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| **Contract Number** | ECHO/-WF/BUD/2018/91044 |
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| **Project Duration** | 18 months |
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| **Project Language** | English |
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| **Mission administering the Project** | Action Against Hunger Nigeria |
| **Responsible ACF HQ** | Action Against Hunger France |
| **Evaluation Type** | Independent Project Evaluation |
| **Evaluation Dates** | 22nd July 2019 – 31st August 2019  |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AAH | Action Against Hunger |
| ALNAP | Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance |
| CBT | Cash Based Transfers |
| CTB | Cash Based Intervention |
| CRM | Complaint Response Mechanism |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| EFSA | Emergency Food Security Assessment |
| ELA | Action Against Hunger’s Evaluation, Learning and Accountability Unit - UK |
| FCS | Food Consumption Scores |
| FSL | Food Security and Livelihoods |
| FSSWG | Food Security Technical Working Group |
| GAM | Global Acute Malnutrition |
| GFD | General Food Distribution |
| HHs | Households |
| HDDS | Household Dietary Diversity Score |
| IDP | Internally Displaced Persons |
| INGOs | International Non-Governmental Organizations |
| IYCF | Infant and Young Child Feeding |
| LGA | Local Government Area |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MAD | Minimum Acceptable Diet |
| MDDS-W | Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MT | Metric Ton |
| MUAC | Mid-Upper Arm Circumference |
| NGN | Nigerian Naira |
| OCHA | Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PDM | Post Distribution Monitoring |
| PLW | Pregnant and Lactating Women |
| PWD | Persons with Disabilities |
| SAM | Severe Acute Malnutrition |
| SEMA | State Emergency Management Agency |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedures |
| U5s | Children Under Five Years |
| WASH | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene |

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND**
	1. **Map of Project Area**

****

* 1. **Rationale for the Project**

ACF has been operating in North Eastern Nigeria since 2010 supporting a number of development and humanitarian interventions with a focus on addressing issues of malnutrition, WASH and food livelihood security. Building on existing capacities and national guidelines, the project *“Multi-sectoral nutrition, WASH and livelihood support to the vulnerable population in Yobe State”* focuses on treating severe acute malnourished children aged 6-59 months in different ways. It includes support to health facilities, promoting optimal IYCF, health and hygienic practices among pregnant and lactating mothers, support treatment and prevention of severe acute malnourished (SAM) U5 children through Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) and Care Group approach to improve the adoption of optimal Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) practices. The nutrition and health component of the project aims at creating commitment from local authorities to maintain CMAM services beyond the project period through capacity building, system strengthening, integration into existing primary health care system and advocacy.

The project aims to strengthen the technical capacity of Government institutions and community structures for improved access to nutrition treatment and preventive services, safe water and sanitation (including hygiene promotion) and access to social protection support for most vulnerable households.

* 1. **Project Goal**

The action's key aim is to save lives by providing key lifesaving interventions through existing government institutions and facilities. In reference to the identified life threatening problems and risks, the interventions package comprised of:

1. Life saving treatment of severe acute malnutrition;
2. Promoting optimal IYCF, critical hygiene and health practices having life saving impacts;
3. Improving access to water and sanitation in targeted health facilities;
4. Providing social safety nets support to most vulnerable families led by elderly and/or women and/or children <18 years - where presence of infants & young children in the family will be given priority to reduce hunger.

The treatment services are directly aimed to contribute in the reduction of childhood mortality related to severe acute malnutrition while promoting optimal infant and child feeding and care practices; improving access to water, sanitation are aimed to reduce morbidities among children.

Action Against hunger proposed to ECHO a cash based social protection intervention that seeks to build up the capacity of vulnerable HHs to resist recurrent lean season and other conflict related shocks that have adverse effect on food security & nutrition status of the HH members more especially children under 5. The proposed social protection activity is a pilot study aimed at ascertaining and properly documenting replicable best practices in social protection programing in the largely post conflict situation in Yobe.

