

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL PROGRAMME EVALUATION OF SDG-F JOINT PROGRAMME

Type of Contract: Local Consultancy - Individual consultants

Based in: Ethiopia

Consulting days: 30 working days

Consultancy time: 2 May – 12 June 2018

Application Deadline: 30 March 2018

1. GENERAL CONTEXT: the SDG-F and JP RWEE

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learned, and best practices of the MDG Fund and the MDG experience, while focusing on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships and gender and women's empowerment as cross-cutting priorities in all our areas of work. The SDG Fund aims to act as a bridge in the transition from MDGs to SDGs providing concrete experiences on how to achieve a sustainable and inclusive world as part of 'Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development'.

The SDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy is under implementation to track and measure the overall impact of this instrumental contribution to multilateralism. The SDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC) regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results.
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the SDG-F objectives, SDGs, Paris Declaration and Delivering as One.
3. To obtain and compile evidence-based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the SDG-F strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The Joint Programme on Rural Women Economic Empowerment (JP RWEE) was launched in 2012 as a five-year global Joint Programme to support a result oriented collaborative effort among the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) and the World Food

Programme (WFP) to promote the economic empowerment of rural women in seven countries, namely, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Nepal, Niger and Rwanda. Since 2015, the Joint Programme “Accelerating Progress towards the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women” (RWEE) is being implemented in Ethiopia by the Government of Ethiopia (GoE), mainly with the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA), Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MoANR), Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC), Federal Cooperative Promotion Agency (CPA) and their regional counterparts in partnership with UN Women, IFAD, WFP, and FAO and coordinated by UN Women and MoWCA. JP RWEE in Ethiopia has been developed as a separate and differentiated component of the United Nations Joint Flagship Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (JP GEWE) implemented by GoE.

The JP RWEE was also developed by leveraging on the comparative advantages and institutional strengths of FAO, IFAD, UN Women and WFP to generate more sustainable and wider-scale improvements in women’s livelihoods. UN Women brings in technical expertise on gender mainstreaming in all interventions, including planning and supporting community mobilization on women’s rights through gender sensitization, running of community conversations by engaging male in the process and also using the HeForShe strategy, and its extensive experience on enhancing women’s economic leadership development through business development services and provision of time and labour-saving technologies and promoting gender-sensitive policies, strategies, programmes and institutions. WFP’s rich experience in enhancing the income, agricultural production and markets of smallholder/low-income farmers; FAO’s experience in agricultural research and in establishing seed producers’ cooperatives, enabling production of a significant amount of quality seed of different crops is value addition for the programme success.

Background Ethiopia

Rural women play a key role in the development of Ethiopian Economy, providing a considerable proportion of agricultural labour force, playing a key role in food production and nutrition, and performing most of the unpaid care work, thereby supporting reproduction of the Ethiopian society. In Ethiopia, the majority of farmers are smallholders (rural women and men), dependent on subsistence agriculture and who are extremely vulnerable to external shocks such as drought and other natural disasters.

On average, rural women farmers perform up to 75 per cent of farm labour but they only hold 18.7 per cent of agricultural land and head 20.1 per cent of rural households. Their farms are smaller than men’s (0.9 Ha in comparison to 1.03 Ha) and produce 35 per cent less per hectare due to lower levels of input use and less access to extension services.¹ Despite the various policy initiatives to strengthen the position of women in the agricultural sector, rural women still have restricted access to agricultural inputs, fertilizers, finance, credit, extension services, technology and information that limit their contribution to household food security, improved income and the efficiency of the agricultural sector in the country. Besides, agriculture in Ethiopia continues to be very rain dependent, with irregular rain, making about one third of the population chronically food insecure. Rural women’s vulnerability to shocks, particularly droughts and their consequences such as food price increases, food shortages and livestock disease outbreaks, is aggravated by competition over resources and inter-clan rivalries. For instance, the drought strike in 2015 due to El Niño has also affected the 2016 harvest of the country. The impact of the drought is most severe for vulnerable households living in the pastoral areas of lowlands and the high-density parts

¹ FAO (2011). The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11: Women in Agriculture. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization

of highlands that make rural women farmers more prone to the consequences of poverty, food insecurity and lack of nutrition.²

Having recognized the disadvantaged status of rural women, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women in its Concluding Observations to the Fourth Periodic Report have called upon the state of Ethiopia to: take measures to combat poverty among rural women including effective measures to ensure rural women's access to justice, education, housing, safe drinking water, sanitation, formal employment, skills development and training opportunities, income-generating opportunities and micro-credits, and ownership and use of land, taking into account their specific needs; and ii. to ensure the participation of rural women in decision-making processes at the community level on an equal basis with men.

