

---

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**Final Evaluation of the Programme:**  
**"ACCELERATE PROGRESS TOWARDS MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOAL 1C"**  
**(MDG1.C Programme)**  
**Mozambique**  
**EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi**  
**Lot N° 1- Request N° 2018 / 404595 Version 1**  
**Contracting Authority: European Union Delegation to Mozambique**

<b>1.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2	THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED .....	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION.....	5
1.4	MONITORING EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND AVAILABLE DATA AND STUDIES.....	5
<b>2</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1	PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION .....	6
2.2	REQUESTED SERVICES.....	8
2.3	PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES .....	9
2.4	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION .....	13
2.5	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT.....	14
<b>3</b>	<b>EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.1	NUMBER OF EXPERTS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY .....	14
3.2	EXPERTISE REQUIRED .....	14
3.3	PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING.....	16
3.4	SPECIFIC ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER).....	16
<b>4</b>	<b>LOCATION AND DURATION</b> .....	<b>16</b>
4.1	STARTING PERIOD.....	16
4.2	FORESEEN DURATION .....	16
4.3	PLANNING .....	16
4.4	LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT .....	16
<b>5</b>	<b>REPORTING</b> .....	<b>17</b>
5.1	CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION .....	17
5.2	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	18
5.3	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS .....	18
5.4	LANGUAGE .....	18
5.5	NUMBER OF COPIES.....	18
5.6	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	18
<b>6</b>	<b>INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>18</b>

---

## 1. BACKGROUND

The "Accelerate progress towards MDG1.C in Mozambique" (MDG1), is a EUR 87.7 M programme funded jointly by the Government of the Republic of Mozambique and the European Union (EUR 77.3 M), implemented by the three Rome-based United Nations Agencies (IFAD, FAO and WFP) and coordinated and monitored by the Government of Mozambique mandated institution for food security and nutrition coordination (Technical Secretariat of the Ministry of Agriculture for Food Security and Nutrition - SETSAN).

The Programme seeks to improve the implementation of Millennium Development Goal 1C (MDG1.C) in Mozambique, so reducing hunger and chronic malnutrition in the country. The Programme specifically aims at improving the 3 standard components of food security through a complex and comprehensive set of activities: i.e. Availability of food (through improved agro-inputs, vaccination services, extension, increased fisheries), access (improved markets, market information, infrastructure, access to finance) and usage / consumption (nutrition education, fortification, home gardens).

### 1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

Although Mozambique's record economic growth since the late 90s have resulted in a substantial reduction of poverty levels at national level, these gains have only been moderate in rural areas.

Nutrition and food security indicators in particular have barely improved in the country in the last decade, reflected in critical child stunting rates of 43 % in 2013 (compared to 48 % in 2003) resulting in an estimated loss of 11 % of the country's GDP.

Preliminary results of an ongoing "Fill the Nutrient Gap" study conclude that although the majority of families (93 %) in Mozambique can afford to meet energy needs, more than half (54%) cannot afford the minimum costs for an adequate diet because of poverty, limited market access, and dependence on own production. In addition, high rates of infectious diseases like malaria, poor access to health services, water and sanitation are considered the roots causes of persistently high malnutrition.

Mozambique suffers from recurrent food crisis with a quarter of the population periodically in stress situation (IPC Phase 2) or in crisis (IPC Phase 3) and above, needing assistance. Trends over the last 10 years indicate an increase of the population facing food crisis at some point during the year, reaching at its highest peak 2.1 million persons facing IPC 3 in early 2017.

The underlying causes of malnutrition and food insecurity are multiple and the response strategy requires a multi-sectoral approach. Amongst them, agricultural development provides an obvious and significant entry point for efforts to improve food security and nutrition in Mozambique. This is particularly relevant as 75 % of the population in Mozambique depends on agriculture and fisheries as their main source of food security and income. Furthermore, women, as the principal drivers of good nutrition, account for nearly two thirds of the agricultural labour.

At the core of the matter is smallholders low productivity. An estimated 3.7 million smallholders with an average size of 1.1 ha produce on an average 95% of the total agricultural production. Production is characterized by rain fed agriculture with low technology application and vulnerable to external shocks as floods and draughts, pest and diseases. Post-harvest losses amount to 20-30%. For a significant part of the population their own production is insufficient to cover annual food needs and levels of chronic food insecurity remain high.

In some areas of the country, however, malnourishment has become a prevailing condition, even when the agriculture production is apparently sufficient to ensure access and availability of food. This is the result of a combination of scarce diversity of food intake and inadequate nutrition practices, compounded by poor water and sanitations conditions.