This social protection component is aimed at improving the status of vulnerable families to provide them means sustainable support through the lean seasons to go through the seasonal stress. It works with social and behavioral part to encourage the community members for increasing the needs diet diversity and utilization of cash support for savings during the post harvest lean season. The key part of this intervention is to provide support to households based on the lean season through three different Tier systems. The total cash disbursement to the household is the same but the timing of the support will vary to explore the benefits of cash in target communities. It targets 720 extremely vulnerable households in 6 wards of Fune LGA with 120 extremely vulnerable households being selected per ward as per the laid down beneficiary selection criteria.

* In two wards (**T1**), **120** extremely vulnerable beneficiary HHs receive 5,000NGN (*in line with National Cash Transfer Office amount*) for the five (5) non-lean season months i.e. October, November, December, January and February. In these same wards (**T1**), the beneficiaries receive 9,000NGN (*half the exiting Federal Government minimum wage for meeting HH basic needs*) in the four (4) “mild” lean season months of March, April, May, and September. Additionally, in these same wards (**T1**), the beneficiaries receive 18,000 NGN (*the exiting Federal Government Minimum wage minimum wage for meeting HH basic needs*) in the three (3) peak of the lean season months (June, July and August). Transfers started in August 2018 and the total transfer per beneficiary at the end of the project in July 2019 shall be 133,000 NGN (*an average of 10,231 NGN per month for 13 months*)
* In two (2) other wards (**T2**), **120** extremely vulnerable beneficiary HHs receive 5,000 NGN *(in line with National Cash Transfer Office amount*) for the five (5) non-lean season months i.e. October, November, December, January and February. In these same wards (**T2**), the beneficiaries shall receive 9,000 NGN (*half the exiting Federal Government Minimum wage minimum wage for meeting HH basic needs*) in the four (4) “mild” lean season months of March, April, May, and September. Additionally, in the same wards (T2), the beneficiaries shall receive 54,000 NGN in one Month (*three times the exiting Federal Government Minimum wage minimum wage for meeting HH basic needs*) in June at the start of the peak of the lean period and will not get transfers in July and August. Transfers started in August 2018 and the total transfer per beneficiary at the end of the project in July 2019 shall be 133,000 NGN (*an average of 10,231NGN per month for 13 Months*).
* Again (2) other randomly selected wards (**T3**), **120** extremely vulnerable beneficiary HHs shall receive a constant figure of 10,000 NGN all the 13 cash transfer months. Transfers shall started in August 2018 and the total transfer per beneficiary at the end of the project in July 2019 shall be 133,000 NGN.
1. **PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**
	1. **Rational for the Evaluation**

This evaluation will be conducted as an exercise of accountability towards the donor ECHO and the beneficiaries at its final implementation stage. It aims to provide useful insights for programme learning and accountability especially in light of the transitioning process from full-scale emergency operations to rehabilitation/reconstruction and resettlement

* 1. **Objectives of the evaluation**

The overarching purpose of the evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the project and to determine if it has achieved its intended outputs and outcomes. Likewise, the evaluation should clearly explain why (or why not) these outputs and outcomes were achieved through an integrated analysis of the entire result chain (inputs, activities, outputs outcomes and Likelihood of Impact) and other contextual factors. The evaluation will use DAC criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and impact) in addition the consultant will look at design, coverage and coherence.

* 1. **Users of the Evaluation**

**Direct users:** Action Against Hunger Field Teams, Technical and Senior Management Teams, Action Against Hunger Technical Advisors/ Director in the HQ (France), Ministry of Agriculture, State Nutrition Department, NEMA/SEMA, FSSWG, and the Donor, ECHO.

**Indirect users:** Action Against Hunger International Network, in particular the ELA Unit within Action Against Hunger UK, regional and local governments, ministries, UN agencies and Global Clusters, NGOs and NGO Consortiums as well as humanitarian learning platforms (such as ALNAP).

* 1. **Use of the Evaluation**

The evaluation will be used for learning, improvement and accountability. Lessons learnt (from the project), identified best practices and recommendations are expected to be taken into consideration in designing other interventions of similar nature. The evaluation findings and results will inform knowledge management base of Action Against Hunger and will ensure best practices are adopted and applied within all the sectors. Feedback from the evaluation will be used to improve quality of our programs, modification and revision of design based on the lessons learnt.

