agricultural (CRA) practices.

The project’s work and activities focus on supporting income generation opportunities for residents in Marneuli municipality, specifically vulnerable groups (women, youth, and ethnic minorities) via the integration and promotion of climate resilient and environmentally friendly agricultural practices.

By working with different target groups, such as farmers, local civil society representatives, local government members, women, and active young girls, the action builds on three outcomes to achieve the goal:

1. Outcome 1: Mechanisms are established for implementing climate-resilient agricultural practices on the municipality level.
2. Outcome 2: Community institutions and local stakeholders are empowered and have the capacity to apply climate-resilient agriculture (CRA) practices and implement the Human Right Based Approach (HRBA).
3. Outcome 3: Income generation opportunities are created, and quality of life is improved by financing and implementation of climate-resilient agriculture initiatives (sub-grants)

2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The final evaluation is carried out at the end of the intervention, as a mandatory assessment of the design, implementation, and results of the implemented project. The results will be reported to the project team, project stakeholders, project beneficiaries, and a donor organization. The evaluation is both summative and formative. It is summative in the sense that it aims to assess accountability in terms of achieved results (intended and unintended, direct and indirect, positive and negative, and at output, outcome, and/or overarching goal level). At the same time, **the evaluation is formative as it is aimed to contribute to learning for future similar interventions and/or the next possible phase of the project.** As a result, the findings will be used to both promote accountability and learning. The findings will be used to foster accountability and learning not only vertically (between CENN and Heks/Eper), but also horizontally – with project stakeholders, project beneficiaries, and with CENN colleagues. **The evaluation is aimed to assess all interventions of the project from its start in 2021 up to the latest available data in 2024, as well as additional needs and entry points for its continuation.** The geographic focus is Marneuli Municipality in Georgia.

3 CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation is aimed to assess the following DAC criteria:

1. **Relevance:** The extent to which the intervention's objectives and design responded to beneficiaries' global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
2. **Coherence:** The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) supported or undermined the intervention and vice versa, including internal coherence and external coherence.
3. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.
4. **Efficiency:** The extent to which the intervention delivered results in an economic and timely way.
5. **Impact:** The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
6. **Sustainability:** The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

The evaluation is expected to provide an assessment of all the above-mentioned criteria, however, taking into consideration time and budget constraints, the prioritized evaluation criteria are **effectiveness** and **sustainability**.

The evaluation is also expected to provide assessment of the evaluation criteria in terms of remaining and future needs of the beneficiaries for continued intervention.

In addition to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation team is also expected to specifically assess the following target areas for all beneficiary groups and if possible, beyond (impact), by indicating level of the change (individual, household, community, region etc.), disaggregated by age, sex and ethnic group:

1. Change towards non-discrimination and equal rights¹
2. Change in the livelihoods²

¹ **'Non-discrimination'** refers to equal rights and participation for all people no matter to which group people belong (focusing on gender, geographic location, ethnicity, religion, economic income, migration status and language). This project empowers excluded and vulnerable people and communities, to claim and enjoy their rights. At the same time, it holds duty-bearers accountable for providing inclusive services to guarantee rights de jure and de facto (e.g. advocating access to improved infrastructure such as irrigation channels etc.). This project promotes not only systemic access to basic services (e.g. access to non-formal education in minority languages, thematic trainings on climate resilient agriculture, access to improved seedlings, access to demonstration plots, access to funding opportunities etc.), but also inter- and intra-group relations of excluded groups and mainstream society (e.g. supporting cooperation between ecomigrants, contributing to their economic integration in the society). **Enactment of Equal rights:** According to HEKS/EPER's Conflict Transformation Implementation Concept, the term 'equality' implies a correspondence between different people or population groups that have the same qualities in at least one aspect but may differ in others. Equality means that everyone has equal conditions, treatment, and opportunities for realizing their full potential, human rights and dignity, and for contributing to (and benefitting from) economic, social, cultural and political development. Equality is, therefore, the equal valuing by society of the similarities and differences of everyone, and the role everyone plays.

² **Livelihoods** can refer to the following: 1. Achieving survival and/or livelihood protection threshold 2. Ownership of, and access to, productive assets 3. Productivity enhancement 4. Increase and/or diversification of incomes 5. Gain and application of productive knowledge 6. Access to livelihood support services and markets 7. Disaster risk management and natural resources management 8. Livelihood rights, policies and regulations improvement.