## 1.2 The Action to be evaluated<sup>1</sup>

<b>Title of the Action to be evaluated</b>	<b>Accelerate progress towards MDG1.C in Mozambique</b>
<b>Budget of the Action to be evaluated</b>	EUR 87,693,425
<b>CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated</b>	Decision FED/2012/024-173
<b>Dates of the Action to be evaluated</b>	Signature of financing agreement : 30/11/2012 End date of implementation: 30/06/2019

The programme "Accelerate progress towards MDG1.C in Mozambique" (MDG1C) seeks to improve the implementation of Millennium Development Goal 1C in Mozambique, so reducing hunger and chronic malnutrition in the country. The Programme's Specific Objectives cover the 3 standard components of food security: 1) Enhance agricultural and fisheries production, 2) Improve access to food 3) Improve nutritional status of vulnerable groups, in particular women and children. This is to be achieved through a complex and comprehensive set of sixteen results (Result Components)<sup>2</sup>:

Result 1: Availability in the market of high quality seed of adapted varieties improved

Result 2: Smallholder and emerging farmers have increased access to agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers, herbicides) and have improved knowledge of their cost effectiveness.

Result 3: Smallholder and emerging farmers have increased access to relevant advisory services from different sources (FFS, Service providers, private companies, farmer's organizations).

Result 4: Producers, in particular women, have increased access to poultry vaccination services against Newcastle disease

Result 5: Capacity of fish production in aquaculture regime improved

Result 6: Capacity for fish production in artisanal fisheries improved

Specific Objective 2: Improve Access to food

Result 7: Dynamic market intermediaries in small scale agriculture established

Result 8: Smallholder farmers storage facilities at household level improved and post-harvest losses reduced

Result 9: Higher value fish is produced and marketed by artisanal fisher folks

Result 10: Economic and market infrastructure improved for agricultural and fisheries sectors

Result 11: Access to Financial services improved

Result 12: Commodity Exchange plan elaborated, Government capacities developed and market information systems strengthened

Result 13: Fortification of staple foods accelerated

Result 14: Capacity to implement nutrition communication/education activities improved

Result 16: Women and children with improved knowledge in basic nutrition, hygiene and health and of production of fruits, vegetables and chickens

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

<sup>2</sup> Result component 15 was deleted through Addendum (Addendum 3, signed December 2016)

Result 17: Food assistance provided to food insecure people combined with nutrition interventions in drought affected districts of Mozambique

The Programme is implemented by the three Rome-based United Nations Agencies (International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World Food Programme (WFP), and coordinated and monitored by the Technical Secretariat of the Ministry of Agriculture for Food Security and Nutrition (SETSAN, - which has the mandate to coordinate food security and nutrition support in the country) with the support of a service contract (technical assistance EPTISA).

The original Finance Agreement has been revised in three occasions:

- Mobilisation of EUR 3 Mio from contingencies in order to respond to the emergency caused by the El Niño in 2015, administered by WFP. This resulted in an addendum to the existing WFP Contribution Agreement.
- Additional Allocation of EUR 10 M from 11th EDF in order to respond to the El Niño emergency in 2016. A separate contract (PAGODA) was signed with WFP.
- Mobilisation of EUR 730,000 from contingencies to extend FAO sub-programme. This resulted in an addendum to the existing FAO contribution agreement.

The MDG1.C includes 6 ongoing contracts:

1. FED/2013/313-281 Contribution agreement (CA) with IFAD (EUR 27,648,000).
2. FED/2013/315-626. CA with FAO. (EUR 22,178,425)
3. FED/2013/316-043 CA with WFP (EUR 12,700,000)
4. FED/2015/369-290 Programme Estimate 3 (EUR 1,598,425) managed by SETSAN with support from the Technical Assistance (below) using EDF procedures. It follows 3 previous Programme Estimates: FED/2013/219-490, FED/2013/334-886 and FED/2014/353-688 – (start-up, PE1, PE2, respectively, all closed).
5. FED/2014/341-968. Service contract– with EPTISA with the objective of supporting the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of MDG1.C as well as, helping develop information systems. The TA is located in SETSAN offices and report to SETSAN hierarchy.
6. FED/2017/384-512 PAGODA with WFP (EUR 10.1 M), in order to respond to the El Niño emergency in 2016. This is an additional EU contribution from 11<sup>th</sup> EDF to the original FA. This budget is not coordinated by the MDG1C governance structure

The indicative budget is set out in the table below.

<b>Implementing agency</b>	<b>EU Contrib. (EUR)</b>	<b>Contrib. governm. (EUR)</b>	<b>Contrib. impl. agency (EUR)</b>	<b>Total (EUR)</b>
<b>IFAD</b>	27,498,000		150,000	27,648,000
<b>FAO</b>	22,130,000		48,425	22,178,425
<b>WFP</b>	22,700,000		100,000	22,800,000
<b>SETSAN</b>	2,970,000			2,970,000
<b>TA to SETSAN</b>	1,400,000			1,400,000
<b>Monitoring evaluation, audit, visibility</b>	600,000			600,000
<b>Estimated contribution taxes and duties</b>		10,095,000		10,095,000
<b>Contingencies</b>	2,000			2,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	77,300,000	10,095,000	298,425	87,693,425

---

The supervision and coordination setup reflects the Programme complexity. It includes : A National Steering Committee (NSC) –Chaired by the Minister of Agriculture himself, which only met once in June 2017; a Programme Task Force (PTF) – involving representatives from SETSAN, relevant Ministries, the three UN Agencies and EUD, that meets at least twice a year for co-ordination and oversight of the activities; and a Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) – involving Programme coordinators from three agencies, SETSAN and EUD, which meets regularly once a month to cover operational aspects and draw lessons. In addition, meetings with TA EPTISA, SETSAN and GON are organised at a regular basis.