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE**

* 1. **Elements covered by the evaluation**

The evaluation will focus on the entire project funded by ECHO. It will cover selected sites in Damaturu, Fune, Potiskum and Yunusari LGAs, looking at different levels of the intervention (community level, district level, and national level) and at the links between those levels. It will also cover all selected target groups of beneficiaries and will examine the implementation of all activities and the degree of achievement of all outputs and objectives.

Finally, the evaluation should provide key recommendations towards sustainability, if relevant and the recommendations should focus on both the outcomes of the project as well as on the overall process. Moreover, the evaluation will identify and recommend potential exit strategies. The recommendations should be solid and concrete to inform the project team on the best practices to adapt and to enhance interventions of similar nature in the future.

* 1. **Data Mining**

The evaluation will include a data analysis part as part as the inception period, extracting and examining trends, processes and patterns of large pre-existing databases in order to generate new level of information regarding beneficiaries for informed decision on future programming. Data analyzed from these pre-existing project data (beneficiaries’ database, transaction history, etc.) will be used to refine existing understanding of the impact/effectiveness of the project in different locations of project implementation and across different modalities of the food support intervention and will be reflected in the inception report

* 1. **Cross-cutting issues**

Throughout the evaluation process, gender concerns should be addressed in line with the Action Against Hunger Gender Policy. All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women, men, boys and girls as well as marginalized groups targeted by the project (such as PWD) should be considered throughout the evaluation process. Moreover, the community participation should be emphasized and how Action Against Hunger ensures that communities were involved throughout the programme cycle.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**

As per Action Against Hunger’s Evaluation Policy and Guidelines[[1]](#footnote-1), **Action Against Hunger adheres to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria** for evaluating its projects.

Specifically, Action Against Hunger uses the following criteria: Relevance/Appropriateness, Coherence, Coverage, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Likelihood of Impact[[2]](#footnote-2). To the latter list Action Against Hunger adds an additional criterion, **Design**. Action Against Hunger also promotes a systematic analysis of the **monitoring system in place** within the aforementioned criteria.

Evaluation questions have been developed to help the evaluator assess the project against these criteria (Refer to Annex II). The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between Action Against Hunger’s Head of M&E Department on Nigeria mission and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.

All independent external evaluations are expected to use DAC criteria in data analysis and reporting. In particular, the evaluator must complete the DAC criteria rating table (Refer to Annex III) and include it as part of the final evaluation report.

1. **EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This is a **one-group design** evaluation, examining a single intervention, without including any comparison with units (people, communities, etc.) that did not participate in the intervention. However, the evaluation is expected to consider the project coverage as well as the outcome of the project on the locations and individuals where the project is been implemented such as households who did not benefit from the intervention. This evaluation is also expected to look at units participating in the program “**before and after**” the intervention has been in operation.

Outlined below is the suggested methodological approach for the evaluator to collect quantitative and qualitative data and the chronological steps of the evaluation process. The evaluator will, to the extent possible, develop data gathering instruments and methods that allow collecting sex-disaggregated data. The instruments need to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible.

* 1. **Evaluation Briefing**

Prior to the evaluation taking place, the evaluator is expected to attend an evaluation technical briefing with country program technical coordinators. Briefings by telephone must be agreed in advance.

* 1. **Desk review**

The evaluator will undertake a desk review of project materials, including the project documents and proposals, progress reports, distribution lists, cash disbursement records and outputs of the project (such as publications, communication materials, videos, recording etc.), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources (Annex IV).

* 1. **Inception Report**

At the end of the desk review period and before the field mission, the evaluator will prepare a brief inception report based on the format provided. The report will be written in English and will include the following sections:

* Key elements of the Terms of Reference (TORs) to demonstrate that the evaluator will adhere to the TORs;
* The methodological approach to the evaluation include an evaluation matrix in annex to specify how the evaluator will collect data to answer the evaluation questions, pointing out the limitations to the methodology if any and the choice of sites per field visit;
* A detailed evaluation workplan and;
* Statement of adherence to Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and outline the evaluation report format.

The inception report will be discussed and approved by the M&E HOD in Action Against Hunger Nigeria and shared with stakeholders.