3. Change towards effective and active participation³
4. Progress towards the creation or reform of institutions, policies, and mechanisms supporting non-discrimination, sustainable land/resources governance, basic needs, and enactment of equal rights

It is expected that the selected evaluation team prepares detailed interview guides corresponding to each target group and evaluation criteria, reviewed and approved by CENN. Furthermore, the evaluation questions may be updated taking into consideration the priorities and needs identified by partner organizations and beneficiaries during the last stage of monitoring data collection as well as the inception phase of the evaluation through a participatory workshop, and will be finalized accordingly.

The general evaluation questions are provided below:

Relevance

- To what extent the objectives of a development intervention were consistent with and meaningful to the municipality, regional, and country needs?
- Were all interventions of the project relevant to beneficiaries' needs?
- To what extent have the (original) objectives proven to have been appropriate for the intervention in question?

Coherence

- To what extent has the project been aligned with other interventions implemented by CENN and HEKS/EPER?
- To what extent has the project been consistent with the relevant international norms and standards to which CENN and HEKS/EPER adhere (e.g. HRBA, SDGs)?
- To what extent has the project been aligned with external policy commitments of the region and the country?
- To what extent has the project been aligned with interventions implemented by other actors in the same context?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the intervention achieved the intended objectives?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or underachievement of the objectives?
- To what extent have the needs of target groups been reached? To what extent did the project provide inclusiveness and equity of results among different beneficiary groups?
- Are there any unintended effects, both positive and negative that have occurred as a result of the intervention?
- Were there any positive and negative effects arising from the intervention's context that require further efforts for scaling up or solving?

Efficiency

- To what extent were the costs associated with the intervention proportionate to the benefits it has generated? What factors were influencing any particular discrepancies? How do these factors link to the intervention?
- Was the allocated resources (human, financial, time, etc.) sufficient for the project?
- Were there any alternatives for achieving the same results with fewer inputs/funds?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log-frame as a management tool. Were the monitoring instruments of the project sufficient and follow up ensured? Review the monitoring

³ **Effective participation:** the capacity to influence on a group decision in decision-making organisations/bodies at community level; **Active participation:** the capacity to suggest ideas and/or advocate for these ideas in decision-making organisations/bodies at community level).

tools used: did they provide the necessary information? Did they involve key partners? Were they efficient? Were they cost-effective? Were additional tools required?

- Were lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Impact

- What are intended and unintended changes that have occurred as a result of the project intervention for beneficiaries and other stakeholders?
- Has any practice and/or service and/or model created under the project been replicated by non-project participants and/or outside the target area?
- What needs (previously identified or newly emerged) exist among the project beneficiaries, as relevant to the project intervention?

Sustainability

- To what extent will activities and results continue after donor support has ended?
- To what extent did the intervention reflect on and take into account factors that, by experience, have a major influence on sustainability (i.e. economic, ecological, social, and cultural aspects)?
- To what extent did the project strengthen local ownership and leadership?
- What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

Evaluations must comply with the OECD-DAC quality standards for development evaluations (<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>) and the SEVAL evaluation standards (<http://www.seval.ch/en/Standards/index.cfm>).

4 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The evaluation follows a mixed-methods approach using a non-experimental design, with hybrid (on-site and remote where applicable) methods. The methods suggested are a document review, secondary data analysis, key informant interviews, focus group discussion(s), and surveys of specific target groups (if applicable) as listed below. The triangulation of data, sources, and methods should be ensured as much as possible to promote credibility and use of evaluation results. The evaluation design, approach, and methods should clearly show how data collection will be human rights-based, foster environmental sustainability, and be gender sensitive. In addition, all data needs to be disaggregated by sex, ethnic group, age, and stakeholder group (duty bearers vs. rights holders).

Under the overall guidance of CENN, the selected partner will be responsible for providing the following tasks:

1. To design the qualitative and quantitative study methodology (including sample designs) in close consultations with the CENN team and based on OECD-DAC quality standards for development evaluations and SEVAL evaluation standards
2. To develop and pilot quantitative and qualitative research instruments
3. Before starting data collection, conduct a participatory workshop with the group of partners and beneficiaries and prioritize evaluation questions accordingly
4. To conduct surveys representative of relevant target groups (as applicable)
5. To conduct the Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group(s) for collecting data from direct project stakeholders as listed below
6. To conduct desk study and review relevant secondary data for measuring achievement of intended project targets;
7. To analyze the collected quantitative and qualitative data (including the secondary data obtained from desk study) and submit the first draft report in English language to CENN
8. To incorporate feedback in the report and submit the final report in English to CENN.

The main stakeholders and beneficiaries who are expected to be involved in the evaluation process are listed below (indicating an approximate number of people in each category). Furthermore, the evaluation team is expected to suggest how impact will be assessed beyond the direct beneficiaries (for each group

separately, e.g. households of farmers, households of Girls' Club members, village representatives, etc.), which additional groups will be covered by evaluation and by which methods.