Empowering rural women is key not only to the well-being of individuals, families and rural communities, but also to overall economic productivity, given women's large presence in the agricultural workforce of Ethiopia. The barriers which prevent this need to be urgently removed in order to leverage development benefits of women's engagement in national economic development. These objectives are in line with the SDG targets on poverty reduction (SDG 1), food security (SDG 2), women's empowerment (SDG 5), and inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work (SDG 8).

JP RWEE in Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, JP RWEE was officially commenced on 14 November 2014 and it is scheduled for completion on 30 April 2018³. Its overall budget is USD 3,188,256⁴.

The JP RWEE aimed at accelerating the progress towards economic empowerment of rural women (farmers and pastoralists) in two pilot regions (Afar and Oromia) with an overall goal of securing their livelihoods and rights in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and in line with Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP I & II).

The Joint Programme has the following four key outcomes:

Outcome 1. Rural women improve their food security and nutrition

- Output 1.1. Rural women have increased access to and control over resources, assets and services critical for their food and nutrition security
- Output 1.2 Rural women's and their household's nutritional status improved

Outcome 2. Rural women increase their income to sustain their livelihoods

- Output 2.1 Women's increased capacity to produce goods with diversified access to local markets
- Output 2.2 Rural women access to holistic income-generating facilities and to gender-sensitive financial and non-financial services increased
- Output 2.3 Rural women increased their knowledge and incorporate acquired skills on financial literacy, entrepreneurship and sustainable agriculture techniques

² <http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/country/home/tags/ethiopia>

³ This is based on the approved no cost extension from SDG Fund.

⁴ From governments of Sweden (USD1,442,774), Spain (USD 1,500,000) and Norway (USD245,482).

- Output 2.4 Rural women have increased access to productive resources and services (land and agricultural inputs and technologies)

Outcome 3. Rural women strengthen their voice in decisions that affect their lives

- Output 3.1 Rural women confidence and leadership skills built to fully participate in family matters, rural institutions, cooperatives and unions

Outcome 4 Gender responsive policy and institutional environment for women's economic empowerment.

- Output 4.1. Agriculture key stakeholders, including relevant government bodies, capacity enhanced to conduct gender analysis and integrate gender sensitive indicators and targets in planning and budgeting

Context of Targeted Regions

The JP RWEE is implemented in four districts of two pilot regions, Oromia and Afar. Oromia regional state, which stretches over the largest part of the country is the most populous state. Administratively the Oromia Regional State consists of 12 administrative zones and 180 districts/Woredas of which RWEE JP targeted only three namely Dodola, Yaya Gulele, Adamitulu Jiddo Kombolcha. The foundation of the region's economy is agriculture providing employment for an estimated 89 percent of the population and accounts for about 65 percent of the region's gross domestic product. Exports of agricultural products originating in Oromia, such as coffee, hides and skins, pulses and oil seeds make up the lion's share of the country's exchange earnings. However, agricultural productivity is constrained by several factors including traditional farming methods, natural resources degradation and limited use of modern technologies.

On the other hand, Afar regional state, which is in the eastern part of Ethiopia, consists of 5 administrative zones, 29 districts/Woredas, out of which the Project targets one District called Dubti. The region is the origin of human species, where a 4.4 million years old humanoid is recently discovered. The population of Afar combine pastoralism with farming, rearing camels, cattle, goats, sheep and donkeys. Agriculture in the region is primarily on the production of maize, beans, sorghum, papaya, bananas, and oranges. In addition, cotton and salt are also produced and are common occupations in the region. The region is most challenged in Ethiopia and the most vulnerable to drought and climate change in the country.

Targeted Beneficiaries

The JP RWEE targeted 2,000 rural women (farmers and pastoralists) in two pilot regions (Afar and Oromia) (an extending to over 30,000 people – husbands, children and community members). The 1,600 rural women were targeted from six Rural Saving and Credit Cooperatives (RUSACCOs) of three districts (Yayagulele, Adamitulu Jidokombolcha and Dodola) of Oromia Region. The remaining 400 rural women were targeted from four RUSACCOs established in Dubti District of Afar region.