* 1. **Field Mission**

Primary data collection techniques

As part of the evaluation, the evaluator will **interview key project stakeholders** (expatriate/national project staff, local/national representatives, local authorities, humanitarian agencies, or donor representatives) as per the list in Annex V. The evaluator will use the most suitable format for these interviews as detailed in the inception report. The evaluator is also **expected to collect information directly from beneficiaries using both qualitative and quantitative methods**. Towards enriching triangulation, **if budget and timeframe allows,** the evaluator could also conduct **Focus Group Discussions** with other relevant stakeholders.

Field visits

The evaluator will visit the project sites according to select methods described in the inception report. The field visits will be informed by participation of community members in the program, accessibility during the evaluation and methodological approach used to select the sites.

Secondary data collection techniques: Desk review

The evaluator will further review complementary documents and collect project monitoring data or of any other relevant statistical data available within Action Against Hunger Nigeria and relevant to the project.

Debriefing and stakeholders workshop

## The evaluator shall facilitate a learning workshop in-country to present preliminary findings of the evaluation to the project and key stakeholders (including Local, National actors and among other sector players) to gather feedback on the findings and build consensus on recommendations; to develop action-oriented workshop statements on lessons learned and proposed improvements for the future.

* 1. **Evaluation Report**

The evaluation report shall follow the following format and be written in English:

* **Cover Page**
* **Summary Table** to follow template provided
* **Table of Contents**
* **List of acronyms**
* **Executive Summary** must be a standalone summary, describing the intervention, main findings of the evaluation, and conclusions and recommendations. This will be no more than 2 pages in length
* **Background Information**
* **Methodology** describe the methodology used, provide evidence of triangulation of data and presents limitations to the methodology
* **Findings** includes overall assessment of the project against the evaluation criteria, responds to the evaluation questions, all findings are backed up by evidence, cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed and; unintended and unexpected outcomes are also discussed
* **Conclusions** are formulated by synthesizing the main findings into statements of merit and worth, judgements are fair, impartial, and consistent with the findings
* **Lessons Learnt and Good Practices** present lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve project performance, outcome, or impact and; identify good practices: successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication; further develop on one specific good practice to be showcased in the template provided in Annex VI
* **Recommendations** should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action, and of the resources available to implement it both locally. They should follow logically from conclusions, lessons learned and good practices. The report must specify who needs to take what action and when. Recommendations need to be presented by order of priority
* **Annexes** should be listed and numbered and must include the following: Good practice template (annex VI), Evaluation Criteria Rating Table (annex III), list of documents for the desk review (annex IV), list of persons interviewed (annex V), data collection instrument, evaluation TORs

The whole report shall not be longer than 30 pages, 50 pages including annexes. The draft report should be submitted no later than 10 calendar days after departure from the field. The final report will be submitted no later than the end date of the consultancy contract. Annexes to the report will be accepted in the working language of the country and project subject to the evaluation.

* 1. **Debriefing with Action Against Hunger Nigeria**

## The evaluator should provide a debriefing with the relevant stakeholders in Action Against Hunger Nigeria on her/his draft evaluation report, and on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. Relevant comments should be incorporated in the final report.

1. **KEY DELIVERABLES**

The following are the evaluation outputs the evaluator will deliver to the M&E and Technical HOD in Nigeria mission:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outputs** | **Deadlines** |
| Inception Report | 26th July 2019 |
| Stakeholders workshop | 16th August 2019 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 29th August 2019 |
| Final Evaluation Report | 31st August 2019 |

**All outputs must be submitted in English and under Word Document format. The final report will be submitted as a PDF document.**

The quality of the inception report and the evaluation report will be assessed by the Technical Head of Departments in Action Against Hunger Nigeria.

The evaluator is expected to follow the format, structure and length as defined under section 5.3 and 5.5 above.

1. **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORKPLAN**

This evaluation TOR have been developed in a participatory manner, by the ELA in Action Against Hunger UK and the Nigerian mission based on inputs from relevant stakeholders.