### **1.3 Stakeholders of the Action**

Each contracted UN agency is responsible for delivering the inputs and the outputs of their specific components. The implementation is to be handled in close coordination with the Ministries involved and aligned to the relevant Government strategies and implementation plans of the different sectors. Interventions are focused geographically, targeting 76 districts located in 10 provinces. The necessary co-ordination and monitoring of the programme is led by the Technical Secretariat of the Ministry of Agriculture for Food Security and Nutrition (SETSAN).

Within the scope of this multi-sectorial programme, numerous partners are involved at national, provincial, district and communities level. These include various ministries, related public and parastatal entities, provincial and district directorates, farmer organizations, NGOs, private sector and other Food and Nutrition Security Programmes.

### **1.4 Monitoring evaluation systems and available data and studies**

The MDG1 Programme, SETSAN established a harmonized reporting and M&E.

The overall MDG1 Programme indicators (impact and outcomes) are under the responsibility of SETSAN. SETSAN has harmonized the MDG1 Programme outcomes indicators (definition and description) with SETSAN key partners and overarching National Multi-sector Action Plan for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition in Mozambique (Portuguese acronym PARMDC).

The evaluation will use, in the largest extent possible, the information and dataset available in the bi-annual MDG1 Programme Consolidated Reports; MDG1 databases managed by SETSAN; MDG1 UN Agencies specific databases and studies (comprehensive list in Annex 2) .

The last National and MDG1 specific Food and Nutrition Security baseline surveys/studies was carried out end of 2013 setting baseline indicators for the MDG1 Programme and overarching PAMRDC. Concurrently, a nutrition causal analysis was carried out early 2014 in selected districts, by providing a more detailed livelihoods-based understanding of the situation of chronic under nutrition and context-specific causes.

A MDG1 FNS end line survey of Food Security and Nutrition indicators and a community level impact evaluation are planned to be conducted in September 2018. It is expected that the data will be available at the time of the evaluation.

In addition, each UN agency is responsible for assessing the outcomes of their interventions and for measuring the various indicators presented in the logical framework (per result component). Each agency is also responsible for reporting on and monitoring their activities and measuring their outputs. This includes as far as possible a gender disaggregation in data collection, and specific consideration of the impact upon women. In some cases each agency has conducted specific studies or surveys of the outcomes

It is difficult to attribute improvements in food security at provincial or national level to particular interventions; there are a multitude of effects at this level, and the EU funded-MDG1 Programme focuses upon a limited number of interventions areas and a specific geographical focus. Nevertheless, the overall

impact should be more marked and measurable at district level where programme activities are implemented. Efforts will be made to estimate the overall contribution of the MDG1 Programme to the improvement of the food security and nutrition as measured by the main surveys.

UN agencies have conducted or are currently conducting several studies of the different interventions, (Comprehensive list in Annex II) these will be made available to the evaluation team with all the databases used in the analysis. These studies will be essential for the analysis and lesson learning of the approaches.

A comprehensive mid-term evaluation was conducted in September 2015. In addition, the action was the object of comprehensive analysis by the studies for the programming of PROMOVE-Agribiz including the 11th EDF Identification and formulation study for Sustainable agriculture – production and productivity conducted by Michigan State University and study on agro-inputs by ISS-FANSSA (Integrated Support Service on Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture).

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Final
<b>Coverage</b>	ACCELERATE PROGRESS TOWARDS MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOAL 1C" (MDG1.C Programme)
<b>Geographic scope</b>	Republic of Mozambique
<b>Period to be evaluated</b>	Entire period of the Action to date

### 2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

This is an EU, FAO, WFP and IFAD joint evaluation to respond to the contractual evaluation needs of the Financial Agreement and the respective contribution agreements.

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority<sup>3</sup> of the European Commission<sup>4</sup>. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the results<sup>5</sup> of actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs<sup>6</sup>. From this perspective, evaluations should look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention and seek to identify the factors driving or hindering progress.

---

<sup>3</sup> COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com\\_2013\\_686\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf); EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

<sup>4</sup> SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval\\_comm\\_sec\\_2007\\_213\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf); SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd\\_br\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - [https://ec.europa.eu/neighborhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\\_cir.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighborhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

---

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the cause and effects links between inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the MDG1C Programme, paying particular attention to its results measured against its objectives;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve current and future actions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to:

- obtain an unbiased assessment of whether or not the planned inputs have led and/or contributed to the achievement of the anticipated results (outputs, outcomes, and early signs of impact);
- examine programme achievements, identify programme barriers to implementation and challenges (reasons why or why not the achievements have been made), identify any broader consequences, positive or negative, intended or unintended, which have occurred as a result of MDG1.C Programme and study determinants for success;
- provide recommendations based on solid evidence and lessons learned on best strategies and approaches to improve the food security and nutrition in Mozambique;
- provide recommendations for the programming and implementation of EDF 11 Programmes in the rural development sector, and in particular for PROMOVE agribiz (currently in formulation ) and steering of PROMOVE Nutrição (currently implemented), as well as other resilience related Programmes , in particular Pro-ACT 2018.

