

Terms of Reference

Anukulan Final Evaluation

Lead Implementing Partner - International Development Enterprises (iDE)
Implementation Country – Nepal

1. Introduction

Anukulan – BRACED is a UKAid funded three year (2015-2017) duration project implemented by International Development Enterprises (iDE) and its consortium partners. The overall goal is to improve the well-being of poor people, especially women and children, despite their exposure to climate related shocks and stresses.

The project facilitates the development of sustainable rural organisations around economic opportunities in agriculture, water resource management, and community forestry. It promotes the harmonisation of disaster risk reduction (DRR) planning and climate change adaptation (CCA) strategies to influence climate risk management policies and institutions. It empowers women to take leading roles in rural institutions and contribute to economic opportunities through public-private partnerships. Furthermore, Anukulan improves food security and nutrition, and increases annual incomes by an average £140 for 100,000 households, benefiting more than 500,000 people, through climate resilient farming systems and diversification of livelihoods. The project is thus designed to scale-up and integrate proven approaches to strengthen climate change resilience for poor and vulnerable households and communities. The project is being implemented in six districts: Kailali, Kanchanpur, Dadeldhura, and Doti of Far-Western Development Region, and Bardiya and Surkhet of Mid-Western Development Region.

Partners of the Consortium

- International Partners (7): iDE, ADRA, IWMI, CIMMYT, RW, MU, and Netafim
- National Partners (4): Rupantaran, RIMS Nepal, SAPPROS Nepal, and NTAG
- Local Implementing Partners (6): Tharu Women Upliftment Center (TWUC), Sundar Nepal Sanstha (SNS), Creation of Creative Society Nepal (CCSN), National Environment and Equity Development Society (NEEDS), Rural Development Service Center (RDSC), and Multipurpose Development Society (MPDS)

Project Sub-Sectors: Vegetables, Essential Oils, Nutrition, and Cereals

The specific outcome of the project is – “poor people in Nepal achieve improved resilience through enhancements in their ability to absorb, anticipate and adapt to climate related shocks and stresses”. The underlying objective is to develop climate resilient livelihoods for local communities through public-private partnership in western Nepal that suffer from climate extremes and environmental disasters. The project expects to achieve the following outputs:

- a. Increased capacity of poor people to reduce their vulnerability to climate related shocks and stresses.

- b. Increased capacity of local government, civil society and private sector to respond and provide support to climate related shocks and stresses.
- c. Better understanding of what works in building resilience to climate related shocks and stresses and integration into DRR approaches.
- d. Improved policies integrating DRR and climate change adaptation in place at local and national levels.

Refer project log-frame for more detail (Attachment-1).

2. Final Evaluation Aims and Objectives

- The overarching aim of the final evaluation is to gather information about project progress and lesson learning throughout the life of the project. This should help the IPs of Anukulan to understand “How, where, when and why do Anukulan interventions work, and what can be learned”. The final evaluation should enable the Anukulan IPs to undertake robust reflection and gathering of evidence on project success and failure in order to explore, test and revise assumptions.
- The Anukulan final evaluation will examine the outcomes the project has achieved, linking these to the “activity packages” implemented under Anukulan, and any synergies between these, as well as taking a broad view of the project as a whole. In order to understand what is working well (or in need of improvement), and why, the final evaluation needs to examine the **mechanisms** through which these activity packages are working. It also needs to investigate the way that the project **context** shapes these activities and outcomes.

2.1 Scope

- The final evaluation will focus on project progress and lesson learning throughout the project (January 2015 – December 2017).
- Evaluation planned and delivered against a standard set of headline evaluation questions with sub-questions tailored to project theory of change.
- Process-orientated and explanatory in nature.
- Focus on outcomes and ‘mechanisms’ of change, testing assumptions about how the project works and what activities might be replicated, in what contexts and why.
- The final evaluation will also ensure that the evaluation questions address some of the OECD DAC evaluation criteria set out in Annex 1 of M&E Guidance note 7 – however, the evaluation and sub-questions naturally ‘map’ onto the OECD-DAC criteria.