The evaluator will directly report to the M&E HOD in Action Against Hunger Nigeria. The evaluator will submit all the evaluation outputs directly to M&E HOD in Action Against Hunger Nigeria. The M&E HOD in Action Against Hunger Nigeria will do a quality check (ensure required elements are there) and decide whether the report is ready for sharing. The M&E HOD will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications. The M&E HOD will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator by date agreed between the M&E HOD and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders. The evaluator will consider all comments to finalize report and will submit it to the M&E HOD who will then officially forward to relevant stakeholders.

The M&E HOD will benefit from the support of Action Against Hunger UK and the other technical Head of Department within Nigeria for the review and validation of all evaluation outputs.

Once the evaluation is completed, Action Against Hunger Nigeria will prepare the management response follow-up form to track implementation of the recommendations outlined in the evaluation report.

* 1. **Tentative workplan**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Evaluator Working Days** | **Dates** |
| Arrival in country | **1** | 22nd July 2019 |
| Evaluation briefing with Action Against Hunger Nigeria | **0.25** | 23rd July 2019 |
| Briefings with HQ France (via call/Skype) | **0.25** | 23rd July 2019 |
| Desk review, preparation of field work and prepare **Inception Report** | **3** | 24th – 26th July 2019 |
| Travel to the field | **1** | 29th July 2019 |
| In country interviews with project staff | **1** | 31st July 2019 |
| Field work, collection and analysis of secondary data & meeting with stakeholders | **15** | 1st – 17th August 2019 |
| Stakeholders Workshop in the field | **1** | 16th August 2019 |
| In-country Debrief | **0.50** | 17th August 2019 |
| Travel back from Nigeria | **1** | 21st August 2019 |
| Evaluation debriefing with HQ | **0.25** | 23rd August 2019 |
| **Draft Report** | **5** | **29th August 2019** |
| Action Against Hunger: Quality check and initial review by ELA, HQ and mission staff  | **NA** |  |
| **Final report** on the basis of stakeholders, Mission, HQ, and Action Against Hunger UK comments | **1.50** | **31st August 2019** |
| **Total:** | **30** |  |

* 1. **Profile of the evaluator**

The evaluation will be carried out by an international evaluation consultant with the following profile:

* Knowledge in Food Security and Livelihood sector with particular experience on cash-based-interventions, agriculture, nutrition security and nutrition;
* Background in social sciences/psycho-social area, and experience in care practices and complementary feeding;
* Significant field experience in the evaluation of humanitarian / development projects;
* Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the evaluation to be undertaken;
* Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs;
* Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;
* Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work);
* Fluent in English;
* Understanding of donor requirements (ECHO);
* Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines;
* Independence from the parties involved;
* Familiarity with the context of the humanitarian situation in Northeast Nigeria will be an added advantage.
	1. **Application requirements**

Qualified and interested parties are asked to submit the following;

* Letter of interest in submission of the Proposal and a CV of the consultant(s)
* A detailed technical proposal clearly demonstrating a thorough understanding of this ToR and including but not limited to the following;
	+ - * Consultant/Company Profile and legal documentation
			* Description of the Methodology and Sample Size Determination
			* Demonstrated previous experience in similar assignments and qualifications outlined in this ToR.
			* Proposed data management plan (collection, processing and analysis).
			* Proposed timeframe detailing activities and a work plan.
			* Team composition and level of effort of each proposed team member (include CVs of each team member).
* A financial proposal with a detailed breakdown of costs for the study quoted in euros.
* Date of availability
* Chronogram if different from the one proposed in this ToR
* Terms of payment if different from the one proposed in this ToR
* Currency of payment
	1. **Application procedure**

All applications should be sent electronically to: supply.ng@acf-international.org with attachments in pdf and a subject line: “ECHO A1N – Final external evaluation application”, before **14th June 2019.**

Note: As part of the Consultant selection process, the best five candidates will be subjected to an interview process, as may be required by the Supply Chain and Core Technical Teams, to inform the final decision on the award of the Contract.

* 1. **Evaluation of applications**

The evaluation of the applications by an internal team comprising of the M&E technical team and project manager will be conducted. Internal evaluation criteria and selection procedures from Action Against Hunger Nigeria and the ECHO A1N project will be applied.