Selection and justification of each method appropriate for the given group of stakeholders/beneficiaries should be provided in the technical proposal. The suggested methods for already identified stakeholders are given below:

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) (partners)

- Central and regional authorities of Georgia (approx. 3)
- Authorities in Marneuli municipality (approx. 3)
- Representatives of donor organization (approx. 2)
- Educational institutions (approx. 2)
- Partner organizations (approx. 1)
- Representatives of other interventions with similar objectives (approx. 2)

Focus Group discussions (direct beneficiaries)

- Farmers (approx. 50 people)
- Multi-Stakeholder Working Group (MSWG) members (approx. 16 people)
- Cooperative members (approx. 10 people)
- Girls' Club members (approx. 15 people)
- Grant recipients (approx. 15 people)

Focus Group discussions (indirect beneficiaries)

- Farmers' household members (approx. 50)
- Parents of the Girls' Club members (approx. 15)
- Household members of Grant recipients (approx. 15)
- Representatives of the Mayor (approx. 8)

Project team to be interviewed:

- Project team in Georgia (approx. 5 people)

5 DELIVERABLES

As a result of the evaluation the following deliverables are expected to be submitted to HEKS/EPER:

- Inception Report, including any deviations from the evaluation design, method, and tools described in this ToR, and results of the participatory workshop
- Comments, if applicable, on the evaluation matrix
- Data collection tools
- The evaluation will result in the drawing up of a report written straightforwardly, in English.
 - Cover page
 - Table of the content
 - Abbreviations
 - Acknowledgements
 - Executive summary
 - Brief description of the evaluated action, objectives, methods, and duration of the evaluation.
 - Main conclusions: The conclusions must refer to the main evaluation criteria.
 - Main recommendations and suggestions for improvement, considering needs for future intervention: The recommendations and suggestions must be directly and logically related to the conclusions.
 - Introduction
 - Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation
 - Description of the development intervention
 - Evaluation criteria and questions
 - Methodology and procedure
 - Findings
 - This chapter will provide the background to the points listed in the Executive Summary. It will contain a description of the findings and an analysis or

interpretation of the action in terms of the main evaluation criteria, focusing particularly on the main issues that were to be studied.

- **The findings should also clearly indicate the remaining needs of the target population and entry points for continued intervention.**
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (**including recommendations for future intervention**)
- Annexes
 - TOR
 - Evaluation matrix
 - List of consulted stakeholders
 - Table with the achieved results based on the log frame
- A final debriefing with HEKS/EPER staff including the HO representative, regional director, and the programme officer.
- All deliverables must be in English (as part of the beneficiaries represent ethnic minority groups, the data collection instruments should additionally be in Georgian, Azerbaijani, and Armenian, as needed).

6 SCHEDULE

The process of the evaluation should follow the next steps:

Kick-off and Inception Phase (May 2024)

The first phase comprises of the following actions/deliverables by the evaluation team:

- a. Desk research and a study/desk review of documents and data (portfolio analysis) provided by the project and documents identified by the evaluation team (other literature/evaluative evidence)
- b. Focus group discussion with project team focusing on project theory.
- c. Agreement on prioritizing of DAC criteria and selection/focus of the evaluation questions
- d. Review of existing evaluations and studies as a basis for enhancing the project theory
- e. Draft inception report (10 pages plus annexes) that must contain at least the following points:
 - Detailed presentation of the methods to be applied during data collection
 - Proposed evaluation time plan, including field visits
 - Final reconstructed project theory
 - Evaluation Matrix (showing how each question will be answered through the use of indicators, data collection tools, etc.)
 - Interview and survey outlines (in annex)
 - Bibliography (in annex)
 - Proposed structure of replication strategy
- f. Incorporation of the written comments into the draft inception report and submission of the final inception report.
- g. A workshop for the presentation of inception report results.

Data Collection and Interview Phase (May-June 2024)

The main components of the second phase are:

- a. Data collection as agreed upon in the inception report. Any changes to the inception report need written permission from CENN
- b. Key informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and survey data, as applicable.