3. Evaluation Questions

The following set of evaluation questions will be used as the basis for planning the final evaluation:

- **Evaluation question 1 – To what extent have particular interventions led to anticipated changes and results?** This opening question, consistent across MTR and final evaluation, requires Anukulan IPs to reflect on the evidence of results delivered against the results / changes anticipated in their theory of change.
- **Evaluation question 2 - Specifically focusing on understanding ‘mechanisms’ (the causal forces or powers that explain why a change happens), how and why have particular intervention packages led to observed results and changes?** Anukulan will focus on defining ‘mechanisms’ in order to understand what it is about the nature and design of an intervention that has enabled it to be effective or not. Sub-questions under this question will explore:

- What has the project learned about delivering these packages of interventions?
 - What evidence is there that the interventions and the mechanisms that support them have the potential to deliver ‘amplified results’ and/or ‘transformational impact’?
- **Evaluation question 3 - Based on Anukulan’s accumulated knowledge and understanding, what key resilience strengthening lessons can be learned and replicated from Anukulan?** *This final evaluation question requires Anukulan IPs to reflect on the intervention-level learning the IPs have accumulated over the life of the project and to distil this learning into a set of evidence-based lessons, defining which of these can potentially be replicated elsewhere.*

The guiding document for the Final Evaluation will be the Evaluation Matrix (Attachment-2) which has been developed with the support of the Evaluation Synthesis and Support Team to suit the Anukulan project specific needs.

4. Evaluation Data Collection and Data Analysis

4.1 Methods

4.1.1 Data Collection

- The final evaluation will be based on data and information gathered from both primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources will comprise relevant project documents and district wise database. The project documents are quarterly reports, annual reports, baseline reports and factsheet etc. The district wise database will be generated from government publications, district profiles and other relevant line agencies publications.
- The project evaluations will be participatory in nature and generate data through a range of qualitative and quantitative methods. Quantitative data will be drawn from logframe, annual reporting and baseline-endline comparison. Additional data collected for the final evaluation is most likely to be qualitative to get at ‘how’ and ‘why’ things happened the way they did.
- The evaluations will test ‘assumptions’ based on the theory of change about how the project worked, refining these in the light of IPs experience in implementing the project. IPs will build on what they learned in the MTR and they will define/identify key outcomes and their indicators to include in the inception report.
- The review of existing project routine results reporting data (including KPI4, the 3As, Areas of Change, Evaluative Monitoring, and MTR) will be combined with specific primary data collection activities.
- Primary data collection will be primarily qualitative (through key informant interviews, focus groups and participatory exercises and feedback mechanisms) but it will also include quantitative data from fieldwork, and email surveys with staff. The key informant interview will be conducted to government official, collection center chairperson, DU chairperson, MUS committee chairperson and leader farmers and other stakeholders.
- The reviews and evaluations will engage a broad range of project stakeholders, from project team members to project beneficiaries/participants as well as wider key informants, champions, and observers.
- Not just ‘direct’ project stakeholders but also those stakeholders who have an ‘external’ perspective on the project (e.g., the teams of other resilience strengthening projects operating within the same area) will be engaged in the final evaluation.

The Evaluation Matrix will be used as a summary and analysis tool, rather than a data collection instrument.

4.1.2 Data Analysis

- A consultant or a team of consultants will be hired to execute the final evaluation. The consultant team will develop a detailed methodology for the final evaluation, clearly describing the way that the team plans to arrive at a set of robust and evidence-based findings and conclusions. The team will also explain how it will use the evaluation matrix to capture and summarise data.
- Evidence will be consistently cross-referenced throughout the final report, and claims made will be substantiated / validated through reference to the evidence to support these claims.

4.2 Evaluation Team Roles and Responsibilities

The composition of the study team is left up to the consultant/ organization based on their internal system, ideas and logic. However, iDE Nepal recommends that the team comprise one Team Leader (TL) to coordinate the overall study and liaise with IDE Nepal. To collect information from the field, adequate number of Field Facilitators (FFs) will be deployed in facilitation of iDE's Project Officers at the Districts. Supervision of the field work and quality (reliability and validity) of the data/information collected from the field is the primary responsibility of the TL. The study team should work closely with the M&E Unit and Project Team. In each step and process, consultation with the Programme Development and M&E Director is vital. The consultancy / consultant team will be primarily responsible to:

- develop / design final evaluation questionnaire for HH survey and checklist and tools for group interaction including FGD at District, VDC and target beneficiaries. Consultant should prepare questionnaires based on the logical framework and Final Evaluation Matrix and other project requirements both in English and Nepali language.
- share study design including process, methods and questionnaires/checklist with project team, collect feedback and finalize the study design;
- pre-test questionnaires and other tools in one of the project VDCs;
- debrief/discuss with project team about effectiveness of questionnaire, checklists and other tools used in pre-test, collect feedback and finalize them;
- orient, train and supervise the enumerators;
- carryout field work together with enumerators;
- ensure the quality of information collected from fields, cross check with the validity of information collected and verify/revise where needed;
- update progress of the study regularly to M&E Director
- analyse data and prepare quality report;
- give presentation of draft report to iDE Nepal; and
- submit the final qualitative and quantitative report in separate section to the project after incorporating the feedbacks and suggestions from iDE Nepal.