The selection criteria used are the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical evaluation criteria  | Point |
| (i) Quality of the approach / adherence to the ToR | 30 |
| (ii) Specialized experience, technical competence and contextual Knowledge | 20 |
| (iii) Quality of the proposed methodology | 40 |
| (iv) A realistic and affordable budget- Weighted Average  | 10 |
| TOTAL:  | 100 |

**Immediate exclusion criteria**

* Technical offer
* Incomplete documentation;
* Lack of methodological note and or budget;
* Lack of previous relevant experience.

**Rating of financial offers**

Financial offers will be rated on scale from 0-10 based on the completeness and clarity of the information and on the apparent cost-effectiveness of the proposed action vis-à-vis the expected costs. The score is attributed by weighting every total budget against the most affordable financial proposal received, in order to include a comparative element in the final score.

* 1. **Security and travel arrangements**

The consultant will follow all Action Against Hunger Nigeria internal procedures, rules and security plans. All relevant documents will be shared with the consultant upon arrival in Nigeria.

The consultant will receive specific security briefings for every bases or sub-bases visited during the evaluation period.

All internal travel arrangements and accommodations will be arranged and/or provided by Action Against Hunger while on the Nigeria mission.

1. **LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS**

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belong to the agency and the funding donor exclusively. The document, or publication related to it, will not be shared with anybody except Action Against Hunger before the delivery by Action Against Hunger of the final document to the donor.

Action Against Hunger is to be the main addressee of the evaluation and its results might influence both operational and technical strategies. This being said, Action Against Hunger is likely to share the results of the evaluation with the following groups:

* Donor(s)
* Governmental partners
* Various co-ordination bodies

For independent evaluations, it is important that the consultant does not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

* 1. **Intellectual Property Rights**

All documentation related to the Assignment (whether or not in the course of your duties) shall remain the sole and exclusive property of the Charity.

* 1. **Payment modality**

An advance payment equal to 30% of the overall agreed compensation will be paid after production and validation of the inception report and upon receipt of an invoice addressed to Action Against Hunger Nigeria.

Following the completion of all the agreed expected tasks and following validation of the final technical report by the M&E HOD and project team, the remaining 70% of the overall agreed compensation will be paid, upon receipt of an original invoice addressed to Action Against Hunger Nigeria. The payment will be made through a bank transfer.

1. **ANNEXES TO THE TORs**
2. Project Log frame
3. Evaluation Criteria and Detailed Evaluation Questions
4. Evaluation Criteria Table
5. List of Project documents for the desk review
6. List of people to be interviewed
7. Good Practice Template

**ANNEXES**

**Annex I: Log frame (at May 2019)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objectives/Results** | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Progress to date (March 2019)** |
| Goal: To improve access to Nutrition and social protection services for the most Vulnerable Populations | Severe Acute Malnutrition Recovery rate | 75% | 75% | 93% |
| % of target facilities (PHU, schools, markets) with basic WASH services functioning | 20% | 30% | 61% |
| Average Coping Strategies Index (CSI) score for the target population | 34 | 30 | 7.9 |
| % of the target population with acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS) | 18% | 40% | 47% |
| % of beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex, age and diversity) reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible and participatory manner | 0 | 90% | N/A |
| Result 1 : Improved access to nutrition treatment and preventive services (including WASH in PHCs) through reinforcement of capacity for government health management team at State, LGA and facility level | % of infants aged less than 6 months exclusively breast fed | 23,3% | 30% | N/A |
| Number of children under 5 admitted for treatment of Severe or Moderate Acute Malnutrition | 20388 | 55933 | 19,837 |
| Number of health facilities where nutrition programs are implemented | 47 | 57 | 56 |
| Number of health facilities handed over successfully at the end of the project | 0 | 43 | N/A |
| % of feedback/complaints received which have been timely acted upon (disaggregated by sex and age) | N/A | 90% | 97% |
| Number of health facilities rehabilitated including WASH services | 20 | 30 | N/A |
| Result 2 : Increased support to vulnerable groups through Social protection safety nets.  | Number of households with at least one change in social behavioral pattern (for example use of cash, saving pattern, investment, planning and food production) | 0 | 576 | N/A |
| Number of people enabled to meet their basic food needs | 0 | 4320 | 6,567 |
| Percentage of participants showing an improved knowledge on social safety nets | 0 | 80% | N/A |
| % of feedback/complaints received which have been timely acted upon (disaggregated by sex and age) | 0 | 90% | 97% |