The main users of this evaluation will be :

- The Government of Mozambique, in particular line ministries involved in the programme and SETSAN to gain relevant evidence and learning for improving ESAN and PAMRDC operationalisation (both central and provincial levels) and other FNS strategies;
- the 3 implementing UN agencies to have a thorough assessment of what was achieved in relation to planned results, including recommendations for future programmes which may serve for advocacy efforts to scale up interventions and modes of action;
- the EU, primary donor, as an assessment of results achieved, and help prioritise funding decisions and make recommendations for similar programmes in the future;
- other donors concerned by Food and Nutrition Security and rural development in Mozambique will similarly benefit from the mid-term and final external evaluations;
- implementing partners of EDF 11 Programmes in the sector, in particular PROMOVE Agribiz (to be implemented by FAO, GIZ, World Bank DIME and the National Fund for Sustainable Development - FNDS) and PROMOVE Nutrição (implemented by UNICEF, the National Health Institute and The SUN-Civil Society Movement );
- implementing partners of post emergency and food security resilience programmes, in particular ProACT (to be implemented by WFP and FAO).

---

## **2.2 Requested services**

### **2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation**

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and early signs of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action adds benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the action itself, with the EU strategy in Mozambique for rural development and food and nutrition security in Mozambique with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

### **2.2.2 Indicative Issues to be addressed**

The issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on them and following initial consultations and documental analysis, the evaluation team will propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of evaluation questions with indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed with the approval of the inception report, the evaluation questions will become contractually binding.

The questions should include in their coverage the following main areas of analysis:

- An assessment of the Programme achievements, paying particular attention to :
  - Extent to which programme specific objectives were achieved: (1) Enhancing agricultural and fisheries productions; (2) Improving access to Food and (3) Improving nutritional status of vulnerable group;
  - assess the capacity building strengthening of community, government Food Security and Nutrition related institutions , and other stakeholders through the action;
  - impact on policy and regulatory reform;
  - assess MDG1C Programme infrastructure related work (Roads, markets , access to energy) and its contribution to food and nutrition security;
  - analysis of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability of each result component, coherence of the programme;
  - barriers to programme implementation and challenges and determinant of success (including internal and external factors that enabled or constrained implementation of the programme and achievement of objectives reasons why or why not the achievements have been made);
  - unintended (positive or negative) effects of the programme
  - Assess the UN agencies collaboration and joint field actions in common areas and beneficiaries.
- Recommendations and lessons learned for policy and approaches to food security and nutrition in Mozambique, in particular,
  - institutional arrangements;
  - effective operational approaches;
  - monitoring and information systems;



- integration of emergency with structural long term approaches to food security and nutrition.
- Recommendations based on the action lessons learned for EU strategy and future EU and Rome-based United Nations agencies' actions, in particular;
  - recommendations for EU strategy in Mozambique to rural development;
  - recommendations for multiannual programming;
  - recommendations for the programming of EDF 11 Rural development focal sector, and in particular for PROMOVE Agribiz (currently in formulation );
  - recommendations for integration of emergency support (e.g. food assistance) with long term approaches to food security, including implications for EU programming of future interventions in both emergency and post emergency settings.
- develop 4 specific case studies (including approach, results, lesson learning and policy and operational recommendations) that will cover in more depth the following themes;
  1. key lessons for programme approaches to Food and Nutrition Security and resilience,
  2. assessment of the support to seed value chains, including regulatory and policy work, support to public and private sector and at community level, including a critical assessment of e-vouchers' (as a type of smart subsidies) contribution to local supply, demand and adoption;
  3. critical assessment of programme approaches to the development of agriculture extension services, including Farmer Field Schools (FAO) and outsourcing (IFAD) models, including an analysis of impact on productivity and food security, institutional constraints, as well as, interrelations with subsidised system (e-voucher);
  4. critical assessment of the action in the support to smallholder farmers' (including fish folk) market integration, including support through extension, contract facilitation, infrastructures development , and access to finance.

The themes above will be revised during inception.

## **2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables**

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases: (1) inception /desk, (2) field, (3) synthesis, (4) dissemination. Deliverables in the form of reports and slide presentations should be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table below.

### **2.3.1 Synoptic table**

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted during each phase (not necessarily in chronological order) and lists the deliverables to be produced by the team, including the key meetings with the Reference Group. The main content of each deliverable is described in Chapter 5.

