**Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation**

**of the project**

**“Increasing Resilience through Innovative and Sustainable Improvement of Food Security and Livelihoods for Returnees, IDPs, and Host Communities in the Western Coastal areas of Yemen"** *(Project No. K-YEM-2020-0371)*

**Note:** There could be minor amendments to this TOR in the course of advertisement and processing the bid

1. **Background**

**Organizational**

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) is part of the Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V. (EWDE), one of the biggest welfare institutions in Germany. The organisation supports people affected by natural disasters, war and displacement in 36 countries across the world. This is delivered through a global network of partner organisations.

DKH provides technical assistance and comprehensive support to all partner organizations, focusing on capacity-building and reinforcing collaborative relationships. DKH has been supporting partner organisations in the delivery of emergency responses and resilience building initiatives in Yemen since June 2019. It currently operates from its office in Aden.

**Brief description of the interventions to be evaluated**

The project "Increasing Resilience through Innovative and Sustainable Improvement of Food Security and Livelihoods for Returnees, IDPs, and Host Communities in the Western Coastal areas of Yemen" is funded by a grant from the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) transitional development assistance (TDA). Implementation of the project is done through the partnership of DKH Yemen and local partner organisations Abs Development Organization (ADO) and Nahda Makers Organization (NMO).

The intervention started in August 2020 and is due to end in December 2024. The project was revised in 2023, with a revision of project deliverables on the West Coast as the initial intervention on fish farming (Fish hatchery, fish feed processing plant, and floating pounds) and their management by the local community was not realistic based on the existing context, absence of technical expertise (private and public) in the area and limited time frame and fund allocated by the project.

The overall objective of the project is to enhance the existing livelihood strategies and make them more sustainable through the successful introduction of locally adapted innovative products and processes, increasing community resilience and food security.

As per the Project Document, the results expected to be achieved under the Project are the following:

Outcome 1: Coastal communities are more resilient through the enhancement of existing Livelihood Strategies

Outcome 2: Coastal Communities are more food-secure

**Target Groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | TOTAL (direct) | Male | female | IDP/ Migrants | Returnee / host community |
|  | | | | | |
| Awareness-raising and community mobilization | 8,060 | 4,760 | 3,300 | 1,392 | 6.668 |
| Fuel-efficient cooking solutions and dryers | 4,640 | 2,320 | 2,320 | 1,392 | 3,248 |
| Fishery (awareness-raising sessions on the causes of harvest losses) | 1,920 | 1,440 | 480 | 0 | 1,920 |
| Fishery (awareness raising sessions on the topic of available financial services and services and products of existing financial institutions) *(Internal note: work with MFI/Bank experts)* | 1,500 | 1,000 | 500 |  | 1,500 |
| Exposure visits (relevant stakeholders) | 50 |  |  |  |  |
| *Total indirect beneficiaries* | 28,260 *(considering at least half the participants are from unique households* | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Livelihoods / Conditional cash (vocational training) | 980 | 695 | 285 | 0 | 980 |
| Productive assets/ relief goods for fishing households (boats, boat motors, nets, rescue jackets) | 450 | 405 | 45 | 0 | 450 |
| SMEs for women from fishing communities (production and repair of nets); 3 groups per project district; 5 women per group. | 30 | ~~0~~ | 30 | ~~0~~ | 30 |
| Women SMEs (Fish processing and possibly other IGA); 3 groups per project district; 5 women per group. | 30 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 |
| Men SMEs (maintenance and repair of boats); 5 groups per project district; 5 fishermen per group. | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Production of fuel-efficient cooking solutions and food dryers *(male and female returnees and host community members)* | 300 | 240 | 60 | 0 | 300 |
| Food processing on communal food dryers *(female returnees and host community members)* | 120 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 120 |
| *Total indirect beneficiaries* | *6,530* | | | | |
| Food security | 22,170 | 10,500 | 11,670 | 21,330 | 840 |
| Distribution of fuel-efficient cooking solutions (women from vulnerable households) | 1,100 | 0 | 1,100 | 330 | 770 |
| Distribution of food dryers (households with access to produce) | 70 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 70 |
| Distribution of food items (fresh fish and dried produce) to 21,000 individuals (3,000 households) (IDPs and migrants) | 21,000 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 21,000 | 0 |
| *Total indirect beneficiaries* | *29,190* | | | | |
| **Note**: *From the totals under ´Food security´ 20% of beneficiaries are female-headed HHs and 10% will include HHs with persons with disabilities* | | | | | |
| **Total of direct beneficiaries** | **31,210** | | | | |
| **Total of indirect beneficiaries** | **63,980** | | | | |

1. **Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation**

Purpose of the evaluation:

The evaluation is intended to produce a report that presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations in a structured format, providing clear insights into the project’s performance, impact and areas for improvement. It serves to enhance organizational and stakeholder learning, promote accountability to donors and beneficiaries, and inform decision-making in line with evaluation standards. Findings, Lessons and recommendations are expected to be shared with implementing organizations, stakeholders, donors and other key actors to guide future programming strategies and resource allocation.