**Annex II: Evaluation Criteria and Detailed Questions**

To assess the project against each evaluation criteria, the evaluator will respond to the following evaluation questions:

**Design:** *A measure of whether the design is logical, allows for Results Base Management and include a sustainability strategy involving local partners and beneficiaries*

* Are beneficiaries needs (by sex and age) well identified and in which way? What was the level of beneficiary participation in project design?
* Is gender properly taken into account in project design?
* Do the selection criteria used take into consideration vulnerability status of beneficiaries?
* How is the cash disbursement coordinated between vendors, Action Against Hunger staff and Beneficiaries?
* Are project objectives and indicators SMART? Are sources of verification realistic?
* Is the design of the exit strategy realistic?
* Is there a good design of the M&E system in place?
* What is the balance of benefits vs side effects of the cash based intervention in the long run into livelihood asset creation in the households and what influence does it have on household dynamics?

**Relevance/Appropriateness:** *A measure of whether interventions are in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policies, thus increasing ownership, accountability, and cost-effectiveness)*

* Were the actions undertaken relevant and appropriate given the local context and needs of the target population?
* Was the assistance relevant and appropriate in relation to the practices / culture of the target population?
* To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken in to account in project implementation?

**Coherence:** *A measure of whether interventions are consistent with existing interventions, global and national policies and strategies to ensure consistency, maximize synergies and minimize duplication*

* Are other stakeholders informed or aware about Action Against Hunger activities/approach/strategy of the project?
* How have activities of this project been integrated with other Action Against Hunger sectors/ programs in the operational area?
* Do project team members feel they are working towards a common goal with respect to other Sectors which are not part of the project (WASH, Health)?

**Coverage:** *A measure of whether interventions meet the need to reach major population groups facing life threatening suffering wherever they are*

* Were the most affected groups covered with the limitation of the resources available?
* Was the geographical coverage of the project appropriate?
* Were beneficiaries correctly and fairly identified and targeted?
* How was the targeting understood or perceived by local communities?
* Were gender and vulnerable populations within the target community considered in Action Against Hunger’s assessment/identification of the beneficiary and in the implementation of the project?
* Did the project include special components for vulnerable groups (Women, children, disabled and the elderly), if so; were these systematically designed and monitored during implementation?
* Were the food vendors for the agreed commodities able to sustain food supply, was the supply enough to meet HH daily food requirements

**Efficiency:** *A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.*

* Were the resources properly allocated to reach the objectives?
* How efficiently are the project implementers utilizing the project’s inputs to conduct activities and achieve the project’s intended results?
* How efficient is the overall management set up of the project; or in other words, how is the suitability of management arrangements in place?
* Is the project being implemented in the most efficient way compared to other eventual alternatives (e.g. cash/food voucher, voucher/GFD, porridge mum/care group)?
* Are the project activities being implemented as planned and scheduled?

**Effectiveness:** *A measure of the extent to which the interventions’ objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance and illustrating the effectiveness of Action Against Hunger approach*

* What is the quality of the project outputs and/or project activities?
* What are the major internal and external factors influencing the achievement or non- achievement of the intended outputs and objectives?
* How effective is the electronic voucher system (Redrose) to beneficiaries, Action Against Hunger, Vendors and local economy?
* How were the cash (unconditional) disbursements organized from planning to redemption?
* How effective have the project performance and its outputs and objectives’ indicators been monitored?
* How is the adequacy of control mechanisms to limit fraud and corruption? How has the feedback mechanism in place worked? What could be improved?
* How was the project team able to adapt to the constraints of the project?
* What steps were taken by Action Against Hunger to ensure that its responses were coordinated with other organizations and local authorities?
* To what extent does Action Against Hunger take part in technical coordination mechanism at all level of project implementation?
* How does the porridge mum influence complementary feeding practices?