Phases	Key activities	Deliverables and <i>meetings</i>	Location
<b>Inception phase (Includes desk review)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document/data collection</li> <li>▪ Background analysis</li> <li>▪ Definition of methods of analysis and evaluation questions</li> <li>▪ In-depth document analysis</li> <li>▪ Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase</li> <li>▪ Methodological design of the Field Phase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Kick-off meeting with reference group /EUD (Videoconference)</i></li> <li>▪ Selected interviews</li> <li>▪ Inception note including evaluation matrix and work plan for field phase (see Section 5)</li> <li>▪ End of inception <i>debriefing with reference group /EUD</i></li> </ul>	Home based Rome Mozambique
<b>Field phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Meetings at country level</i></li> <li>▪ Gathering of primary evidence with the use of tools to be proposed by the evaluator</li> <li>▪ Visits to 4 provinces (Nampula/ Zambezia, Manica and Sofala) and districts (to be defined)</li> <li>▪ Data collection and analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Debriefing with the Reference Group</i></li> <li>▪ Intermediary Note / Slide Presentation (support to the debriefing sessions to be conducted at the end of the Field Mission)</li> </ul>	Mozambique (Maputo and selected Provinces and Districts )
<b>Synthesis phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Final analysis of findings, overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft Final Report</li> <li>▪ Executive Summary</li> <li>▪ Case studies drafts</li> <li>▪ Final Report</li> </ul>	Home based
<b>Dissemination phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publication of report, dissemination of findings</li> <li>▪ Support to design of seminar</li> <li>▪ Presentation to workshop / seminar, facilitation relevant sessions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Case studies for publication</li> <li>▪ <i>Final presentation seminar</i></li> </ul>	Home base Mozambique (Seminar)

### 2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying its key issues, as well as, at conducting most of the documental analysis needed for carrying out the evaluation.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session via videoconference between the EU Delegation/ reference Group and the evaluators. The meeting has the purpose to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility.

The inception phase will include a desk review, with the aim of conducting most of the documental analysis needed for carrying out the evaluation. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the action, especially evaluations and research studies carried out by Government, implementing UN Agencies and other donors and/or the private sector. This is to ensure a more robust approach to identifying information gaps and to ensure complementarity with evaluations that have already been done.

---

Selected interviews with the programme management, the relevant EU services in Brussels and UN Agencies' Headquarters in Rome and regional offices in Nairobi, Harare and Johannesburg should be conducted during this phase as to support the analysis of secondary sources. These should be conducted via video-conference, with the exception of interviews with resource persons based at the UN agencies' headquarters that could be the object of face-to-face meetings in Rome (a maximum of 2 days of team leader).

The evaluators will prepare the evaluation methodology, the evaluation questions, the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, and the planning of the following phases.

During this phase the evaluation team shall furthermore define the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures defined.

Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present terms of reference. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager in consultation with the reference group.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **inception note**; its content is described in Chapter 5.

The inception phase will be conducted home based, in Rome (team leader) and in Mozambique for its last stage. The evaluation team will present the inception note in a debriefing to the reference group in Maputo. Half a day presence is required for this.

### **2.3.3 Field Phase**

The field phase starts after approval of the inception note by the evaluation manager in consultation with the reference group.

The field phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and bringing further information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the evaluation manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the evaluation manager and reference group.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team shall use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the Field Phase an **intermediary note** (this could be in the format of a slide presentation) will be prepared. The note shall present preliminary findings. Its content is described in Chapter 5.

The field phase will be conducted in Mozambique in its totality. The evaluation team will present the intermediary note in Maputo to the Reference Group and the MDG1C Programme Task Force. Other debriefing meetings could be organised with other key stakeholders if found relevant. Half a day presence is required for this.

---

### 2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation of the final report and entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to finalise the answers to the evaluation questions and prepare the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present in a single report plus annexes their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (see Annex III); a separate executive summary will be produced as well.

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluator will deliver and submit the **draft final report** to the reference group.

The evaluation manager consolidates the comments expressed by the reference group members and sends them to the evaluator for revision, together with a first version of the quality assessment grid assessing the quality of the draft final report. The content of the quality assessment grid will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required.

The evaluator will then finalise the **final report** and prepare the **executive summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team should explain the reasons in writing.

In addition, the evaluation team will draft at least **4 case studies** on the themes indicated in section 2.2.2 based on the evaluation findings and lesson learning. These will include a description of the specific approaches, results, lesson learning and policy and operational recommendations. Evaluators will work with the UN agencies team and the EU Delegation to define the most useful content for adequate use in existing global practice platforms (e.g. capacity4dev.eu , FAO's policy series, WFP evaluation briefs and synthesis reports)

### 2.3.5 Dissemination phase

The main findings of the final report will be presented by the evaluators in a programme closing workshop /event to be organised in Mozambique (probably mid 2019 in Maputo).

One day presence of team leader is required for this.

The object of the evaluator's participation at the event will be to present the conclusions to the relevant Government institutions and interested development partners. Particular emphasis will be given to recommendations on the overall approach to Food and Nutrition security and rural development. The details of the seminar are to be developed at a later stage.

The expert will: (1) support the design of the meeting; (2) prepare and present a **slide presentation with key conclusions** adapted to the scope of the workshop and (3) facilitate the relevant sessions.