Data Analysis and Submission of Report (June-July 2024*)

- a. Data analysis and preparation of triangulation matrix.
- b. Submission of a Draft Evaluation Report that must contain at least the following points:
 - Executive Summary
 - Introduction
 - Background and Context Analysis
 - Evaluation Design and Approach

- Methodological Approach
- Data Collection and Analysis Tools
- Limitations, Risks, and Mitigations Measures
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Annexes
- a. Incorporation of the feedback (or else non-incorporation of feedback based on a sound justification) by the evaluation team and submission of the final draft report and replication strategy (in separate documents) to CENN
- b. Provision of a PPT presentation summarizing the main findings of the evaluation
- c. Holding of a concluding workshop, including the presentation of results and conclusion as well as a discussion on refining the recommendations by the evaluation team
- d. Incorporation of the written comments by the evaluation team and submission of the final version of the report to CENN for coherence screening.

*** The final draft of the report should be provided to CENN for review no later than July 15, 2024.**

7 MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluation is mandated by CENN, and the selection of the evaluation team and daily management will be provided by the CENN team. Furthermore, CENN will ensure timely communication with HEKS/EPER about all deliverables and will communicate the received feedback back to the evaluation team. The evaluation team is responsible for providing all deliverables in a timely manner, taking into consideration requirements as defined in this ToR.

8 FOLLOW UP OF THE ASSESSMENT

The study results including recommendations will be discussed among the members of the project partners, as well as representatives of the target groups, and **serve as the basis for learning, adaption, and improvements of the intervention strategy for the possible next phase.**

9 LIST OF DOCUMENTS

The evaluation team will be provided with:

- Project documents (including annexes, revisions, and budget)
- All progress reports
- Final report (draft report will be prepared during the evaluation)
- Previous evaluations and relevant data collection results of the project
- Information on other projects closely connected with the project to be evaluated
- List of contacts containing all persons involved in the implementation of the project (with function, task, contact data, and information on language skills) as well as all local partners (including representatives of the target group, as far as feasible)
- All other relevant documents prepared by the project (e.g. guidebooks, recommendations, etc.).

10 ASSESSMENT TEAM / QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation should be conducted by a team of evaluators, including at least one national evaluator from Georgia. The team composition should be detailed and explained in the technical offer, together with a division of tasks among all team members and the added value of each member.

The team leader should have the following qualifications:

- Track record in leading evaluations during the last 5 years (at least three evaluations conducted), proven by at least one such evaluation annexed to the offer
- Solid experience in developing methodologies and research instruments, including survey development in line with international academic standards and guidelines proven by at least one writing sample (published or unpublished, to be annexed to the offer)

- Graduate degree in social science, environmental studies or related field
- At least 5 years of experience in evaluating donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development (experience in working with multi-stakeholders: government, civil society, community-based organizations, and UN/multilateral/bilateral institutions will be an asset)
- Sound understanding of rural development, sustainable development and participatory decision-making process in the regions of Georgia
- Proven knowledge of climate-resilient agriculture is a strong asset
- Familiarity with the political, economic and social situation in Georgia
- Language qualifications: Fluency in English; fluency in Georgian; knowledge of Azerbaijani and/or Armenian languages will be a strong asset
- Previous experience in designing and implementing donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development and/or environment in Georgia would be a strong asset
- Previous experience in working with international organizations would be a strong asset.

The other team member(s) should have the following qualifications:

- Graduate degree in social sciences or humanities and/or senior academic experience
- At least 5 years of experience in leading the design and conducting surveys, writing study reports
- Proven experience with survey development and conduct, proven by at least one writing sample
- At least 5 years of proven work experience on project/program evaluations with the OECD/DAC and EU Better Regulation Guidelines & Toolbox evaluation criteria; previous evaluations in the rural development/environmental field in Georgia will be an asset
- At least 3 years of experience in researching rural development issues will be an asset
- Sound gender expertise and knowledge of evaluation methods needed for gender-specific analysis will be an asset
- Proven knowledge of climate-resilient agriculture will be an asset
- Proven familiarity with or work experience in Georgia; evaluation experience in Georgia
- Language qualifications: Fluency in English, and Georgian. knowledge of Azerbaijani and/or Armenian languages will be a strong asset.

The proposal must include the following components provided below. Incomplete applications will not be considered. The weight of each award criteria is given below:

Award criteria	Weight of award criteria in %
1. CV of a maximum of 4 pages for each person, highlighting relevant experience	20%
2. One sample of previous similar work (in English)	10%
3. The technical proposal with a description of the understanding of the assignment, the suggested expert/s, evaluation design, data collection, and analysis methods to be used, including risks and mitigation strategies, suggested work plan, division of work, and detailed timeframe.	50%
4. The financial proposal, with a detailed cost breakdown	20%

Please send any questions as well as your complete offer (1. CVs in a separate PDF and 2. All other requested documentation) to the following email addresses:

jimsher.koshadze@cenn.org and sopiko.babalashvili@cenn.org no later than **April 23, 18:00 Tbilisi time**.