4.3 Limitations

The main limitations of this final evaluation are as follows:

- Final evaluation is based on a certain samples located at a single geographic community (i.e. 4 district of far-western development region and 2 district of mid-western development region), so generalization may not be applicable to wider area.
- Several variables were synthesized by analysing the data on recall basis of the farmers which might lead to some response errors.

5 Key Cross Cutting Considerations

5.1 Gender and Social Difference

The final evaluation methodology will account for influence of gender dynamics and social power relations on project implementation and impacts. During the final evaluation, the team will:

- Assess how **all** activities (not just those aimed at empowering women and girls) and outcomes affect and benefit gender and other social groups (including through the use of disaggregated data).
- Facilitate the participation of different gender and social groups in the final evaluation, including building comparisons (e.g. between data gathered from male- and female-only focus groups, or interviews with different members of the same household).
- Encourage reflection on how the implementation process is addressing gender and social relations. This would include a ‘reality check’ of Anukulan ambitions for changes in women’s empowerment and gender norms. This will ensure that these ambitions are realistic, and identify changes needed to make programming more effective.

The evaluation matrix contains a module of questions specific to gender and other forms of social difference, and gender and social difference can be integrated into many of the other questions.

5.2 Quality, Rigour and Ethics

- The final evaluation will be balanced and representative of overall project progress, results and learning.
- The final evaluation will be participatory in nature and generate data from a representative sample of project stakeholders - from project team members to project beneficiaries/recipients as well as wider key informants, champions, and observers, accounting for gender and other social differences among those involved in the projects.
- We (the Anukulan IPs) will aim to engage not just ‘direct’ project stakeholders but also those stakeholders who have an ‘external’ perspective on the project.
- The final evaluation will combine both primary and secondary qualitative and quantitative data collection and data analysis methods.
- We (the Anukulan IPs) will be explicit about the process by which we plan to arrive at a set of robust and evidence-based findings and conclusions. Evidence will be consistently cross-referenced throughout the review and evaluation reports and claims made will be substantiated / validated through reference to the evidence to support these claims.
- All data collection approaches will be in line with DFID’s Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation

6 Expected Outputs

1. Final Evaluation report (up to 50 pages long). The final evaluation report will contain (but is not confined to) the following sections:
 - Description of project and outcomes achieved, the ‘intervention packages’ – the activities that it is undertaking – and the synergies between these
 - Description of the final evaluation approach and data collection methods (e.g. routine data collection / interviews etc.) including participant selection, and the reasons for your choice of methods;
 - Description of the final evaluation team and data collection process
 - Description of assumptions underlying the project (drawing on theory of change and other evidence)
 - Key evidence and analysis – how and why things happened the way they did, for whom and in what circumstances; how assumptions about the project have changed since the start

- Key lessons
- Set of evidence-based lessons and discussion of what should/ could be replicated and/or done differently next time

The final evaluation report will be fully referenced back to the underlying data sources. Adequate data storage protocols will be ensured so that data can easily be shared with the team (i.e. through Dropbox or Google Drive).

7 Timeline and Budget Summary

7.1 Time Line

Detail plan will be worked out jointly with the consultant team and project staff. The work is expected to commence from December 7, 2017 with the final report to be submitted by January 2018.

S. No.	Activity	Week											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Development and finalization of the final evaluation methodology	■	■										
2	Orientation to field team for interviews and information collection			■									
3	Field work execution				■	■	■						
4	Information collection, compilation and analysis							■	■	■			
5	Preparation of draft final evaluation report									■	■		
6	Discussion of the report within Anukulan team and refinement											■	
7	Submission of the final evaluation report												■

7.2 Budget

The maximum allowable budget for this final evaluation work will be NRs. 15,00,000 (including all applicable taxes) which covers all field survey costs including consultant's fee for conducting final evaluation review. 40% of total budget will be released upon signing of the contract while remaining 30% and 30% budget will be released after submitting draft report and final report respectively. Government tax regulation will apply and tax deduction at source will be done in such cases.