

**Terms of Reference  
End of Project Evaluation  
PHASE Worldwide and PHASE Nepal  
December 2016**



### **1.1 - Background information**

DFID provides significant funding to civil society organisations (CSOs), which includes NGOs, in line with its overall strategy to alleviate poverty and promote peace, stability and good governance. More information can be found at: <https://ukaiddirect.org/>

### **1.2 - Project Description**

**Project Aim:** Reducing the Impact of Poverty on Maternal and Child Health by Improving Food Security and Access to Basic Health Services for 18,000 people in the Karnali Region of Western Nepal.

**Project Summary:** This project will contribute to reducing Maternal and Under 5 Child Mortality within a marginalised population of 18,000 people in the Karnali Region, West Nepal. It will achieve this by improving access to nutritious food and basic health services specifically for mothers and children by increasing food security through skills training for female and male farmers, seed and stock distribution, educating and mobilising women's groups and supporting government health centres.

**Region:** Jair, Maila and Melcham VDCs in Humla district; Kolti and Bai (Wai) VDCs in Bajura district, Mid/Far Western Regions of Nepal (Karnali Region)

**Project duration:** 16<sup>th</sup> July 2014 – 15<sup>th</sup> July 2017

**Project Budget:** £397,232.45 (received from DFID £249,990)

### **1.3 – Report commissioners**

This report is jointly commissioned by PHASE Worldwide (Director: Sarah Galvin) and PHASE Nepal (Executive Director: Dr Jiban Karki)

### **1.4 - Purpose of the independent final evaluation**

Independent final evaluation reports will be used to inform the Fund Manager's (Mannion Daniels) understanding of the grantee's performance at the project level and will also be used to inform the Evaluation Manager's assessment of performance at the UK Aid Direct fund level.

The independent final evaluation report needs to be a substantial document that

- (a) answers all the elements of the Terms of Reference (ToR)
- (b) provides findings and conclusions that are based on robust and transparent evidence
- (c) where necessary supplements the grantee's own data with independent research.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress made towards achievement of the specific objectives of the project, its outcome and impact on the lives of beneficiaries that include the families, communities and governments. It will also measure the level of community and other stakeholder participation. It will also identify the intended and unintended outcomes, best practices, lessons learned as well as challenges arising from project execution. In addition, the evaluation will come up with conclusions and recommendations for learning and future intervention.

### **1.5 – Specific objectives of the evaluation**

The evaluation has two objectives:

- a) To independently verify (and supplement where necessary), grantees' record of achievement as reported through its Annual Reports and defined in the project logframe;
- b) To assess the extent to which the project was good value for money, which includes considering:
  - How well the project met its objectives
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome
  - What has happened because of DFID funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened
  - How well the project aligns with DFID's goals of supporting the delivery of the MDGs.

### **1.6 - Evaluation questions**

The evaluation should answer the following questions:

#### **Relevance**

- To what extent did the grantee support achievement towards the MDGs, specifically off-track MDGs?
- To what extent did the project target and reach the poor and marginalised?
- To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the design and delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?
- How well did the project respond to the needs of target beneficiaries, including how these needs evolved over time?

#### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent are the results that are reported a fair and accurate record of achievement?
- To what extent has the project delivered results that are value for money? To include but not limited to:
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
  - What has happened because of DFID funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened
- To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
- What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?

#### **Efficiency**

- To what extent did the grantee deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?

- To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?

### **Sustainability**

- To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources?
- What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
- To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?

### **Impact**

- To what extent and how has the project built the capacity of civil society?
- How many people are receiving support from the project that otherwise would not have received support?
- To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?

## **1.7 - Evaluation methods**

Specific details around the methods that are the most appropriate for demonstrating impact will be decided together with PHASE Worldwide at the start of the evaluation. Evaluation methods should be rigorous yet proportionate and appropriate to the context, data should be triangulated so that findings are as robust as possible.

The research should be based on a contribution-based approach which results in a 'plausible' account of the difference that DFID's funding has made to the impact of grantees. This approach should be informed by a wide range of evidence sources that are brought together to produce a 'plausible' assessment of the 'contribution' of grantees to higher level outcomes and impacts.

The evaluator should apply a mixed-methods approach for assessing impact. This would combine qualitative data to provide an explanation of 'why' and 'how' the project has achieved the type and scale of results that are quantitatively observed.

Relevant primary and secondary research may include:

- Review of existing documents and review of context and poverty trends including the project proposal and other documents, annual and quarterly reports, monitoring and evaluation reports.
- Field observation of the targeted community
- Household survey using survey questionnaires (100 HH)
- Interviews and workshops with PHASE key staff, local authorities and local groups
- Focus Group Discussions involving primary project participants, other social groups and key stakeholders.
- Report writing and debriefing with project and management teams
- Scoping reviews of secondary studies and sources, measuring impact where possible and proportionate through comparison groups and other quantitative methods

- Verifying reported data through back checking and quality control assessments.