The organisation of the event shall be conducted jointly with SETSAN, FAO, WFP and IFAD.

In addition the evaluator will present findings within existing policy dialogue / development partners technical working groups (these could include agriculture- AGRED and Nutrition Partner Forum, to be identified during inception). These events will be organised back to back with the workshop.

The evaluators will also develop **the case studies** for publication ensuring their high visual impact and inclusion of infographics to support the events and for broader circulation to the community of practice. Articles should be ready to be posted on existing knowledge share platforms such as Capacity4Dev.

---

## 2.4 Management and Steering of the evaluation

### 2.4.1 At the commissioning body level

The evaluation is managed by the EU Delegation to Mozambique jointly with the FAO Office of Evaluation, IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation and WFP Office of Evaluation.

The evaluation manager will be the EU Delegation programme manager for the MDG1c Decision. The evaluation manager will manage the evaluation on behalf of the EU Delegation. She/he manages the whole process from the beginning to the end in collaboration with the representatives of the UN independent evaluation units. She/he is appointed:

- To ensure consistency throughout the evaluation process, from the terms of reference to the dissemination of the report and the follow-up of recommendations.
- To be the contact person for administrative issues and to coordinate the activity of the different actors (reference group and evaluation team).
- To organise, supervise and assess the quality of the different phases of the work.
- To ensure the smooth running of the evaluation.

The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a reference group consisting of:

- 1 representative of the FAO Office of Evaluation
- 1 representative of the IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation
- 1 representative of the WFP Office of Evaluation
- Technical Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition (SETSAN) from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA)
- National Directorate for Agriculture (DINAS) from MASA
- National Directorate for Agriculture Extension (DENEAE) from MASA
- Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC)
- Ministry of Health/ Directorate of Public Health (MISAU)
- Ministry of Education and Human Development (MINEDH)
- Ministry of Sea, Interior Waters and Fisheries (MIMAIP)
- Mozambique Agricultural Research Institute (IIAM)

The main functions of the reference group are:

- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the action.
- To define and validate the evaluation questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the evaluation manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

In addition to their participation in the reference group, the representatives from the UN independent evaluation offices will ensure that the evaluation process satisfies adequate quality standards and UN evaluation principles and needs. They will provide advice on the evaluation tools and methodology and support the evaluation manager in ensuring consistency throughout the evaluation process, and supervising and assessing the quality of the different phases of the work. They will be able participate in any of the phases, including fieldwork, and will remain strictly neutral during all stakeholder consultations.

## 2.4.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the team leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that for each evaluation phase specific tasks and deliverables for each team member are clearly defined.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.

## 2.5 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English. Working languages will be English and Portuguese.

# 3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The team will consist of a minimum of 4 experts, of which at least 1 should be a Category I expert and 3 Category II experts to be contracted directly by the EU under the Framework contract object of these terms of reference.

The exact composition of the team of experts and their inputs should be balanced to allow for complete coverage of the different aspects of the assignment, as set out in these terms of reference.

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and outside place of posting). The contractor can propose additional experts and days.

	Total minimum number of working days	(Out of which) minimum number of field working days - outside normal place of posting
	164	52
<i>Per expert:</i>		
Team leader Category I	51	17
Expert 1 – Category II	45	15
Expert 2 – Category II	45	15
Expert 3 Humanitarian response- Category II	23	5

## 3.2 Expertise required

Minimum requirement for all experts:

- At least Master's Degree.
- Fluency in English with strong ability to write and edit documents in English.
- At least 6 years of relevant experience (12 years for Team Leader – Category I), with a minimum of 4 years (10 years for Team leader – Category I) in developing countries, preferably Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Must possess proven experience in identification and formulation or review and evaluation of development programmes, preferably EU funded and UN implemented interventions.

---

Additional assets that will be considered as distinctive advantage for all experts:

- Previous assignments conducted in Mozambique.
- Experience in the implementation of food security projects/programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Specific expertise required:

1. Agriculture and agriculture services development. At least one member of the team will have specific expertise in agriculture and agriculture services development, with the following requirements:
  - At least Master's Degree in Rural Development, Agricultural Economics or a relevant directly related discipline.
  - Specific experience related to rural development programmes implemented with the public and private sector in cooperation with CBO's and direct beneficiaries.
  - Experience with development of support services (in particular agriculture extension services) and institutional development.
2. Food and nutrition security. At least one member of the team will have specific expertise in food and nutrition security, with the following requirements:
  - At least Master's Degree in food security, nutrition or development or equivalent discipline.
  - The expert must have specific experience related to nutrition and Food Security, including: Chronic and acute food and security programme management, institutional assessment; policy and strategy, and information systems development.
3. Private sector and value chains development. At least one member of the team will have specific expertise in private sector and value chains development, with the following requirements:
  - At least Master's Degree in Rural Development, Agricultural Economics or a relevant, directly related discipline.
  - The expert must have specific experience related to agriculture value chains development and private sector development with focus on micro small and medium size enterprises.
4. Humanitarian response At least one member of the team will have specific expertise on humanitarian responses , with the following requirements:
  - At least Master's Degree in Humanitarian/Development studies, directly related discipline.
  - The expert must have specific experience in humanitarian response programmes, with particular relevance EU funded (including ECHO) and UN ;

A team leader will be proposed amongst the experts. The team leader must have senior experience leading complex evaluations.

