

Terms of Reference - Independent Final Evaluation

Programme name: Reducing Poverty and Hunger of vulnerable people (majority women) through improved pig production, processing, marketing and income generation in 25 rural communities in five districts in Sierra Leone

Programme duration: 01/05/2015 to 31/10/2017

Donors: UK Department for International Development

1.1 Project description

The project is a pig value chain intervention designed to enhance the livelihoods and incomes of 5,588 poor rural people in 35 communities in five districts of Sierra Leone: Western Rural, Port Loko, Bombali, Tonkolili and Bo. Through improving knowledge and skills, increasing access to high quality affordable inputs (e.g. feed, vaccines, medicine), and increasing access to markets and processing facilities, this project is designed to significantly increase production and incomes of 832 poor, small-scale farmers (minimum 80% women) and their families (4,077 people in total). In addition, establishing slaughter houses should further increase farmer profits and benefit 115 slaughter house wage labourers through employment (564 household members). The project responds to the lucrative income generating and food security enhancing opportunity that modern pig farming represents in Sierra Leone, and the specific needs in selected communities that have persistently high levels of food poverty above the national average.

BRAC is seeking an evaluator in the global development agriculture sector to conduct the independent final evaluation on this project, facilitated by the BRAC team, in Sierra Leone. The consultancy, with a suggested timeframe of 25 days, will be arranged within an agreed period between 15th Sept – 20th Oct 2017.

1.2 Donor background

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) is a funding mechanism for civil society organisations (CSOs) and is the main donor for this project.

1.3 Purpose of independent final evaluation

The independent final evaluation of the project will evaluate the progress and impact achieved. The evaluation should provide findings and conclusions based on robust and transparent evidence, using BRAC's own data, and where necessary, supplementing it with independent research. The evaluation will be used to inform:

- The DFID GPAF Fund Manager's understanding of BRAC's performance at the project level, which it will assess through project completion reporting and independent final evaluation.
 - o This process may include ad hoc follow up or clarification requests, therefore where supplementing information with primary research, the independent final evaluator should include transparent sources from which BRAC can draw after completion.
- The DFID GPAF Evaluation Manager's assessment of overall performance at the GPAF fund level. The analysis of the information from the independent evaluation process will

represent a major source upon which the Evaluation Manager will assess the final performance of the Fund.

- BRAC's learning objectives

1.4 Key objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation has two explicit objectives:

1. To independently verify (and supplement where necessary), the record of achievement of the project as reported through its Annual Reports and defined in the project logframe
 - a. This exercise could include verifying information collected by BRAC for reporting purposes and possibly supplementing this data with additional information collected through primary and secondary research.
 - b. Other activities and results that occur outside of the logframe that may require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reporting will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results
2. To assess the extent to which the project was good value for money. This includes considering the following questions:
 - a. How well did the project meet its objectives?
 - b. How well did the project apply value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcomes?
 - c. What has happened because of DFID and other donor funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened?
 - d. How well did the project align with DFID and donor objectives to support the delivery of the Millennium Development Goals?

1.5 Verification of BRAC reporting

The first task of the final evaluation is to verify BRAC's achievement. The record of achievement will be presented in past Annual Reports and progress against the project logframe. Verifying the results from the project log frame will begin to capture what the project has achieved. However, there will be other activities and results that occur outside of the logframe that may require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reporting will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results.

1.6 Evaluation questions

To ensure comparability across the final evaluation reports of all DFID GPAF grantees, the evaluator(s) should respond to the questions below. All evaluators are encouraged to structure their research questions according to the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact¹.

Evaluator(s) should use discretion in the weighting given to each question, as this may vary depending on the objectives of certain projects and the availability of data. Questions should be organised according to the structure provided in section 2.4.

¹ DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance, OECD (1991)

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

- Relevance
 - To what extent did BRAC support achievement towards the MDGs, specifically off-track MDGs?
 - To what extent did the project target and reach the poor and marginalised?
 - To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the design and delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?
 - How well did the project respond to the needs of target beneficiaries, including how these needs evolved over time?
- Effectiveness
 - To what extent are the results that are reported a fair and accurate record of achievement?
 - To what extent has the project delivered results that are value for money? To include but not limited to:
 - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy and efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
 - What has happened because of DFID and other donor funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened;
 - To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
 - What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?
- Efficiency
 - To what extent did BRAC deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?
 - To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?
- Sustainability
 - To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources? What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
 - To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?
- Impact
 - To what extent and how has the project built the capacity of civil society?
 - How many people are receiving support from the project that otherwise would not have received support?
 - To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?

3 Evaluation methods

2.1 Research methods and sources

The consultants(s) (or consulting firm) commissioned to conduct the final evaluation and the grantee are jointly responsible for choosing the methods that are the most appropriate for demonstrating impact. Evaluation methods should be rigorous yet at all times proportionate and appropriate to the context of the project intervention. As the project works across 5

districts of Sierra Leone, site visits will be arranged in line with the methods selected. Evaluator(s) are encouraged to triangulate data sources where possible, so that findings are as robust as possible.