**Sustainability:** *A measure of whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn and project activities officially cease.*

* How and when does the project intend to withdraw its resources?
* What plans are in place to ensure that the achievements of the project are not jeopardized by the time of project phase out? Assess and evaluate Action Against Hunger’s exit strategy.
* Was the project assistance provided in a way that took account of the long-term context?
* How suitable are these plans and are they being implemented?
* Did the partnership or local community based organizations established at local level contribute to the sustainability of the work?
* To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long term?
* What is the added value of porridge mum vs classic food aid, in term of nutrition status, social linkage/cohesion, self -confidence, perceived support, perceived control, child development, etc?

In porridge mum, beneficiaries have a more active role than in classic food aid: how is it perceived by beneficiaries? Do they feel more empowered by this approach?

* What will happen after the last cycle of distribution, will the group continue to meet? Do they continue to cook together? Do they continue to use the recipes? Is the social linkage restored/improved in some way? What characteristics are associated to sustainability/success of the group? How do husbands perceive the activity? Should we involve men/father to make it more sustainable?

**Likelihood of impact:** *Early signs of positive and negative, primary and secondary, short, mid and long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended*

* To what extent is the project contributing to improved food and nutrition security status of vulnerable households? What does the comparison between baseline and endline suggest?
* What are some of the significant changes the beneficiaries can point to as a result of the cash transfer
* What are some of the changes realized in the markets as a result of cash transfers?

**Annex III: Evaluation Criteria Table**

The evaluator will be expected to use the following table to rank the performance of the overall intervention using the DAC criteria. The table should be included in annex of the evaluation report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating(1 low, 5 high) | Rationale |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance/Appropriateness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coherence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coverage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood of Impact |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Guidance for rating the evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating**  | **Definition** |
| **1. Unsatisfactory** | Performance was **consistently below expectations** in most areas of enquiry related to the evaluation criteria. **Overall performance** in relation to the evaluation criteria **is not satisfactory** due to serious gaps in some of the areas. Significant improvement is needed. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and Action Against Hunger will monitor progress in these areas. |
| **2. Improvement needed** | Performance **did not consistently meet expectations in some areas of enquiry**– performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas of enquiry.  Some improvements are needed in one or more of these. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and Action Against Hunger will monitor progress in these key areas. |
| **3. On average meets expectations** | On average, performance **met expectations** in all essential areas of enquiry and the overall **quality of work was acceptable**. Eventual recommendations over potential areas for improvement are outlined in the evaluation report. |
| **4. Meets expectations** | **Performance consistently met expectations** in all essential areas of enquiry, and the overall **quality of work was fairly good**. The most critical expectations were met. |
| **5. Exceptional** | **Performance consistently met expectations** due to **high quality of work** performed **in all essential areas of enquiry**, resulting in an **overall quality** of work that was **remarkable**. |

**Annex IV: List of Project documents for the desk review**

The evaluator will review the following documents during the desk review phase[[3]](#footnote-3):

|  |
| --- |
| **Document** |
| Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and Guidelines |
| Action Against Hunger Gender Policy |
| Action Against Hunger LogAdmin CBI Guideline and Annexes |
| Action Against Hunger\_ NG M&E SOP Registration cash beneficiary\_JAN2019 |
| Appendix AAH Nigeria Risks and Controls Cash Transfer Program |
| Project Proposal (ECHO Submission Package including annexes) |
| Action Against Hunger-NG\_ Project ME Plan and Calendar - Yobe State |
| Project Donor Reports – Monthly, Quarterly, and Annual Results Report  |
| Project Baseline survey report , PDMs reports |
| Project internal research reports and databases  |
| Price Monitoring Data |
| List of people to be interviewed |

1. <http://www.alnap.org/resource/6199> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The criterion has been rephrased to “Likelihood of Impact” as a thorough impact assessment is linked to the estimation of attribution, which can only be measured through experimental or quasi experimental evaluation designs. The evaluation design for carrying out a performance evaluation would not be suitable to determine the effects attributed to the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This list is non-exhaustive. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)