The JP RWEE has also targeted 26 government institutions (MoWCA, MoANR, CPA, Bureau of Women and Children Affairs (BoWCA), Bureau of Agriculture and Natural Resources (BoANR), Bureau of Pastoralist and Agricultural Development (BoPAD) and their zonal and district counterparts as the direct programme implementing partners and to build their institutional capacities for women economic development) and policy decisions. Within these institutions, 780 senior government officials (policy makers), experts and development partners were also targeted to promote gender-responsive rural polices/legal frameworks,

provide gender-responsive financial and non-financial services and ensure the participation and benefit of rural women from ongoing government initiatives and development programmes and projects.

Governance and Coordination Mechanisms/structures

The JP RWEE has a national governance structure composed by the High-level Steering Committee (HLSC) responsible to provide oversight of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) more generally and which exists as the apex of the local governance structure. It is co-chaired by the United Nations Resident Coordinator (UNRC) and the State Minister of MoFEC.

Part of JP RWEE governance structure is the Programme Management Committee (PMC) which is expected to benefit the programme through its overall supervision and strategic guidance. It is co-chaired by the Minister of MoWCA and UN Women in its role as the JP RWEE lead agency. The PMC comprises of MoFEC, MoWCA, representatives (Heads of Agencies or Deputies) from the participating United Nations agencies and representative from the United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) and the representatives of development partners that contribute to the programme.

The national Technical Working Group (TWG) is responsible for the planning, implementation, operational coordination, monitoring and reporting. The TWG is comprised of the technical level representatives of FAO, IFAD, UN Women WFP, MoFEC, MoWCA, the Gender Directorates of MoANR, CPA, and from the Afar and Oromia Bureaus of Finance and Economic Cooperation (BoFEC), BoWCAs, BoANR/BoPADs (short BoA), and Bureau of Cooperative Promotion Agency (BoCPA). Like the PMC the TWG is also co-chaired by the designated official of MoWCA and UN Women.

In addition to the above-mentioned structures, regional and district level steering committees and TWGs were also functioning to ensure the regional and district level coordination of JP RWEE in both regions. The regional steering committee are comprised of the heads of regional bureaus (BoWCA, BoFEC, BoA, BoCPA) participating in the JP and are chaired by BoWCAs and co-chaired by BoFECs of the two regions. The district level steering committee are also comprised of the heads of the district administration, heads of district level offices participating in the JP and district finance and economic development. The district level steering committees are chaired by the district administrations and co-chaired by head of BoWCAs of the two regions.

The regional TWGs are comprised of the focal persons of the regional bureaus (BoWCA, BoFEC, BoA, BoCPA) participating in the Joint Programme, the chair of the district level steering committee and are chaired by focal persons of the BoWCAs and co-chaired by BoFECs of the two regions. Finally, the district level TWGs are comprised of the focal persons of the district level offices participating in the Joint Programme and district finance and economic development. The district TWGs are chaired by the district BoWCAs of the two regions.

2. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The JP RWEE final evaluation is scheduled in line with the programme's M&E plan agreed with SDG Fund and accordingly, the main purposes of this final evaluation are the following:

Accountability:

- Provide credible and reliable judgements on the programmes' results, including in the areas of programme design, implementation, impact on beneficiaries and partners, and overall results.

- Provide high quality assessments accessible to a wide range of audiences, including SDG Fund, donors, UN Women, FAO, WFP, IFAD, women’s rights and gender equality organizations, government agencies, peer multi-lateral agencies, and other actors.

Learning:

- Identify novel/unique approaches to catalyse processes toward the development of rural women and gender equality commitments.
- Identify approaches and methodologies that are effective in meaningfully and tangibly advancing rural women’s economic and political empowerment.

Improved evidence-based decision making:

- Identify lessons learned from the JP RWEE implementation in order to influence policy and practice at national, regional and global levels.
- Inform and strengthen participating United Nations and government agencies’ planning and programming by providing evidence-based knowledge on what works, why and in what context.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the joint programme, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period between four to six months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the JP RWEE, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation. The geographic area of intervention evaluated are two Kebeles namely: Boyna and Asboda in Dubti District of Afar and six Kebeles namely: Abune germama and Aneno shesho Kebeles of Adam Tulu Jido Kombolcha District, Nonona chemeri and Eluna Dire Kebeles of Yaya Gulele district and Wabe burkitu and Buura Adele Kebele of Dodola district of Oromia Region.