- Evaluator(s) are encouraged to apply a mixed-methods approach for assessing impact. This would combine qualitative data to provide an explanation of 'why' and 'how' the project has achieved the type and scale of results that are quantitatively observed.
- To definitively attribute impact, a counterfactual is required in the analysis (i.e. what would have happened to beneficiaries in the absence of the intervention?) Evaluation should capture impact, while also balancing concerns relating to proportionality of intervention.
- A contribution-based approach should result in a 'plausible' account of the difference that DFID and other donor's funding has made to the impact of grantees. Such an approach is typically informed by a wide range of evidence sources that are brought together to produce a 'plausible' assessment of the 'contribution' of grantees to higher level outcomes and impacts².

2.2 List of indicative materials to review:

BRAC's original application for funding; grant agreements; updated versions of organisational project logframes; monitoring data; monitoring systems, annual reports and comments provided by the Fund Manager; organisational monitoring & evaluation strategy; studies undertaken by the BRAC; financial information / information on resources spent; information on synergies / collaboration with DFID country programmes and other actors; published material (e.g. to demonstrate sharing of learning with others); and additional relevant documents. BRAC will provide research designs, sampling frame including for comparison group, tools (questionnaire), and data of baseline study.

2.3 Indicative methods for conducting primary and secondary research

Relevant primary and secondary research may include: interviews with staff at BRAC involved in the management and delivery of work; focus group discussions with ultimate beneficiaries; surveys with other relevant stakeholders where possible and proportionate; systematic reviews of secondary studies and sources, measuring impact where possible and proportionate through comparison groups and other quantitative methods; and verifying reported data through back checking and quality control assessments.

2.4 Structure of report

The main body of the report (draft and final version) must be limited to 40 pages (this can include or exclude annexes).

A table summarising the findings according to the OECD-DAC criteria should be included as an annex.

To ensure consistency across DFID GPAF evaluation reports, the following structure should

² Please see further DFID documents for additional guidance:
Broadening the Range of Designs and Methods of Impact Evaluations:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67427/design-method-impact-eval.pdf
Evaluation Manager's Evaluation Strategy for the GPAF and PPA:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/237270/evaluation-manager-PPA-GPAF-evaluation-strategy.pdf

be used for reporting:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Organisation context
 - Logic and assumptions of the evaluation
 - Overview of GPAF and other donor funded activities
- Evaluation Methodology
 - Evaluation plan
 - Strengths and weaknesses of selected design and research methods
 - Summary of problems and issues encountered
- Findings
 - Overall Results
 - Assessment of accuracy of reported results
 - Relevance
 - Effectiveness
 - Efficiency
 - Sustainability
 - Impact
- Conclusions
 - Summary of achievements against evaluation questions
 - Summary of achievements against rationale for GPAF and donor funding
 - Overall impact and value for money of GPAF and donor funded activities
- Lessons learned (where relevant)
 - Project level - management, design, implementation
 - Policy level
 - Sector level
 - GPAF and other donor management
- Recommendations
- Annexes (such as)
 - Independent final evaluation terms of reference
 - Evaluation research schedule
 - Evaluation framework
 - Data collection tools
 - List of people consulted
 - List of supporting documentary information
 - Details of the evaluation team
 - BRAC management response to report findings and recommendations

3. Contractual and reporting arrangements

3.1 Profile of the Independent Final Evaluation provider

The Independent Evaluator should be a suitably-qualified and experienced consultant or consulting firm. The consultant profile should include:

- An evaluation specialist with extensive experience in programme/project evaluation in an international development context (a mixed approach that incorporates the technical skills of an evaluation specialist but includes some inputs from a sector specialist is most effective).
- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation;
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches and research methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative research methods. Where feasible and proportionate, the person or team should include skills and expertise required to design, plan and conduct impact evaluation, potentially using experimental or quasi-experimental techniques;
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience such as market-based solutions, value chain programming, agriculture, nutrition and gender, non-state actors and economic growth to ensure the evaluation design and research methods are as relevant and meaningful as possible given the aims and objectives of the project and the context in which it is being delivered;
- Ability to design, manage and implement primary research in potentially challenging project environments, such as fragile and conflict affected states. This may include the design of surveys, in-depth interviews, focus group and other research;
- Design and manage data and information systems capable of handling large datasets for monitoring and evaluation purposes
- Consideration of the extent to which the evaluator or evaluation team has appropriate country knowledge/experience. This includes language proficiency to conduct the research required or that resources be made available (e.g. translator or social gatekeeper) to enable the research to proceed smoothly; and while evaluation consultants may be nominated by the grantees they must not have a conflict of interest with the on-going activities of BRAC.

3.2 Budget, logistics and management

BRAC is responsible for recruitment briefing of the evaluator(s), and all logistical and technical support to facilitate required meetings and interviews in Sierra Leone. BRAC will be committing £7,434 towards this independent final evaluation, which is inclusive of all costs, encompassing expenditures related to both logistics and research.

The evaluator will report to Country Representative of BRAC Sierra Leone or his/her appointed person for every day task and final submission.

3.3 Deliverables and timeframe

The specific deliverables by external consultant are:

- Research design, tools, methods and detailed budget.
- Training of the enumerators

- Research supervision for data collection
- Data cleaning and data analysis
- Writing the final report, including revisions following feedback on draft
- The final evaluation consultant(s) will submit the final report (in line with the structure stipulated in section 2.4) to BRAC, in line with an evaluation schedule agreed with the evaluator(s).

BRAC will cooperate fully with the chosen evaluator through the provision of information, enumerators, field logistics, and computers for data entry.

The suggested timeframe is currently 25 working days within a 30 day period.

The consultancy will be arranged within an agreed period between 15th Sept – 20th Oct 2017.