As envisaged in the Project Document, an independent Final Evaluation will take place in the final months before the end of the Project. The final evaluation will also reference baseline assessments conducted by the two implementing partners at the beginning of the project and their monitoring reports.

Main objectives of the evaluation:

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide the key stakeholders – including the targeted community, project implementing partners, DKH and the donor BMZ - with a comprehensive assessment of how the project was designed, implemented, and what it achieved. The evaluation will review the projects achievement of adjectives as well as its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

1. **Scop**

The Project Evaluation will cover the period 1 January 2021 to 31 December 2024 covering all the project locations – in the west coast of Yemen, Al Hudaydah and Taiz governorates governorate in both (Khawkha and Al Mukha) districts. The evaluation will cover programme implementation, monitoring, reporting, audit reports and evaluation of results and will engage all project stakeholders. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, Impact, Sustainability and Coherence of the project; explore the key factors that have contributed to the achieving or not achieving of the intended results; and determine the extent to which the project is contributing to increase resilience through sustainable improvement food security and livelihood for returnees, IDPs and host communities in the western coast of Yemen. and adhere DKH and donor roles and regulations.

1. **Research Criteria and Questions**

* The evaluation shall use all six of the following OECD-DAC criteria and corresponding questions (Relevance, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability). Assess the extent to which the Project achieved its results at outcome level as well as its impact and prospects of sustainability
* Analyse the strengths and weaknesses in project design, project adaptation, implementation, and monitoring
* Draw related conclusions and lessons learned, best practices and provide recommendations at strategic and operational levels to the implementing partners (DKH, ADO, and NMO), to BMZ, and other key stakeholders to feed back into the current and future programming

The team of the consulting firm will be able to review and revise the questions (not the criteria) in consultation with the team of the DKH country office as well as the project implementing MEAL team, as part of the inception phase of the evaluation, and as relevant.

1. **Evaluation Questions**

The Final Evaluation will answer the following evaluation questions:

1. **Relevance**

* How well did the project address the actual needs of the target population (men, women, elderly, and children)?
* How relevant was the project in the given socio-economic, political and security context of the target area?
* To what extent were the project’s objectives consistent with national policies and priorities?

1. **Effectiveness**

* To what extent has the project achieved its outcomes and results or is likely to achieve them?
* What major factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the expected outcomes and results? (including any which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
* Did the project contribute to capacity development to the local organizations (such as Community based organizations, Self-help groups etc) as planned?
* To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
* To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project?

1. **Impact**

* To what extent did the program contribute towards the attainment of the intended primary and secondary long-term objectives?
* Have any unintended positive and negative changes occurred?
* Has the project influenced broader systemic changes, if so, how and which?

1. **Sustainability**

* To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after the completing of the project support?
* How did the project’s strategies ensure, that results are sustainable over the long term?
* To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after project closure?
* Are local stakeholders involved in planning to maintain the positive project’s results.

1. **Efficiency**

* Were the objectives achieved with the most efficient allocation of resources (money, time, personnel)?
* Did the project experience any significant delays or cost, if so, what where the causes and what impact did they have?
* Were the resources allocated proportionate to the results and effects of the project activities?

1. **Coherence**

* How well did the project align with other initiatives and programs in the project area, sector and region?
* Where gaps or overlaps found between other initiatives in the area and this project?
* Was the project integrated well with policies and strategies existing in the area/country?

1. **Design and Approach**

The Final Evaluation will follow qualitative approaches and methods, using semi-structured techniques that can provide an in-depth understanding of perceptions. The team of consultant/firm are expected to determine the final methodological approach for presentation and approval during the inception phase.

The data collection methods and techniques to be used are:

**Document review of all relevant documentation:** This will include the review of the below documents

1. **Project planning documents:**
   * Project proposal
   * Workplan
   * Logical framework
   * Financial plan
2. **Implementation and monitoring documents:**
   * Project deliverables
   * Third-party monitoring reports
   * Baseline and endline studies
   * Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) reports
   * During Distribution Monitoring (DDM) reports
   * Interim project reports
   * Final project report
3. **Stakeholder engagement documents:**
   * Reports from meetings
   * Roundtable discussions
   * Workshop proceedings

**Semi-structured interviews** **with key stakeholders**: This would include a representative sample of project key stakeholders – including the west coast organization affairs office (WCOAO), local council, red see fishery authority, ministry of agriculture, irrigation and fishery, implementing partners, community committees, and DKH respective team members, etc. Development of evaluation questions should be tailored to the different needs and participation of various stakeholders. The interviews will be of a semi-structured approach, with flexible interview guidelines that allow for more in-depth responses to questions.

All analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence, and data. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalizable. The broad range of data provides strong opportunities for triangulation. This process is essential to ensure a comprehensive and coherent understanding of the data sets, which will be generated by the evaluation.

The detailed information on the methods to be used will be developed by the evaluators during the Inception phase.