The evaluation’s overall objectives will be to:

- Measure the extent to which the JP RWEE has fully implemented its activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes, specifically measuring development results;
- Generate substantive evidence-based knowledge on inclusive economic growth, food security and nutrition according to SDG-F sectoral policy goals, and gender equality and women’s empowerment by identifying the best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at the national (scale up) and international levels (replicability);
- Make recommendations for possible replications of the best practices and the concrete results achieved in the programme period.

The specific objectives of the final evaluation will be to:

- Measure the extent to which the JP RWEE has contributed to resolving the needs and problems identified in the design phase as stated in the result framework.
- Measure the JP RWEE’s degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
- Measure the extent to which the JP RWEE has attained development results for the targeted population, beneficiaries, and participants, whether individuals, communities or institutions, etc.

- Measure the JP RWEE's contribution to the objectives set in the respective specific SDG-F sectoral policy goals as well as the overall SDG fund objectives at local and national levels (accelerating progress towards realization of SDGs) compliance with the Paris, Accra and Busan commitments, UN system's ability to deliver results in an integrated and multidimensional manner and supporting transformational change).
- Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific results, policy goals and objectives with the aim to support the sustainability of the JP RWEE or some of its components.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Following the UN Women Evaluation Policy and United Nations Evaluation Group guidelines, the evaluations will be organized around the standard OECD evaluation criteria, which are relevance, efficiency, ownership, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programmes. The evaluation must also integrate gender and human-rights perspectives throughout each of these areas of analysis and within its methodology. This is particularly important to understand and assess programmes addressing complex, intersectional issues in women's rights.

The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme. The evaluation should be answering the following questions:

Design level

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the SDGs.

- To what extent was the design and strategy of the JP RWEE relevant (assess including link to SDGs, UNDAF, GTP II, Paris, Accra and Busan commitments, stakeholder participation, national ownership design process)?
- What are the main strategic components of the programme? How do they contribute and logically link to the planned outcomes? How well do they link to each other?
- Do the activities and strategies address the problems identified?
- Are the planned outputs and results relevant and realistic for the situation on the ground?
- Was a gender analysis conducted during the UNDAF or the development of the JP RWEE. If undertaken, did the gender analysis offer quality information on underlying causes of inequality to inform the JP?
- Is the intervention logic coherent and realistic, considering the phases of the programme from joint programming towards a joint programme? What needs to be adjusted? (refer to the programme Results Matrix)
- To what extent was this programme designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly?
- To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
- How strategic are partners in terms of mandate, influence, capacities and commitment? To what extent had implementing partners an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
- To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results? How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the programme document in assessing the programme's progress? Are the targeted indicator values

realistic and can they be tracked? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful?
Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

- To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable Communication and Advocacy strategy?

Process level

Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.

- To what extent was the JP RWEE's management model (i.e. instruments, economic, human and technical resources, organizational structure, information flows, decision-making in management) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
- Have JP RWEE's governance and coordination structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the JP RWEE?
- To what extent and in what ways did the JP RWEE increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
- Is the programme cost-effective, i.e. could the outcomes and expected results have been achieved at lower cost through adopting a different approach and/or using alternative delivery mechanisms?
- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources were efficiently used?
- What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
- Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?
- Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate human rights and gender equality in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the JP RWEE?
- Were there any constraints (e.g. political, practical, and bureaucratic) to addressing human rights and gender equality efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges?

Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions.

- To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities make the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?
- Have the stakeholders taken ownership of the programme concept?
- To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the JP RWEE?
- To what extent did the JP RWEE promote shared private and public responsibility for development?
- To what extent did the JP RWEE promote and create networks to develop alliances between public and private?

Results level

Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.

- What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?
- To what extent and in what way did the JP RWEE contribute:
 1. To the SDGs at the local and national levels?
 2. To the Paris Declaration, specifically the principle of national ownership?
 3. To the goals of Delivering as One at country level?
- To what extent are the targeted rural women participating in and benefitting from the JP RWEE?
- What are the changes produced by the programme on legal and policy frameworks at the national and regional level?
- To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?
- To what extent have capacities of government participating organizations, gender equality advocates and women institutions been strengthened because of the JP RWEE?
- Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the JP RWEE will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time if the programme was to cease?
- To what extent have the JP RWEE decision-making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decision and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the JP RWEE?
- Is JP RWEE supported by national/local institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the JP RWEE or replicate it? Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
- Do the implementing government partners have the financial capacity to maintain the benefits from the JP RWEE?
- Are requirements of national ownership satisfied?
- To what extent will the JP RWEE be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?
- To what extent did the JP RWEE align itself with the National Development Strategies (GTP II, etc.) and/or UNDAF?
- To what extent did the JP RWEE mainstream environment and climate change to ensure environmental sustainability?