At least one of the experts must have excellent knowledge and practical working experience with EU procedures and with Rome-based UN agencies implementation modalities.

Although mastering Portuguese is not a requirement for all experts, the team as a whole needs to have the capacity to communicate and work in Portuguese.

Overall, the team will need to have the following expertise in view of producing the service and deliverables stated under 2.3:

Expertise in food security and nutrition, production and value chains related to agriculture (plant production and animal health & husbandry) and fisheries, local economic development with CBO's and farmers organizations, private sector promotion with focus on micro small and medium size enterprises, rural infrastructure development, institutional development, public administration, decentralization,

---

gender mainstreaming and human rights approaches, food security information systems, social behaviour change , interagency coordination.

All experts require excellent writing, editing and communicational skills. If the team proves unable to meet the level of quality required for drafting the report, the consulting firm will provide, at no additional cost to the Commission, an immediate technical support to the team to meet the required standards.

### **3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing**

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

### **3.4 Specific Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)**

It is expected that the Technical Offer provides a clear understanding of the terms of reference and the overall strategy of the MDG1C programme. Knowledge of the Mozambican context has also to be proven.

## **4 LOCATION AND DURATION**

### **4.1 Starting period**

Provisional start of the assignment: March 2019.

### **4.2 Foreseen duration**

Maximum duration of the assignment is 6 calendar months.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

It is assumed that the consultants will work on the basis of a five-day week. Travel could be conducted during week-ends when logistically suitable.

### **4.3 Planning<sup>7</sup>**

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill-in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalized in the Inception Report). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment.

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

### **4.4 Location(s) of assignment**

The place of posting will be home based and Maputo, with field visits in the Provinces targeted by the Programme and Rome (team leader for consultations).

Exact locations are to be defined during the inception phase. Field missions will have duration of minimum 5 working days per province (a minimum of 4 provinces should be visited overall by the team), with minimum 3 days in the districts outside of the provincial capitals. Overall the experts will spend a minimum of 15 days in the Provinces (Minimum of 5 days for the Humanitarian expert)

---

<sup>7</sup> As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA



## 5 REPORTING

### 5.1 Content, timing and submission

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the areas of action is required (to be attached as Annex).

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
<b>Inception Note</b>	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interpretation of intervention logic and theory of change of the entire action</li> <li>▪ Methodology for the evaluation including. data analysis, collection methods, evaluation matrix, and evaluation questions / judgement criteria and indicators</li> <li>▪ Preliminary answer to evaluation questions</li> <li>▪ Issues still to be covered and assumptions to be tested</li> <li>▪ Analysis of risks and of mitigating measures.</li> <li>▪ Workplan for the following phases</li> </ul>	End of Inception Phase
<b>Intermediary Note</b>	Power Point presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activities conducted, difficulties encountered during the phase and measures adopted</li> <li>▪ Key preliminary findings</li> </ul>	End of the Field Phase
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</b></li> </ul>	Synthesis phase
<b>Executive Summary</b>	4 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</b></li> </ul>	10 days after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
<b>Final report</b>	50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the accepted draft report</li> </ul>	
<b>4 case studies (Draft)</b>	6-8 pages each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Description of the specific approaches and results</li> <li>▪ Lesson learned</li> <li>▪ Policy and operational recommendations</li> </ul>	Synthesis phase
<b>4 case studies ready for publication</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High visual impact, ready for printing, includes high quality info graphics,</li> </ul>	Dissemination phase
<b>Presentation closure</b>	Power point presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key conclusions</li> <li>▪ Adapted to content of seminar</li> </ul>	

---

## **5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators**

It is strongly recommended that the submission of deliverables by the selected contractor be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

## **5.3 Comments on the outputs**

For each report, the evaluation manager will send to the contractor consolidated comments within 10 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the reference group shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments, if this is the case.

## **5.4 Language**

All reports shall be submitted in English.

The entirety of the following reports shall be furthermore translated into Portuguese: Executive Summary and case studies.

## **5.5 Number of copies**

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in 2 paper copies and in electronic version.

## **5.6 Formatting of reports**

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

## **6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE**

Identified reimbursable costs with their details that should be considered (indicative as this is a global price):

- National flights on mission and 1 return Home base - Rome (team leader). International travel to place of posting should be covered by the global fees.
- Car rentals for field missions. Travel within place(s) of posting is covered by the global fees.
- Per diems covering field work outside place of posting (Maputo).
- Editing costs for case studies

## **7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager using the quality assessment grid provided in Annex V, which is included in the EVAL Module (EU experts only).