List of partners/stakeholders to be involved/consulted in the evaluation include

- Government bodies (DDC, DHO, DADO, DEO)
- Community group
- Participants
- PHASE Nepal staff (management as well as field staff)

Materials to review will include:

- The Coffey Guide to DFID Evaluations
- The original application for funding
- MOU with DFID for funding
- Project logframes (original and revised)
- Monitoring data
- Monitoring systems
- Annual reports and comments provided by the fund manager
- Other evaluation reports undertaken by the grantee
- Financial information / information on resources spent
- Information on synergies / collaboration with DFID country programmes and other actors
- Published material (e.g. To demonstrate sharing of learning with others)

#### **Further guidance**

Additional guidance is presented in 'Broadening the Range of Designs and Methods of Impact Evaluations':

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/67427/design-method-impacteval.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67427/design-method-impacteval.pdf)

And Annex 8.1 of the Evaluation Manager's Evaluation Strategy for the UK Aid Direct and PPA:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-strategy-programme-partnershiparrangements-ppa-and-global-poverty-action-fund-gpaf>

#### **1.8 - Deliverables and timeframe**

We will be able to provide space in the PHASE Nepal office in Thimi (between Kathmandu and Bhaktapur) for the consultant to work.

#### **Time Frame**

- February 2017 – Contract awarded
- March 2017 – desk study, research design, planning and preparation (5 days)
- April, May – Research and 21 day field visit to far west Nepal (12 days for travel and 9 days for field work)
- Mid May – Initial draft report due (15 days for data analysis and report writing)
- End of May – Final report due (5 days for finalization and submission)

**The following should be delivered:**

- Inception report with detailed evaluation plan
- First draft report
- Final evaluation report
- Submission of hard and electronic copies of materials, data collected / analyzed and other evaluation documents.
- A summary power point presentation highlighting main findings and recommendations

The main body of the report must be limited to 40 pages (exclude annexes). One of the annexes should consist of a table which summarises the findings according to the OECD-DAC criteria.

**To ensure consistency across evaluation reports, the following structure should be used for reporting:**

### **Executive Summary**

#### **Introduction**

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Organisation context
- Logic and assumptions of the evaluation
- Overview of UK Aid Direct funded activities

#### **Evaluation Methodology**

- Evaluation plan
- Strengths and weaknesses of selected design and research methods
- Summary of problems and issues encountered

#### **Findings**

- Overall Results
- Assessment of accuracy of reported results
- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Sustainability
- Impact

#### **Conclusions**

- Summary of achievements against evaluation questions
- Summary of achievements against rationale for UK Aid Direct funding
- Overall impact and value for money of UK Aid Direct funded activities

#### **Lessons learnt (where relevant)**

- Project level - management, design, implementation
- Policy level
- Sector level
- UK Aid Direct management

## Recommendations

### Annexes (such as)

- Independent final evaluation terms of reference
- Evaluation research schedule
- Evaluation framework
- Data collection tools
- List of people consulted
- List of supporting documentary information
- Details of the evaluation team
- Grantee management response to report findings and recommendations

### 1.9 – Outline budget

The approximate budget available is £4000 (consultancy fee (team leader and research assistant/s)).

The budget should be inclusive of all costs covering team member costs, research costs and any other costs associated the completion of the work.

Cost of travel to and from the field will be provided by PHASE Worldwide – and not included in the budget above - but the local travel and other costs in Kathmandu if any should be borne by the consultant team themselves. PHASE Nepal team will offer support with the project visit to the far west. The project sites are up to 4 and 2 days walk away from the nearest road head or the airport respectively, along the Karnali River in Eastern part of Bajura and Southern part of Humla districts.

### 1.10 - Required Qualifications

- A minimum of seven years' experience in programme/project evaluation in an international development context.
- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches and research methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative research methods.
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience given the aims and objectives of the project and the context in which it is being delivered
- Significant experience of working in Nepal
- Excellent writing skills
- Fluency in English and, ideally, Nepali

### 1.11 - Terms of payment

PHASE Worldwide shall pay the consultant in full upon submission and acceptance of the final evaluation report.

### 1.12 – Tenders

Tenders should include and will be assessed on

- method statement – description of activities to deliver requested services; 30-40%

- project team's and organisation's experience and relevant expertise; 15%
- project and resource plan; 15%
- quality assurance and risk; 10%
- Price 20% - 30%

We will invite the top 3 bids for skype interview.

Please also submit your research proposal along with you team composition, budget and CVs highlighting similar evaluations you have conducted previously.

**Applications from qualified firms/individuals should be submitted by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017 to [sarah@phaseworldwide.org](mailto:sarah@phaseworldwide.org)**