Impact:

- What are the positive and negative changes produced directly or indirectly by the JP RWEE on the opportunities of rural women, and on the socioeconomic conditions of their families and localities?
- To what extent can the changes occurred as a result of the JP RWEE be identified and measured?
- To what extent can the identified changes be attributed to the programme?
- What is the evidence that the JP RWEE enabled the rights-holders (rural women) to claim their rights more successfully and the duty-bearers (government institutions) to perform their duties more efficiently?

- To what extent have power balances in the targeted communities shifted towards greater gender equality?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The evaluation will use methods and techniques as determined by the specific needs of information, the questions set out above, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. The consultants are expected to identify and utilize a wide range of information sources for data collection (documents, filed information, institutional information systems, financial records, monitoring reports) and key informants (beneficiaries, staff, funders, experts, government officials and community groups). The consultant is also expected to analyse all relevant information sources and use interviews and focus group discussions as means to collect relevant data for the evaluation, using a **mixed-method approach** that can capture qualitative and quantitative dimensions. To document some key individual and sub-group level results, it is also imperative to design a data collection tool that helps to identify the most significant result. The methodology and techniques (such as a case study, sample survey, etc.) to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the inception report and in the final evaluation report and should be linked to each of the evaluation questions in the Evaluation Matrix. When applicable, a reference should be made regarding the criteria used to select the geographic areas of intervention that will be visited during the mission.

The methods used should ensure the **involvement of the main stakeholders** of the JP RWEE. Targeted rural women and participating government organizations/the national, regional and district level JP RWEE governance structures should be involved in meetings, focus group discussions and consultations where they would take part actively in providing in-depth information about how the JP RWEE was implemented, what has been changed in their status and how the JP RWEE helped bring changes in their livelihoods. The evaluator will develop specific questionnaires pertinent to specific groups of stakeholders and their needs and capacities (for example, illiteracy needs to be factored in, or language barriers). When appropriate, audio-visual techniques could be used to capture the different perspectives of the population involved and to illustrate the findings of the evaluation.

The evaluation will be carried out following the UNEG Norms and Standards (see <http://www.uneval.org/>), UN Women Evaluation Policy as well as the Ethical Guidelines for evaluations in the United Nations system.⁵ In line with norms and standards a management response will be prepared for this evaluation as practical means to enhance the use of evaluation findings and follow-up to the evaluation recommendations. The management response will identify who is responsible, what are the action points and the deadlines.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

The evaluation will cover from the period of conceptualization and design to the moment when the evaluation is taking place. The consultants are responsible for submitting the following deliverables:

Deliverable	Description	Date Due	Payment Schedule
Inception Report	<p>This report will be completed after initial desk review of programme documents. It will be maximum 7 pages in length and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction ▪ Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach ▪ Identification of evaluation scope ▪ Main substantive and financial achievements of the programme ▪ Description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach (including considerations for rights-based and gender-responsive methodologies), data collection tools, data analysis methods, key informants, an Evaluation Questions Matrix, Workplan and deliverables ▪ Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits” <p>This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation manager and reference group.</p>	TBD	20%
Draft evaluation Report	<p>The draft report will contain the same sections as the final report and will be 20-30 pages in length. This report will be shared with UN Women who will then share it among the reference group (including TWG) for their comments and suggestions. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p>		
Incorporate the first comment and produce PowerPoint presentation of preliminary findings to RG	It will be presented after field work is completed.	TBD	30%
Final Evaluation Report after incorporating the	<p>It will be maximum 30 pages in length and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover Page 	Initial draft: TBD	50% paid after validation by Reference Group

<p>feedback from the presentation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary (maximum 2 pages) • Programme description • Evaluation purpose and intended audience • Evaluation methodology (including constraints and limitations on the study conducted) • Evaluation criteria and questions • Findings and Analysis • Conclusions • Recommendations (prioritized, structured and clear) • Lessons Learnt • Annexes, including interview list (without identifying names for the sake of confidentiality/anonymity) data collection instruments, key documents consulted, TOR, RG members, etc. <p>An executive summary will include a brief description of the programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its intended audience, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive Summary should “stand alone” and will be translated to ensure access by all stakeholders if needed.</p> <p>A draft final report will be shared with the evaluation RG for final validation.</p>	<p>Final approval: TBD</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------	--

7. EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY STANDARDS

The following UNEG standards should be considered when writing all evaluation report⁶:

1. The **final report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings**, conclusions, lessons and recommendations and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis (S-3.16).
2. **A reader of an evaluation report must be able to understand:** the purpose of the evaluation; exactly what was evaluated; how the evaluation was designed and conducted; what evidence was found; what conclusions were drawn; what recommendations were made; what lessons were distilled. (S-3.16)
3. In all cases, evaluators should strive to **present results as clearly and simply as possible** so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results. (S-3.16)

⁶ See UNEG Guidance Document “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, UNEG/FN/Standards (2005). http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

4. **The level of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation** should be described, including the rationale for selecting that particular level. (S-4.10)
5. **The Executive Summary should “stand alone”**, providing a synopsis of the substantive elements of the evaluation. The level of information should provide the uninitiated reader with a clear understanding of what was found and recommended and what was learned from the evaluation. (see Outline in Annex 2 for more details). (S-4.2)
6. **The joint programme being evaluated should be clearly described** (as short as possible while ensuring that all pertinent information is provided). It should include the purpose, logic model, expected results chain and intended impact, its implementation strategy and key assumptions. Additional important elements include: the importance, scope and scale of the joint programme; a description of the recipients/ intended beneficiaries and stakeholders; and budget figures. (S-4.3)
7. The **role and contributions of the UN organizations and other stakeholders** to the joint programme being evaluated should be clearly described (who is involved, roles and contributions, participation, leadership). (S-4.4)
8. **In presenting the findings, inputs, outputs, and outcomes/ impacts should be measured to the extent possible (or an appropriate rationale given as to why not)**. The report should make a logical distinction in the **findings, showing the progression from implementation to results with an appropriate measurement** (use benchmarks when available) and analysis of the results chain (and unintended effects), or a rationale as to why an analysis of results was not provided. Findings regarding inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from outputs, outcomes. (S-4.12)
9. Additionally, reports should **not segregate findings by data source**. (S-4.12)
10. **Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings** consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. (S-4.15)
11. **Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis**, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. (S-4.16)
12. **Lessons, when presented, should be generalized beyond the immediate subject being evaluated** to indicate what wider relevance they might have. (S-4.17)

8. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be three main actors involved in the implementation of SDG-F final evaluations:

1. UN Women Ethiopia Country Office, as the lead agency of the JP RWEE will serve as the commissioner of the final evaluation and in collaboration with the JP RWEE TWG members will have the following functions:
 - Lead the evaluation process throughout the three main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
 - Convene the evaluation reference group;
 - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
 - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team through applying a fair, transparent, and competitive process;
 - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the SDG-F Secretariat);

- Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
 - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee;
 - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.
2. The Programme Coordinator as the evaluation manager will have the following functions:
- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
 - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group;
 - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data;
 - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation;
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
 - Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
 - Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation.
3. The Programme Management Committee will function as the evaluation reference group, set up in line with UNEG norms and standards, to serve as sounding board and consultative body to ensure an efficient, participatory and accountable evaluation process and facilitate the participation of stakeholders enhancing the use of the evaluation findings. The reference group will be composed of representatives from the main government counterparts i.e. MoWCA, MoFEC, MoANR, and representatives from the four implementing United Nations agencies (FAO, UN Women, WFP, and IFAD), RCO and the funder (secretariat of SDG Fund).
- Identifying information needs, customizing objectives and evaluation questions and delimiting the scope of the evaluation (ToR);
 - Providing input on the evaluation planning documents;
 - Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports generated to enrich these with inputs and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention;
 - Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
 - Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation;
 - Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference;
 - Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods; Developing and implementing a management response according to the evaluation's recommendations;
 - Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.
4. The SDG-F Secretariat will function as a quality assurance member of the evaluation, in cooperation with UN Women, and will have the following functions:

- Review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted ToR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.
5. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation study by:
- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the ToR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.
 - The evaluation consultant will be responsible for his/her own office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, and printing of documentation. The evaluation consultant will be also responsible for the implementation of all methodological tools such as surveys and questionnaires.
 - The evaluation consultant will provide inputs for the reference group to design a complete dissemination plan of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

Accountability

UN Women, MoWCA and Afar and Oromia regional BoWCAs will be accountable for coordination of stakeholders involved, organizing field-visits, focus groups, providing translator/interpreter and other logistical issues while FAO, UN Women and WFP will provide technical support. They will give approval for the final evaluation report.

9. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure the extent to which development results have been attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and products should go far beyond what was said by programme stakeholders during the field visit or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc.) it's the ideal opportunity to set an agenda for the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also excellent platforms to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scaled-up at the country and international level.

The commissioner of the evaluation, the reference group, the evaluation manager and any other stakeholder relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete plan of dissemination of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, replicability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learned at local, national or/and international level.

10. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by UNEG.

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Programme related to findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the manager of the evaluation. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or if the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

11. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT/TEAM OF CONSULTANTS

The assignment will be managed by a lead consultant who will be responsible to have team members with diversified educational backgrounds and key experiences relevant to this specific evaluation as indicated below:

Academic:

- A Masters or higher-level degree in Agricultural Economics, Gender Studies, and Programme Budget and Finance management and other relevant field related to rural economic development.
- A special training in Monitoring and Results-Based Management is considered an asset.

Experience:

- At least 7 years' experience in conducting evaluations of similar development programme related to local development, rural women economic empowerment / gender equality and women's empowerment programs and with a team comprised of the above educational qualifications.
- Substantive experience in evaluating programmes and projects with a strong gender focus is preferred.
- Experience in working in the targeted Oromia and Afar Regional States is preferred.
- Experience in undertaking gender-sensitive evaluations.

- Ability to manage and supervise evaluation teams and ensure timely submission of quality evaluation reports.
- Proven experiences of previous work, especially in leading complex gender-responsive evaluations of programmes e.g. of United Nations Joint Programmes, Delivering as One, etc.

Language Requirements:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills are required
- Working knowledge in Afan Oromo and Afar official languages is strongly preferred. Consultants without these languages skills are encouraged to partner with other local consultants with the language and educational qualification specified above.

Required competencies:

- Knowledge of issues concerning women in agriculture, local and international policy and legal frameworks, women's rights and gender equality;
- Specific knowledge in food security, nutrition, economic empowerment, cooperative management and gender mainstreaming;
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills;
- Ability to deal with multi-stakeholder groups;
- Ability to write focused evaluation reports;
- Wide experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection methods;
- Willingness and ability to travel to the different programme sites in the country;
- Ability to work in a team.

PROPOSAL

The consultant(s) is required to submit a proposal of maximum 3 pages, which must include the following items:

- Summary of Individual consultant's experience and background.
- List of the most relevant previous consulting projects completed, including a description of the projects and contact details for references.
- Summary of proposed methodology for the evaluation, including the involvement of the reference group and other stakeholders during each step.
- Proposed process for disseminating the results of the evaluation.
- Team structure, roles and responsibilities and time allocation if applicable.

The following items should be included as attachments (not included in the page limit):

- Detailed work plan.
- Cover letter stating why you want to do this work, your capacity and experience and available start date.
- Detailed CV (UN Women P11) - of all the participating consultants. This can be downloaded from the UN Women website. here <http://www.unwomen.org/en/about-us/employment>
- At least **three sample reports** from previous consulting projects (all samples will be kept confidential) or links to website where reports can be retrieved (highly recommended).

Detailed budget: -

The budget must include all costs related to the following items:

- The consultants' time, including the time of any other team members. The day rate for the local consultant and all team members should be clearly specified.

- Transport costs, accommodation costs and per diems for the consultant and any other team members to travel to/from Addis to the targeted districts of Oromia and Afar.
- Communication costs, office costs, supplies and other materials.

Applications with the above details should be sent to Ayantu Ebba (Ayantu.ebba@unwomen.org) until latest 30 March 2018

12. DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

The final evaluation report will be uploaded to the SDG-F online global monitoring platform and thus be accessible globally and will be disseminated through other SDG-F channels.

In Ethiopia, the final evaluation report will be disseminated through all members of the reference group and it will thus be ensured that all stakeholders that were involved in the implementation of the JP RWEE will be informed about the results achieved and lessons learned. In terms of sustainability, it will be especially ensured that the final findings and recommendations will be disseminated to the Government of Ethiopia, which will primarily happen through them being members of the reference group and thus being closely involved in the evaluation process from the beginning.