---

## ANNEXES

---

### ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

(This refers only to EU contracted experts under Frame work contract in reference)

#### SPECIFIC GLOBAL PRICE TECHNICAL EVALUATION GRID

Request for Services- CRIS Ref. 2018 /404595

**FWC SERVICES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXTERNAL AID –  
LOT 1 :Sustainable management of natural resources and resilience  
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/Multi**

#### 1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighing between technical quality and price.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<b>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</b> (including, understanding of ToRs, overall methodological approach, backstopping, and timetable of activities)	<b>20</b>
<b>Total score for the proposed team of experts</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>

#### 2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, will be automatically rejected.

#### 3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

---

## ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- National Indicative Programmes for the periods covered
- Financing Agreement EU-GoM FED/2012/024-173 "accelerate progress towards MDG1.C in Mozambique" (TAPs and Logical Framework)
- Contribution Agreement EU-IFAD FED/2013/313-181 "MDG1.C IFAD Sub-Programmes" and addenda
- Contribution Agreement EU-IFAD FED/2013/315-626 "MDG1.C FAO Sub-Programmes" and addenda
- Contribution Agreement EU-WFP FED/2013/ 316-043 "MDG1.C WFP Sub-Programmes" and addenda
- SETSAN Programme Estimates ( start-up , 1, 2 and 3) and addenda
- Services Contract – Technical Assistance - FED/2014/341-968 " Technical Assistance Support to SETSAN for Monitoring and Evaluation of the MDG1 in Mozambique
- MDG1 - 6 monthly Programme Consolidated Reports
- Relatório de Estudo de Base de Base de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional em 2013 em Moçambique, Secretariado Técnico de Segurança
- Nutrition Situation and Causal Analysis – Mozambique, April 2014
- MDG1 mid-term evaluation report.
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors
- PAMRDC: Multi-sector Action Plan for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition in Mozambique/Plano de Acção Multisectoral para a Redução de Malnutrição Cronica em Moçambique, 2010-15, SETSAN.
- ESTRATÉGIA E PLANO DE ACÇÃO DE SEGUR DE SEGURANÇA ALIMENTAR E NUTRICIONAL, 2008-2015
- Programming and implementation documents of the 10th and 11th EDF Focal Sector 2 Rural Development
- Action identification / formulation studies for EDF 11th PROMOVE Agribiz
- Action Document (formulation) for Improving rural competitiveness in Nampula and Zambézia provinces, Mozambique- PROMOVE Agribiz
- Financing Agreement EU GON FED/038-044for the "Nutrition Support Programme in Mozambique" (PROMOVE Nutricao)
- ProAct 2018 , Mozambique , concept note
- Studies conducted by UN agencies (see appendix)

**Note:** The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

---

## ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The consultant is requested to deliver two distinct documents: the Final Report and the Executive Summary.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 5. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The cover page of both deliverables shall carry the following text:

*"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission".*

### **Executive Summary**

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

#### **1. Introduction**

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

#### **2. Answered questions / Findings**

A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning.

#### **3. Overall assessment (optional)**

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

#### **4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

##### **4.1 Conclusions**

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

---

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.

If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or other dissemination activities

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

#### **5. Annexes to the report**

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

## ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

Activity	Location	Indicative duration in expert days			Indicative Dates
		Team Leader	Experts 2 and 3 (each)	Humanitarian Expert	
<b>Inception phase:</b>					
Kick-off meeting	Home based	0.5	0.5	0.5	11 March
Desk review, methodology	Home based	5.5	5.5	5.5	
Initial consultations	Rome	2			
	Maputo	4	4	2	25 March
Send inception report					28 March
Debriefing to ref group	Maputo	1	1	1	29 March
<b>Field phase:</b>					
Meetings, consultations	Maputo	4	4	3	
Field visit project sites	Provinces	15	15	5	
Send intermediary note to EUD					25 April
Presentation key findings	Maputo	1	1	1	26 April
<b>Synthesis phase:</b>					
Production report	Homebased	8	8	4	
Send draft final report					9 May
Send draft case studies					10 May
Incorporation comments	Homebased	2	2	1	
Send final report					23 May
<b>Dissemination phase:</b>					
Case studies	Homebased	4	4		
Preparation presentation	Homebased	2			
Workshop	Maputo	2			May
<b>TOTAL working days (minimum)</b>		<b>51</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23</b>	

## ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

Refers only to EU experts

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included in the EVAL Module; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

### Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:	End:	
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

#### Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent



**The evaluation report is assessed as follows**

**1. Clarity of the report**

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

**2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence**

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures





Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

**3. Validity of Findings**

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts</li> <li>The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>4. Validity of conclusions</b>		
This criterion analyses the extent to which:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis</li> <li>Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions</li> <li>Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation</li> <li>Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations</li> <li>(If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>5. Usefulness of recommendations</b>		
This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions</li> <li>Are concrete, achievable and realistic</li> <li>Are targeted to specific addressees</li> <li>Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound</li> <li>(If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

**6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)**

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:



- Lessons are identified
- When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)

Strengths	Weaknesses	
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
Final comments on the overall quality of the report		Overall score