1. **Deliverables**

* **Inception Report (Maximum 10-15 pages):** Detailed work plan, evaluation matrix, and data collection tools.
* **Draft Evaluation Report:** Preliminary findings and recommendations.
  + Facilitate and conduct a **validation workshop** in the presence of key stakeholders (Community representatives, implementing partners, DKH, public sector departments etc.) to discuss the draft evaluation report
* **Final Evaluation Report (Maximum 40 pages):** Comprehensive report including executive summary, methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
* **Presentation**: Summary of key findings and recommendations to stakeholders.

1. **Evaluation Team**

* The evaluation team can consist of 2-3 persons (or more, if deemed necessary and if justified), of which at least one member should be a female. One person should take the team lead and act as the main contact point between the evaluation team and DKH. The team must have proficiency in both written and spoken English. Ideally, at least one team member should be fluent in Arabic, ensuring effective communication with local stakeholders. Alternatively, translation services must be arranged.

**Required Qualifications and Experience:**

**Education:**

Minimum Master's degree in a relevant field (e.g., economics, marine science, renewable energy, international development, social sciences, or related disciplines)

**Professional Experience:**

At least 7 years of experience in:

• Designing and leading program evaluations for food security, livelihood, and resilience support projects in conflict or post-conflict environments.

• Project design, results-based management (RBM), and participatory monitoring and evaluation methodologies

Proven expertise in:

• Qualitative and quantitative data collection, instrument development, and data analysis

• Gender and protection mainstreaming

• Food security, livelihoods, and resilience programming.

* Familiarity with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria

**Skills and Knowledge:**

* Excellent report writing, analytical, and problem-solving skills
* Demonstrated ability to draft actionable recommendations based on key findings
* Knowledge of fishery livelihood support projects, fuel efficient cooking solutions interventions.
* Knowledge of the local context in Yemen

**Preferred Qualifications:**

* Experience in evaluating large, complex projects
* Experience with BMZ-funded programs or other international organizations

**Language:**

* Fluency in English (written and spoken) is required
* Arabic language skills are highly desirable

1. **Timeline**

The evaluation is expected to be completed within 45 days, from 1st November 2024.

1. **Budget**

A detailed budget outlining all anticipated costs must be submitted for the evaluation, including expenses for travel, accommodation, personnel, and any other relevant items. Additionally, the payment structure will be divided into three milestones based on the delivered outputs:

* 30% of the total payment will be provided upon submission of the inception report
* 50% will be paid after delivering the draft report and conducting the validation workshop

The remaining 20% will be released once the final report has been approved by DKH after all comments and necessary revisions have been completed

This phased payment approach is designed to align the disbursement of funds with the successful completion of key deliverables throughout the evaluation process.

1. **Assessment and Weighting Criteria of the Proposals**

Required mentioned documents to be included when submitting the Proposal: Interested individuals /firm must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest: (i) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability; (ii) Most updated detailed CVs of the team including past experience in similar assignment, samples of similar assignments, Clear copy of the identity card /passport, and at least 3 references; (iii) A detailed Methodology and work plan on how the candidate/firm will approach and conduct the work.

Legal documents are required if the applicant is a firm:

* Company profile
* Valid VAT and TAX ID certificate
* Valid Trade/Business License

The received proposals will be weighed according to the technical assessment criteria (**70%** weightage) and financial assessment criteria (**30%** weightage). The proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. Technical proposals should obtain a minimum of 70 points to qualify and to be considered. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that secured 70 points or above. Below are the criteria and points for assessing technical proposals:

**a) Technical proposals (total score: 70 points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum obtainable**  **points** | **Weighting (%)** |
| General adherence to the Term of Reference (ToR) | 5 | 7% |
| Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality,  creativity, realism of work plan etc).   * Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR. * Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR. * Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment. | 35 | 50% |
| * Previous relevant experience in program evaluation using DAC criteria including the ability to assess innovative FSL projects. * Company profile * Sample of related previous work. | 10 | 14% |
| Technical capacity of the applicants: qualifications, competencies, experience and skills  as per the ToR. | 20 | 29% |
| **Total** | **70** | **100%** |

**b) Financial Proposal (total score: 30 points)**

The financial proposal will specify a total lump sum amount and payment terms shall be aligned with those in the budget section (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified milestones in the ToR.

Financial Proposal, providing a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems) is to be provided by the offer.

Financial proposal will be assessed based on the completeness, clarity and appropriateness, using the formula:

Marks Obtained = Lowest Priced Offer (Amount) / Offer being considered (Amount) X 30 (Full Marks)

1. **Submission of Proposals**

Interested consultants or firms are invited to submit their proposals, including technical and financial proposals, CVs of the evaluation team members, and examples of previous evaluations conducted at [procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de](mailto:procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de) **. Please provide a maximum of 30 pages.**

**Deadline for Submission:** 15 days after the advertisement, i.e.  **Sunday 8th Dec.2024@ 17:00 pm Yemen time**

For technical questions please reach MEAL Coordinator ‘zubair.abdulaziz@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de’

**Contact Information :** procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de